United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1996 No. 124

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. HEFLEY].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 11, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOEL HEFLEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Bless this day and bless this land,
Keep us safe with Your strong hand.
May Your spirit, O God, forgive,
All our lives so we might live.

May Your benediction, O gracious God, that is new every morning and with us until the last light of day, surround us and keep us in Your peace, now and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MONTGOMERY 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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that during the joint meeting to hear an address by His Excellency John Bruton, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his right and left 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 the order of the House of Thursday, September 5, 1996, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

During the recess, beginning at about 10 a.m., the following proceedings were had:

□ 0955

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, JOHN BRUTON, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms, Donald T. Kellaher, announced the President pro tempore and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the Prime Minister of Ireland 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 New York [Mr. GILMAN]; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE]; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH]; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FLANAGAN]; the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY]; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]; the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY]; the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER]; the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY]; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]; the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS]; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. MANTON]; the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT]; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL]; the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN]; the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY]; and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The President pro tempore of the Senate, at

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort His Excellency, John Bruton, the Prime Minister of Ireland into the Chamber: the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON]; the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN]; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS]; the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK]; the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE]; the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY]; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

□ 1000

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced the Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, Dr. Joseph Edsel Edmunds, Ambassador of Saint Lucia.

The Acting 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 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 10 o'clock and 5 minutes a.m., the Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms announced His Excellency, John Bruton, the Prime Minister of Ireland.

The Prime Minister of Ireland, 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, it is my great privilege, and I deem it a high honor and personal pleasure to present to you His Excellency, John Bruton, the Taoiseach, Prime Minister of Ireland.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS EXCELLENCY, JOHN BRUTON, PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

PRIME MINISTER BRUTON. Mr. Speaker, Senator THURMOND, Members of Congress, it is a great honor to Ireland that I have been asked to address this joint session of Congress today, as only the 30th head of State or government of an European country to do so since 1945. But it is a particular honor to be asked to speak here on this day, the 11th of September.

For it was on this day, the 11th of September, 210 years ago almost to the hour, that delegates from New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Virginia met just 32 miles from here at Annapolis in Maryland, and it was there, at Annapolis, that they decided to convene the convention in Philadelphia that gave the people the Constitution of the United States of America, the world's first Federal constitution, the constitution that made Americans ''the first people whom Heaven has favoured with an opportunity of deliberating upon, and choosing, the form of government under which they shall live,'' making America the pioneer of that most powerful of all political ideas: democracy under the rule of law.

Two hundred and ten years later Americans can look back with pride at what they have given to the world. Never before in that long period have more of humanity lived under a system based on democracy and the rule of law than do so today.

Even in the case of countries as afflicted as Burma, people are standing up for democracy and the rule of law. For the first time in their history, the Russian people have freely elected their own President. The American model, constitutional democracy, has succeeded and spread because it is built on a realistic view of human nature. Checks and balances are needed.

As James Madison said: ''You must first enable the Government to control the governed, and in the next place, oblige it to control itself.''

American democracy has worked because it has controlled itself through the separation of powers in a written Constitution, and through a strong and independent Supreme Court that interprets that Constitution.

As President Andrew Jackson, a man of Irish ancestry, said in 1821: ''The great can protect themselves, but the poor and humble require the arm and the shield of the law.''

I speak today as President in office of the European Council, a body that is aiming to do for the 15 member states of the European Union what the men who met, and they unfortunately only were men who met at Annapolis and at Philadelphia, did so long ago for the 13 colonies of America. The European Union, through an Inter-Governmental Conference launched last April in Turin, is seeking to write a new constitution for Europe that will enable the European Union to add new members to its east, just as your constitution of 1789 enabled this great union to add so many new members to its west.

The establishment of the United States of America was the great constructive constitutional achievement of the late 18th century. The establishment of the European Union out of the devastation of World War II could be described as the great constructive constitutional achievement of the late 20th century.

We in Europe have much to learn from American experience. Americans came together because of necessity. Very few of the eventual Framers of the U.S. Constitution who met at Annapolis were inspired by the theories of Montesquieu or Locke, wanting to build the perfect state, a model democracy, a castle built in the sky. They came together rather because they had to reach urgent agreement on a framework to sort out immediate problems about shipping on the Potomac, about how they would pay for the army, about who was going to pay taxes and how they were going to be collected, how they would get their goods to market, and how their frontiers would be protected, very practical problems.

Americans in 1786 knew at Annapolis that they could not agree on commercial reforms to protect trade without making political reforms as well. That is why the men at Annapolis 210 years ago decided to call a constitutional conference in Philadelphia the following May. By working together to find the means of solving the practical problems of life for their citizens, the Framers of the U.S. Constitution forged the most durable and perhaps the fairest system of government the world has ever seen. They came together as people who were each loyal, first and foremost, to their own States. But they knew that that loyalty and allegiance could find its best expression as part of a wider American continental loyalty.

Mr. Speaker, it was necessity that brought Europe together too, the necessity of reconstruction after World War II, the necessity of resisting communism, and the necessity to resolve national conflicts that had caused 3 wars in just 80 years. That dynamic, that necessity, continues in Europe today.

It is often said that politicians and politics are made to serve commercial needs. The European Union has done the reverse. It has made commerce the servant of a great political objective. By creating a single coal and steel industry, a single agricultural market, a single commercial market, the European Union has created economic bonds that bind its members together politically.

The European Union has undermined the economic base of that force that causes wars, national chauvinism, but the psychological base of national chauvinism still remains a threat in Europe. If Europeans do not constantly work at bringing their union closer together, the strains arising from remaining differences will gradually pull their union apart.

Can the European Union create economic bonds that are strong enough to persuade European states to make sacrifices and take risks for a common objective? That is an important question for Europe, and it is also an important question for Europe's allies and the United States. And it is a question that Europe has to answer for itself. And depending on that answer, we will know whether the Yugoslav violence of 1992–93 was just the last convulsion of an old and primitive Europe or a sign of wider threats to come. And Europe has to answer that question while simultaneously bringing in new members, with a different political tradition from Central and Eastern Europe. That problem, that precise problem of bringing existing members closer together, while also expanding membership, is a familiar problem to anyone who has studied the 19th century history of the United States.

Europe's task of constitution-building today is particularly difficult. Europeans were on different sides in past wars, whereas America's Founding Fathers had all been on the same side. But, Mr. Speaker, we are determined to make the European Union work, to make it work for peace, to make the European Union a firm friend and partner of this great American union.

The United States has built a union that is robust enough to accommodate radical disagreements and still take tough decisions when tough decisions have to be taken. Europe must do the same.

This union, the United States, has worked because it is based on freedom. As Thomas Jefferson said, ''Error of opinion may be tolerated, so long as reason is left free to combat it.''

Conformism of thinking, political correctness, if you will, is the great enemy of democratic discourse. We must not be afraid to disagree. We must not dismiss other people's opinions just because they have used the wrong words to express them. Equally, we must accept that some people's views are so profoundly different from ours that we will never agree with them or them with us.

Living with difference. That's the challenge for the United States today. It's the challenge for Europe. It's the challenge for Ireland as a whole, but in a very particular way, it is a challenge for Northern Ireland—living with difference.

In Northern Ireland we see two communities, each offended by the views of the other, and by how those views are expressed. Two communities, each feeling itself to be a minority, a minority that has been oppressed or a minority that may be oppressed in the future. The fears of each community mirror those of the other.

Two minorities, equally justly proud of their heritage, each believing that their heritage is founded on tolerance and civil liberties, and each believing that sincerely. Two minorities who yet will always be different from one another, but who have not yet been able to see that, on many important issues, they already agree with one another far more than they disagree, and far more than either agree with others. They have exaggerated their differences and minimized their similarities.

Thus, if there is to be a peaceful and fair accommodation in Northern Ireland, each tradition must be willing to sit down and listen for long enough to the views, the worries, and the concerns of the other tradition, to uncover the common ground.

Thanks to the efforts of so many people here in the United States, the President and Vice President GORE, Speaker GINGRICH, and other leaders of both Houses of Congress, most of the parties in Northern Ireland have been sitting down and listening to one another since the 10th of June, under the able chairmanship of Senator George Mitchell, whose skill and commitment I salute today. They have had about 6 weeks of talks together, and they have reached agreement on important procedural issues, and laid the foundation for forward movement.

Against the background of 25 years of barbarity of every kind, and almost four centuries of distrust, it is hard to expect rapid agreement between nine different parties in the space of only 6 weeks. My own view is that the harmony that we seek will not come overnight. It will come in stages, from the experience of working together to solve practical, immediate problems.

But, if that is to happen, it is the strong view of my government that the talks must now move beyond procedure and soon discuss really substantive issues, substantive issues of disagreement. This must happen quickly. This must happen quickly if we are not to miss the window of opportunity, so often highlighted by President Clinton during his recent visit to Ireland.

On that occasion, the President spoke for all Americans. Almost as much as the Irish themselves, Americans welcomed the political efforts that gave us a ceasefire of 17 months. But now all of us want the IRA to stop for good. True negotiations can only take place in an atmosphere of genuine peace.

The all-party talks, for which we have all worked so hard, have been delivered. We must have everybody there at those talks now, genuinely willing, and able, to negotiate. That can only happen when everyone has been convinced that violence will never be used again to intimidate opponents or to control supporters, never again. That means a cessation of violence by the IRA that will hold in all circumstances, and I know that I have the full support of the U.S. Congress for that vital objective.

In trying to work out a system of government that all can share in Northern Ireland in quality and parity of esteem, we are not asking Unionists to cease to be loyally British, any more than we are asking Nationalists to cease to be loyally Irish, any more than the original Framers of the U.S. Constitution ceased to be loyal Virginians or loyal members of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We are asking Nationalists and Unionists to agree on a political framework which will allow them, together, to take on responsibility for solving the day-to-day problems that affect the lives of the 1½ million people who live in Northern Ireland, and to do so in harmony and cooperation with Britain and with the rest of Ireland.

Let the parties build on what they already agree about. All parties in Northern Ireland already agree that the form of government should be democratic. All agree that there should be a Bill of Rights. All agree that there should be links with the rest of the island. Each tradition agrees that the other should be respected, and each agrees that the other tradition cannot be coerced.

The Irish Government has no interest in propelling anybody into an arrangement that they do not wish to be part of. We are not motivated by any interests of our own other than that of obtaining an agreement which is reasonable and fair to the aspirations of both communities in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, as a historian, I know that you are very conscious of the fact that Europe has many psychological boundaries that go back to the Thirty Years War and further, boundaries of religion, boundaries between one world view and another. One of those psychological boundaries does indeed run through the ancient province of Ulster. Yet similar boundaries in Europe have not prevented the development of agreed political structures across boundaries, which allow regions and countries, majorities and minorities, and within states, to work together in partnership, to the mutual benefit of their people.

We in Ireland can admire our history. We can regret aspects of it, too, but we certainly cannot erase it. We don't owe our history any debts. We can't relive our great-grandparents' lives for them. We are not obliged to take offense on their behalf, any more than we are obligated to atone for their sins.

□ 1030

It is our task to live in this generation, as people who live in Ireland and whose children will live there too.

Northern Ireland needs a political system that allows the people there to take responsibility together for their own future. Taking responsibility, something that you, Mr. Speaker, and many other Members of this Congress on both sides of the House have emphasized time and again, taking responsibility. Thanks to the generous support of Congress, the people of Northern Ireland, of both traditions, already take responsibility together for economic projects, aided by the International Fund for Ireland.

They also have taken responsibility together at a local level this summer by agreeing in very different circumstances in many areas the routes of contentious marches. Unfortunately, agreement was not reached in every case, but one should not underrate the importance of responsibility having been taken in many other cases.

But a wider political agreement is what we need now. The destructive force of sectarianism is all too easily fanned. It can quickly get beyond the control of those who fan it, making compromise impossible, and eventually coming back to consume its authors.

That is why we need an agreement, within a workable timeframe. Such an agreement is within reach. The Irish and British Governments were able to agree last year on a detailed model or framework of such an agreement. The parties can add to that. They can subtract from it, or they can come up with

an entirely new draft. But the core problems that the two governments, the British and Irish Governments, have plainly identified last year must be tackled and overcome by this present generation of political leaders. I am absolutely determined that that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, a number of the men who met in Philadelphia to frame the U.S. Constitution were of Ulster Scots ancestry. Some of their distant cousins sit on the Unionist benches at the Belfast talks, just as some of their ancestors defended Derry's walls in 1689.

If men of that ancestry could devise the fairest and greatest democratic Constitution in the world, surely they can work with neighbors today to devise a fair and just system for their own country.

Agreed institutions for Northern Ireland must be ones that enforce fairness and check the arbitrary excesses of whoever happens to be in the majority in any area at any particular time.

Your second President, John Adams, made a bleak, but not altogether unrealistic, comment on universal human nature, when he said:

> The people, when unchecked, have been as unjust, tyrannical, brutal, barbarous and cruel as any king or senate possessed of uncontrollable power. The majority has eternally, and without exception, usurped over the rights of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the enforcement of fairness through law has been one of the keystones of the American Constitution.

That is also why we need rules, and a balanced system of institutions, in Northern Ireland. Rules which limit uncontrollable power. Rules that require people to share power. Rules that allow people to build trust through small successes. Rules which recognize that people are different from one another, and that people's allegiances may be many and varied.

That is a lesson that the world as a whole needs to learn, if it is to live at peace.

Political theorists of the 19th century assumed that a person could only have one sovereign allegiance to his or her territorial nation state.

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, territorially based natural resources, agriculture and mineral, were crucial to the economy, so nation and territory normally had to be one and the same.

In contrast, knowledge, instant communications, multiculturalism, or at least a multiplicity of cultures, and mobility, people moving from one country to another, money moving from one country to another in an instant, these would be the characteristics of the 21st century, and nationalities will inevitably become more and more intermixed, one with the other. That is why in many parts of the world, a new political model is needed to organize this new social reality, a model that recognizes that people can have more allegiances than one, and yet live and work happily together.

The European Union reflects that new concept. In the European Union one can at the same time owe allegiance to Flanders, to Belgium, and to Europe, and yet share the same working and living space with someone who has the different set of national allegiances.

If such a model can work for Europe, it can work for Northern Ireland too, and if we can get it right in Northern Ireland, we will be setting a model for similarly divided communities across the world, just as men of Irish descent set a model for the world 210 years ago today, when they met at Annapolis and decided to draw up the Constitution of this United States.

Yes, both Ireland and the United States have responsibilities to the wider world, to the 6 billion people who inhabit this globe. There are three times as many people in the world today as there were when the Irish state was founded in December 1921, and six times as many people as there were when the United States was formed. Africa had half Europe's population in 1950. Thirty years from now there will be three times as many Africans as Europeans.

All of these people will have to be fed and clothed. All will need around 2,000 calories per day, some will want to consume more, some ought to consume less, and will need, and this is even more important, two liters per day of clean, I emphasize, clean, water. There will be 2 billion more people in the globe 30 years from now, all of whom will have those requirements, and we know that that is going to happen. And all of them, if we are to have peace, will need to feel that they are respected parts of the world community, that they are not second class.

The world is a better place today than it was 50 years ago. It can be even better 50 years from now if we build freedom, freedom for all, within rules set by democratic consent.

Lawmakers everywhere must remember that rules work best when there is consent to the way in which they have been played, and when everyone has had a recognized input to the making of the rules. That is why we need to reform the United Nations, because we cannot impose rules unilaterally. If the United Nations had not been set up in San Francisco in 1946, we would have to be inventing it today, because given the scale of the world's problem, given the extreme increase in world population, we must have a means of making rules which allow us all to share the world together, rules in which all nations have had a part in the making.

Let me take one area as an example of where world rules are needed. We need global rules against terrorism, terrorism which exploits the freedom of our media. As President Bush said, ''simply by capturing the headlines and television time, the terrorist partially succeeds.''

Violence and democratic politics can never mix. Civilized states do not negotiate under threat. That is why those who wish to win respect through democratic politics must give up all connections with terror, give up the threat of terror, and give up even giving coded warnings about terror.

□ 1040

Terror cannot be part of the political calculus of a democracy. That is why Ireland strongly supports the United States efforts to create world rules to combat terrorism, terrorism of which United States citizens have been victims in recent times.

Freedom and democracy work, because in a democracy change must be based on consent, and because it gives space to individuals to innovate; creating the best conditions, freedom, for economic growth.

Ireland is a good example of a democracy that works. Ireland's economic growth rate last year was the highest in Europe for the third year in a row. Inflation in Ireland is amongst the lowest in Europe. Government spending came down from 52 percent of GNP in 1986, to just 40 percent today. Four times as many Irish people go to college today as did so in 1965. The proportion of Irish children who complete high school have quadrupled since then and the numbers have more than quadrupled.

As a result, as a direct result, one-third of all U.S. high-technology investment going to Europe as a whole comes to Ireland. One-third.

Education is the key.

We do have problems. Too many Irish people are unemployed.

But the biggest common factor amongst the unemployed is that they left school too early. It is not enough that 85 percent of Irish children complete high school, or to use the Irish term, sit the Leaving Certificate, we need 100 percent to do so. Not just to acquire a technical qualification but to understand their place in the world, where they are coming from, who they are, and as much as possible about the other peoples with whom they must share this increasingly crowded globe.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all Americans, and Americans of Irish heritage in particular, for their contribution to Ireland's success. I salute the contributions that men and women of Irish heritage have made to this great Nation, in every walk of life.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Congress to continue to support the peace process in Ireland. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask Congress, representing this great American union, to work together with the European Union to build a structure of peace for the world as a whole.

Thank you.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 10 o'clock and 43 minutes a.m., the Prime Minister of Ireland 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 Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. CAMP] at 12 noon.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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 bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3396. An act to define and protect the institution of marriage.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3230) ''An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1997 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.''

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1669. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Jackson, Mississippi, as the ''G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; and

S. 1918. An act to amend trade laws and related provisions to clarify the designation of normal trade relations.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 640) ''An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SMITH, Mr. BAUCUS, and Mr. MOYNIHAN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain fifteen 1-minute speeches on each side.

EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today we are going to have a very important vote. Yesterday, under suspension, we debated H.R. 3759, and I ask my colleagues to pay attention to this bill. It is the Exports, Jobs, and Growth Act. It adds $38 billion in exports. It adds some 123,000 new American jobs, and it cuts the deficit by $600 million. Fifteen unions have endorsed this legislation, business has endorsed this legislation, people all across America are asking for this bill.

With all the emphasis today on the negative things in politics, let us do something positive for America. Let us vote for H.R. 3759 when it comes up today.

RELEASE THE OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S REPORT ON NEWT GINGRICH

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, a month ago James Cole, who is the special counsel investigating our Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH, filed a report with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It cost half a million dollars of taxpayers' money.

What has happened to it? Well, it has been submerged by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They are not going to release it, it appears.

Well, what did NEWT GINGRICH say about these kinds of reports? Back in March 1989, he said in regard to the report of the special counsel on our former Speaker, Jim Wright:

Now that report is secret; I don't know what's in it. I don't know of anybody other than the committee members and Mr. Phelan, who was special counsel, who know what is in it—except Mr. Wright's lawyer. And I think that report and the back-up documents have to be published.

I cannot imagine going to the country—tell them we've got a $1.6 million report—and, by the way, there's nothing in it, but you can't see it, but clearly that report is going to have to be published.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why don't you tell your Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to release the report? They are meeting today at 1:30. Let every Member have it. I would like to have a copy of that report. Every Member of this House by tomorrow should have a copy of that report. I do not know what is in it. I do not know if it exonerates you, but let us release the report.

VOTE ''YES'' FOR THE EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the Exports, Jobs, and Growth Act. This bill is divided into three parts, first the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which helps to ensure against long-term political and commercial risk.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that OPIC will lower the deficit by $600 million over the next 5 years. OPIC is not corporate welfare because companies pay, I will repeat, pay for the services they receive.

Second is the Trade Development Agency. This small 38-employee agency designs in-U.S. specifications into foreign infrastructure projects so American companies can gain valuable contracts overseas.

Finally is the International Trade Administration division of the Commerce Department. Within this division is the United States and Foreign Commercial Service which operates 83 field offices in the United States. They primarily serve small business exporters in the search for export opportunities.

If Members vote against this legislation, it will unilaterally disarm American workers in the global trade war. Our European and Asian competitors spend much more on these programs. It is time to wake up to the imperfect reality of the global trading system and support this legislation. The Clinton administration supports it; business groups support it; labor unions support it. Vote for H.R. 3759.

TIME FOR ETHICS COMMITTEE TO QUIT STALLING

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today the New York Times lead editorial talks about this House and its stalling on ethics. This is shameful. The New York Times points out that the Committee on Standards of Official

Conduct is supposed to meet today, and it goes on to say: If after all this time, Mrs. JOHNSON and her colleagues cannot rise above partisanship to act promptly on Mr. Cole's findings and make them public, then they will demonstrate that this is little more than a charade and not the principled committee upholding the traditions and honor of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I hope everybody looks at this and everybody in this body realizes we will all be tainted if we do not get this report out. It has taken 2 years, it has taken half a million dollars, and they are trying to hermetically seal it down there, say none of us can see it, but then pronounce that it says nothing. If it said nothing, I would think we would be able to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the New York Times article for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 11, 1996]

STALLING ON ETHICS

Crowning two years of partisan gridlock, the House Ethics Committee seems determined to sacrifice whatever little is left of its credibility by letting Congress adjourn without resolving any of the pending ethics complaints against Speaker Newt Gingrich. The committee's present plans do not even call for making public the lengthy report filed last month by James Cole, the special counsel belatedly hired by the committee to look into tax law charges against the Speaker.

By stalling so long to shield him, the committee's Republican chairwoman, Nancy Johnson of Connecticut, has left the panel little time to resolve all allegations against Mr. Gingrich. But the two weeks or so before Congress adjourns is surely ample time to bring at least this phase of the case to an honorable conclusion.

Mrs. Johnson and her G.O.P. colleagues succumbed to public pressure last December and finally agreed to retain an outside counsel, Mr. Cole. They gave him a limited mandate to examine whether Mr. Gingrich had violated tax laws by using tax-deductible donations to finance a college course he taught in Georgia in 1993. It intentionally omitted a range of questions involving Gopac, Mr. Gingrich's aggressively partisan political action committee, which helped to develop the course. These questions, which are the subject of a complaint filed by the House minority whip, David Bonior, also need review by an outside counsel, but Republicans on the committee are resisting.

It is not known whether the evidence gathered by Mr. Cole exonerates the Speaker on the tax charges, or suggests he behaved either improperly or unethically. Committee members have said the report simply lays out the facts while failing to make any recommendations. But the issue at this point is not just Mr. Gingrich's conduct, or the thoroughness of Mr. Cole's work, but the efficacy of the committee itself.

The Ethics Committee is scheduled to meet today. If after all this time Mrs. Johnson and her colleagues cannot rise above partisanship to act promptly on Mr. Cole's findings and make them public, they will demonstrate that this supposedly principled panel is little more than a charade.

OUR CHILDREN DESERVE BETTER THAN DRUGS

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse has released some survey information on teenage drug activity that is absolutely shocking.

The researchers found that by the time a teen reaches the age of 17, 68 percent of them can buy pot within a day; 62 percent have friends who use marijuana; 58 percent have been solicited to buy marijuana; 58 percent know someone who uses acid, cocaine, or heroin; 40 percent have personally witnessed the sale of drugs in their own neighborhood; and less than one in three attend a drug-free school.

Mr. Speaker, this country is losing the war on drugs. We are literally losing a generation of children to hopelessness, to shattered dreams, and eventually to a loss of their freedom.

Our children deserve better. Every child should have a strong family, a drug-free school, and safe streets. And we must do all we can as leaders to make this a reality for all children, before it's too late.

Mr. Speaker, where is our President on this?

ETHICS COMMITTEE SHOULD RELEASE COLE'S REPORT

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, 7 years ago, the current Speaker of the House of Representatives stood on this very floor and said I think that it is vital that we take as a Congress our commitment to publish that report and to release those documents so that the country can judge whether or not the man who is second in line to be President, the Speaker of the House, should be in that position.

Of course, that was NEWT GINGRICH talking about then Speaker Jim Wright. But Speaker GINGRICH's words are as true today as they were 7 years ago. And now we have another report, this one not by Mr. Phelan, but by James Cole, that cost the taxpayers of this country a half million dollars, and every Member of the House of Representatives should know today what is in that report. The people of this Nation who paid for that report need to know what is in that report.

Again the words of then Member GINGRICH, now Speaker GINGRICH, who said I cannot imagine going to the country to tell them that we have got $1.6 million in this report, and, by the way, there is nothing in it. You cannot see it. We must let the American people and this Congress see this report.

TWIN DISASTERS HIT EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from the second district of North Carolina. The devastation to people, property, and crops is overwhelming. We are moving to assess the damage and provide relief to the human suffering caused by Hurricane Fran. I delivered a check to the American Red Cross from U.S. Tobacco to help alleviate the budgetary strain that Fran has placed on the Red Cross. Today, I am joining my colleagues from eastern North Carolina in introducing a bipartisan bill that will provide emergency appropriations to agencies that may run out of money due to the devastation from the hurricane and ongoing flooding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the President for visiting eastern North Carolina this coming weekend to assess the damage on a first-hand basis. He will see the extent of the devastation from Hurricane Fran. Hopefully, he will stop to speak with the tobacco farmers in my district who have suffered a major blow from this natural disaster. But as Bill Clinton flies over the destruction to the people and property of North Carolina, he might ponder about the man-made disaster he helped create—FDA regulation of tobacco—and the devastation it will bring to the tobacco farmers in my district.

RELEASE ETHICS REPORT ON SPEAKER

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

Mr. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH is absolutely right. He said, ''The 435 Members of the House should look at all the facts, should have available to them all the reports and all the background documents and the American people should have the same.''

NEWT GINGRICH said that in 1989 about the ethics report on then Speaker Jim Wright. And what he said then about the need for full disclosure is equally true today about the outside counsel's report on NEWT GINGRICH'S own dealings.

Don't just take my word for it. Today's New York Times calls upon the House Ethics Committee to release the report. The Times says ''If after all this time, Mrs. Johnson and her colleagues cannot rise above partisanship to act promptly on Mr. Coles' findings and make them public, they will demonstrate that this supposedly principled panel is little more than a charade.

Stop the coverup. Release the ethics report on NEWT GINGRICH.

EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, if Members want to send high-paying export-related jobs to Japan, Germany,

France, and Canada then they should vote today against, the Jobs, Exports and Growth Act of 1996.

But if Members want to keep high-paying export-related jobs in the United States while generating over $600 million toward deficit reduction, then they should vote for this legislation.

Revisionists have labeled the Overseas Private Investment Corporation as corporate welfare. Yesterday, this Member challenged their leader, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, to point to 1 year in the last 25 of OPIC's history where it lost taxpayer's money.

You know what Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio didn't answer this Member's question because he can't. OPIC has generated positive net income for our Government very year since its inception in 1971—that's why it has $2.6 billion in reserves.

Without OPIC, America would have sent $43 billion in United States exports and 200,000 American jobs to Japan, France, Germany, Canada, Italy, and other industrialized countries. Political leaders in those countries don't call it corporate welfare, they rightly call export promotion a national priority.

THE NEW AMERICA

(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, there is a new book out called ''The Complete Guide to Offshore Money Havens.'' A big ad in the Wall Street Journal says ''Make millions, protect your privacy and legally avoid paying any taxes on the profits.''

Think about it. The New America. Invest overseas, hire foreign workers for pennies, then ship your product back to America. And do not worry if you make a profit; you do not even have to pay taxes on it.

There are more loopholes in the U.S. Tax Code than those old hockey nets at the Boston Garden. Beam me up. The truth is, America keeps shipping jobs and money overseas, and America is getting in return two truckloads of mangoes and two baseball players to be named later. Think about that shot.

OPPOSE THE EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3759, the so-called Exports, Jobs, and Growth Act. This legislation is going to double the size of OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation. The increase will dramatically increase the exposure of OPIC to high risk areas, such as Africa and Russia, and default on these loans would have a very substantial impact on our budget.

At a time when we are so doggone concerned about the size of our budget deficit, how can we in good conscience expand a program that protects the profits of Fortune 500 corporations at the expense of the American taxpayer and sends more jobs overseas?

□ 1215

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose corporate welfare and vote against H.R. 3759.

NEW YORK TIMES IS RIGHT: ETHICS COMMITTEE IS STALLING ON GINGRICH COMPLAINTS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times has it about right. For the past 2 years we have witnessed a systematic coverup and stall by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in dealing with the ethics complaints regarding our Speaker, NEWT GINGRICH.

They stalled for the consideration of the early complaints. They dismissed those complaints without interviewing without gathering evidence. They stalled in the gathering of evidence in the major complaints against Speaker GINGRICH. And finally, reluctantly, they yielded to public pressure and appointed an outside counsel.

But when they appointed the outside counsel, they restrained his ability to engage in a comprehensive investigation, and then they limited his mandate and what he could investigate. And then, finally, they did not allow him to draw conclusions from the investigation that he engaged in after spending $500,000.

This House cannot go home to our constituents and not be able to report on the findings of the special counsel. The time has come for the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to stop the coverup, to stop the stall, and to give this House the information that it has and to let the special counsel do its work.

OPIC BILL WILL DOUBLE SUBSIDIZED INSURANCE TO FORTUNE 500 COMPANIES

(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, Members should vote ''no'' on the OPIC bill before us today unless we want to double subsidized insurance and loans for the Fortune 500. That is what the OPIC bill does.

OPIC is touted as a Government subsidized entity that acts like a private corporation. Nonsense. If it is a corporation, why does it pay no taxes? That is a subsidy right off the top. Why does it declare no dividends? Why does two-thirds of its income come from Treasury securities?

Contrary to what we were told yesterday, the AFL–CIO does not support this bill. It has no position. Why? Because some unions support it and some do not.

The standard should be not are some jobs made, but are more jobs made than are in fact destroyed. Look at the OPIC Fortune 500, just 4 of them: Ford, 160,000 Americans laid off; Exxon, 83,000 Americans laid off; AT&T, 127,000 Americans laid off; GE, 85,000 Americans laid off.

Until they bring in jobs to match Americans laid off, we must vote against more subsidies for OPIC.

TREASURY AND THE DEBT CRISIS

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

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last November I was extremely concerned about the debt ceiling. I admired the manner in which Secretary Rubin handled the crisis. Secretary Rubin and his staff worked diligently to find a solution to the possibility of hitting the debt ceiling.

Congress' failure to take action placed the Department of the Treasury in a precarious position. Congressional leadership was holding the debt ceiling hostage during the battle of the budget. Congress played chicken with the financial markets and the good name of our country. Secretary Rubin skillfully used every tool possible to save the credit reputation of the United States and to keep the United States from defaulting. The United States faced the real possibility of a default. Our credit rating had dropped.

Secretary Rubin took courageous steps to keep the Government functioning and the markets stabilized and he was severely criticized. At one point, there was even talk of impeachment. Unfortunately, Secretary Rubin was criticized by many Members of this body. Many were concerned about the use of investments of Federal employment retirement funds. The General Accounting Office [GAO] has released a report on Treasury's handling of the debt ceiling. The GAO report concluded that Treasury conducted the Nation's debt management legally and properly during the debt ceiling crisis. Treasury's actions avoided a default and violation of the statutory debt limit.

The GAO report reviewed all actions taken by the Treasury during the period leading up to and after the debt limit was reached, approximately October 1995, through March 1996. Treasury used extraordinary measures because the statutory limit was not raised until 5 months after the old limit was reached. The GAO report concluded Treasury used normal debt management procedures such as investment of trust fund assets. Also, Treasury acted in a proper and legal manner. Treasury's actions were designed to ensure

full and prompt restoration of lost interest to uninvested trust funds within the limits of the law.

I am pleased with the results of the GAO report. This report confirms my belief that Secretary Rubin acted properly and averted a serious and volatile crisis. Once again, I think we should commend the actions Secretary Rubin took this past winter.

VOTE ''NO'' ON OPIC CORPORATE WELFARE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let us be frank. Exxon, Ford, Citibank, and DuPont are profitable multibillion dollar corporations who pay their CEO's millions of dollars in salary. These companies do not need OPIC corporate welfare payments from the taxpayers of this country to provide them with incentives to invest abroad. Incentives to invest abroad.

At a time when some Members of this body are proposing huge cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, veterans programs, environmental protection, it is totally absurd to increase the amount of corporate welfare that we provide to these huge profitable corporations.

Not only is this a bad deal for taxpayers, it is bad economic development and job creation. Many of these same corporations are downsizing, laying off hundreds of thousands of American workers. Our policy should not be to encourage these companies to invest abroad, our policy should be to demand that these companies reinvest in the United States of America, in the State of Vermont, all over this country, and create decent paying jobs here.

Let us vote no on this OPIC corporate welfare program.

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT SHOULD RELEASE SPECIAL COUNSEL REPORT ON SPEAKER GINGRICH BEFORE ADJOURNMENT

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I am appalled at how my colleagues across the aisle are misusing the powers of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They have stalled the review process on a complaint about Speaker GINGRICH to such an extent that now they may not even address the allegations at all before we adjourn this year.

Exactly what does the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct do, if it will not report on findings? What is in the report that they do not want the American people to see it?

The investigation has so far cost the American people half a million dollars. I think these same taxpayers, as well as Mr. GINGRICH's own constituents in Georgia, deserve to know if the allegations are true or false.

If the Republicans on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct plan to adjourn before addressing this complaint, the least they should do is release the report from the outside counsel. Let the people of America judge for ourselves if there is any wrongdoing.

TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY MEANS CUTS FOR MEDICARE AND STUDENT LOANS

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we have been here before. The same folks who brought you the Government shutdown are back. Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, Bob Dole, and others want a $500 billion tax break, mostly for the wealthy.

What does that mean? It means more Medicare cuts, higher even than the $270 billion that the Gingrich-Dole plan originally gave us. It means a doubling of premiums. Where premiums are $46 a month for senior citizens for Medicare, those premiums will go to $90 or $100 a month, perhaps even $110 a month, to pay for the tax break for the wealthy that Mr. Dole and Mr. GINGRICH want to bring to us. It means higher deductibles and higher copayments for Medicare. It means elimination and cutting back of the student loan program and higher costs for those student loans that still remain.

Mr. Speaker, these tax breaks for the wealthy mean more Medicare cuts, more student loan cuts. They are simply not what the public wants.

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST A RETURN TO SUPPLY SIDE ECONOMICS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, just before the August recess the Wall Street Journal published an op-ed urging Presidential candidate Bob Dole to embrace a return to supply side economics. Shortly thereafter the Journal printed a letter I authored in response to that op-ed, showing that the economy performed better since 1992 than it had during the previous 12 years of supply side economics.

In comparing economic performance under Clinton since 1992, to the Reagan-Bush years, we find that under President Clinton the economy has grown more rapidly, employment has risen at a faster rate, per capita income has increased more quickly, and the deficit is much smaller relative to the economy.

Last month's unemployment rate of 5.1 percent provides evidence of just how healthy the economy has become despite the fact that the growth has not been shared equally among all regions of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we owe much of this progress to the success of the 1993 budget reduction law which was enacted by the Democratic Congress. It was reduced the deficit by more than 60 percent. It has expanded the EITC program, providing tax breaks averaging $500 for New Yorkers alone.

Let us not return to supply side economics. Let us keep on a steady course which is providing economic growth for all Americans.

GOP MEANS GET OLD PEOPLE

(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, I support tax cuts cuts. We all support tax cuts, but not when they are at the expense of Medicare.

We have already witnessed attempts by the Gringrich-Dole Congress over the last 2 years to raid Medicare for tax breaks for the rich. Democrats stood up and stopped the Republicans dead in their tracks, preventing the demise of Medicare as we know it.

Today, Bob Dole is back in town, meeting with Speaker GINGRICH behind closed doors, likely discussing ways to attack Medicare again for their tax break schemes. Last year Speaker GINGRICH and former Senator Dole proposed the largest Medicare cuts in history to pay for a tax break that would have primarily benefited the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, it is the same old story. GOP truly means get old people, again and again.

□ 1230

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 3666, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3666) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STOKES moves that the managers on the part of the House be instructed to agree

to the amendments of the Senate numbered 95, 117, and 118.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my motion to instruct House conferees on the 1997 VA-HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Act. I will be the first to admit that this instruction is not quite the norm, but I strongly believe that circumstances and timing dictate this course of action.

The first part of my motion deals with benefits for Vietnam Veterans' children suffering from spina bifida if their parents were exposed to agent orange. It directs the House conferees to agree to the Agent Orange Benefits Act added by the Senate (amendment number 95). The Senate provision is supported by the administration and is the result of research conducted by the National Academy of Sciences in response to congressional direction in 1991. A report issued by the National Academy this past March updated an earlier study presented in 1993. This year's report indicated limited suggestive evidence of an association between exposure to agent orange and incidence of spina bifida in offspring. Based on this new study, the VA has recommended that spina bifida in veterans' offspring be considered service-connected. Without this important provision, the VA lacks the authority to extend benefits to the children of veterans.

Although caring for the spina bifida children will have a cost, the amendment more than compensates for those expenses. By overturning the Gardner decision, the amendment fully pays for the cost of treatment and benefits and even returns several million dollars to the U.S. Treasury for deficit reduction. Under the Gardner decision will still allow veterans to receive compensation for additional disability or death caused by the VA only if there is evidence the VA was at fault. It is noteworthy that provisions overturning the Gardner decision have been included in several recent reconciliation bills. Since it appears highly unlikely that a separate reconciliation bill will be enacted this Congress, it makes sense to capture these savings now.

The second part of my motion deals with parity for mental health coverage under group health plans. It directs the House conferees to agree to the Senate amendment, No. 118, that would require health plans that have benefit limits on medical and surgical condition is to have the same limits on mental conditions. This provision is supported by National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, the National Mental Health Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, and the American Medical Association, among others.

Certain opponents of this measure may argue that small businesses can not absorb the cost of this provision. I strenuously disagree with that assessment. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that private insurance premiums will increase by only 0.4 percent under the terms of this provision, of which employers would pay only .16 percent. In addition, small businesses with 25 or fewer employees are exempt from the provision. Also, the provision ceases to have effect if it would result in a 1 percent or greater increase in the cost of a group health plan's premiums. I am convinced these modifications adequately address the concerns of small businesses.

The final part of my motion directs the House conferees to agree to the Senate amendment, No. 117, requiring health plan coverage for a minimum hospital stay of 48 hours for newborns and mothers following childbirth. This provision was agreed to by a unanimous vote in the other body. Similar legislation in the House has the bipartisan support of more than 150 cosponsors. The provision makes common sense, and it often makes economic sense. Too many times when newborn children and their mothers are discharged from hospitals just hours after birth, complications such as jaundice or more serious conditions require rehospitalization usually at greater cost. Mr. Speaker, the CBO estimates the only cost of this provision in 1997 is $1 million for the establishment of an advisory commission. Over the period 1997–2002, it is anticipated asset sales will more than offset any impact on the Federal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, I realize this approach is somewhat usual in that these provisions more properly lie within the jurisdiction of the legislative committees. Were it not for the looming adjournment date and the shortness of time remaining in which to do our business as well as the broad-based support for these provisions, I would not be urging this course. Also, since it appears likely the VA–HUD appropriations conference report may not offer an opportunity for separate votes on these important matters, this may be House Members' only chance to indicate their position on these issues.

For all these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to support my motion to instruct the VA–HUD conferees.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but respond or react to my colleague's comments regarding these very, very important matters that now, by way of a motion to instruct, will be directed toward the conference on that bill that has to do with the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing, NASA, EPA, not health care. The gentleman has indicated that this may very well be one of the few trains to leave town and, therefore, these items of great importance ought to be attached to this package just because there will be no other chance.

I wanted to be very clear, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first time, that the chairman of the subcommittee has had a chance to even take a look at these items. They address subject areas that are very, very important, but they are subject areas that are not germane to our bill. They are subject areas that, indeed, deserve the light of day that normally would involve our legislative hearing process. They are very important items to the consumers who might be impacted by these items if they should eventually become a permanent part of this bill and have it be signed into law.

Just to make a specific point regarding the three items, if one would just address oneself to the 48-hour notice regarding that which should be required of health insurance that is available to people in the consuming public. Essentially this instruction would tell the conferees by way of the House that we should include a requirement of a 48-hour notice within our bill as it goes to the President's desk.

Frankly, there are lots of pros and cons to that issue. But indeed I am not sure the American public is ready to receive this issue in this form. Average families out there, after the fact, are going to realize that suddenly there is a new premium added to their insurance contracts because of some action arbitrarily taken by the House, taken by the House without any notice to them, taken by the House without any indication as to how that will impact their future health care circumstances.

Indeed, just before we broke for the recess, we had a health care package move forward from the House to the President. That package did not include this 48-hour notice item. Indeed it was much too controversial for the authorizing committees to deal with at the time. So as of this moment, we are about to put them into this train that is leaving town without our knowing whether the arguments in favor weigh on that side or the arguments against weigh on the other side. It is exactly how we should not be handling appropriations bills.

I must say that I am tempted to talk with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], my dear friend from Ohio, and ask him in great detail about spina bifida and about mental health parity, but frankly he and I, even in our own subcommittee discussions where we talk off the record, have not had a chance to discuss these matters.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I presume he like myself, even though I spent a lot of years in the health insurance business, does not presume expertise in these technical policy areas.

This is absolutely the wrong way to legislate, at the wrong time, in an environment that will create problems

that we are going to have to live with ourselves in the months and years ahead, and the public at the other end will be scratching their heads and saying is this what we sent them up there to do?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. As I understand it, none of these three issues constitute subject matter that would be ordinarily entertained by this particular bill. Traditionally the VA–HUD appropriations bill deals with the funding of the Veterans' Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development and a lot of independent agencies, but this bill is not a general health bill; is it?

Mr. LEWIS of California. That is correct; is it not.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield further, it just strikes me as a very, very unusual procedure for us to find that these totally extraneous issues, no matter how meritorious they may be, and in fact are worthy, because our hearts go out to anybody with a child with spina bifida or to a mother who has left the hospital early, but still there are extraneous issues to this bill. And to be dropped on the gentleman at the last minute and be told, ''Well, you've got to consider these without regard to the traditional authorization process,'' is, in fact, not the way that legislation ought to be conducted.

I know it is the position of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] that the membership should vote to instruct the conferees on this particular issue and to go and accept what the Senate has done, but it does seem to me to risk a great danger that we in the haste of trying to do good things in advance of an election all of a sudden adopt things, measures, in such a legislative domain which later on prove to be ill advised or unwarranted or beyond capability to afford or within, say, a trend of increasing government direction that, frankly, the American people tend to resent these days.

The whole procedure is highly subject to question, so I just want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] for raising this issue; I agree with him. I do not know if this matter were brought to a vote how it would turn out. I suspect that most Members would be inclined to sympathize with the subject matter. But I have to stress it is my own feeling that this is just not the way to conduct the legislative business of the United States of America.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments, and they are very helpful comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, let me commend my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and his ranking member for the great job they do on this very difficult appropriations subcommittee dealing with so many agencies and departments, and I know it is a very difficult job.

Having said that, I would just have to say that there is no need for a motion to instruct on the provision regarding the Newborns and Mothers Health Protection Act because the Republican leadership has already agreed to accept that provision, and we will be fighting for it.

Mr. Speaker, this provision is critical because the well-being of newborn babies and new mothers is at stake all across this country.

Mr. Speaker, we will be ashamed to let political maneuvering getting in the way of passing this vital piece of legislation that is attached to the VA–HUD appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have recently heard from a gentleman in my district whose 19-year-old daughter is a victim of this terrible trend of drive-through deliveries. She delivered a baby this past April, and she was released from the hospital less than 24 hours later, kicked out of the hospital, even though the baby had a severe blood disorder, and, my colleagues, 4 days later this young 19-year-old mother had her lung explode, and she has since had three strokes. Tragically, she is still in the hospital and will never again lead a normal life. She is a 19-year-old who cannot even take care of her newborn baby. That is so, so pathetic.

It is these examples, and there are many more, that drove me to introduce this legislation which was subsequently taken up over in the Senate the other day, sponsored by Mrs. KASSEBAUM, Mr. FRIST, and Mr. BRADLEY on a bipartisan basis, and it is badly, badly needed. So I would just hope that my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the ranking member would support that legislation when it is taken up in the conference.

Regardless of the outcome of this vote, we must continue to fight for the well-being of the most cherished population, these young newborns.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself whatever additional time I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think most Members who are focusing at all upon this discussion know full well that these riders that are being proposed by way of this motion to instruct are items that on the surface look very, very appealing. There is little doubt that it would be foolish of any of us to suggest that Members ought to walk in here and vote knee-jerk, or otherwise, against this proposal.

Having said that, I think the public would be misinformed if they thought this appropriations committee of our authorizing committees of jurisdiction had reviewed these issues, held hearings effectively on these issues and really provided the kind of input that the legislative process ought to included.

One more time we are asked to support riders at the last moment, and I want the Speaker and my colleagues to know that as I go to conference I will weigh very carefully the amount of input that we have received from those Members who have responsibilities of jurisdiction. By no way, shape or form does this reflect what I consider to be an obligation on my part to respond positively to these last-minute considerations, which fall well outside my jurisdiction.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], for presenting this motion here today, and I rise in strong support of the motion. I want to stress again that these issues that we are dealing with today have bipartisan support both in this House as well as in the other body, and I want to also say that on the subject of the early, discharge or the so called drive-by delivery, I really appreciate what our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], has said here today, and I want to endorse it. But I want to stress to all our people here that there is urgent need for medical care for these mothers that are postpartum and these newborn babies.

Mr. Speaker, we do not keep mothers and babies in hospitals to give them hotel service. They are there for medical reasons, whether it is jaundice and mental retardation or hemorrhaging, and that has already been said very well today by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

But I want to go on to the second issue, and that is the question of mental health and the parity question under mental health. Again, I want to stress that this is a bipartisan issue. One of the most prominent Republican leaders in the other body is the author of this proposal. Senator DOMENICI put this in the Senate bill, and it is that provision that we want protected in this motion to instruct. This discrimination against mental health medical treatment must end, and it must end now. It is the product of gross ignorance and apathy, and this Congress should go on record today against it.

Members realize, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], has outlined, that it is different from the original parity issue. It releases the cap on lifetime payments, and the Senate adopted it with full support, full bipartisan support.

But again I want to say that this should not be viewed here today as a

partisan issue, and I believe, and here I believe strongly and congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], that the campaign rhetoric must stop and we must do something here and now for the American people, hard-working families, on issues that count, and this definitely is it. The fictions and the ignorance about mental health treatment, the actual return of payment, return of payment to the employers, and to the work and productivity is very apparent, everyone knows it, and we must stop the fiction surrounding this and tell those people that have projected huge costs that they are unrealistic and they really do not know what they are talking about. With that, I thank my colleague from Ohio for having yielded this time to me.

In my State of New Jersey, our Governor, Christine Todd Whitman, has already signed a 48-hour minimum hospitalization proposal into law, and it has been very well received by the public.

I want my colleagues to realize that the latest version of mental health parity is a very modest requirement that health insurance companies provide equal coverage for physical and mental illness in their annual caps and lifetime caps—that's all. Nothing more, nothing less.

In other words, insurance carriers can no longer impose dramatically lower annual or lifetime limits for mental illness coverage than those which they offer for physical ailments.

Today, I will be introducing the House companion bill to the Domenici-Wellstone bill with a bipartisan coalition of Members who share my view that the flagrant discrimination health insurance companies engage in with respect to treating mental illness must come to an end. Retaining this modest proposal begins that process.

Both the Bradley-Frist and Domenici-Wellstone amendments were overwhelmingly approved by the Senate, and I believe that these amendments would enjoy similar levels of support in the House provided that they are retained in the final conference committee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], my good friends, for their really outstanding work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this motion which includes 3 provisions that are critically needed by American families. One of the provisions included in this motion will provide health care, vocational rehabilitation and compensation to Vietnam veterans and their families who are dealing with the effects of exposure to agent orange. A recent report by the National Academy of Sciences showed a link between Vietnam veterans' exposure to agent orange and the occurrence of spina bifida in their children. This provision will give the families of our proud veterans the support they need to care for their children suffering from spina bifida as a result of their military service.

This motion also includes a provision that will insure that mothers and newborns receive adequate hospital coverage during the critical time following a delivery. We have all read the tragic stories of women and babies forced from the hospital before they were ready to go because of the increasing number of health insurers limiting hospital coverage to 24 hours or less. I know as a mother of three grown children how very important this time is to a new mother. The Bradley amendment mandates minimum hospital coverage of 48 hours for a normal delivery and 96 hours for cesarean section. The standards are set by the American College of Obstetricians and Gynocologists and the American Academy of Pediatrics. This provision does not mandate how long any single patient should remain in the hospital but assures that the decision about what is best for each mother and baby's health is made by the patient and her doctor and not by an inflexible insurance policy.

Finally this motion takes us another step toward improving the health security of hard-working Americans and their families. Sadly the health insurance reform bill passed earlier this summer did not include a simple provision to insure that mental health benefits are treated like other health benefits. Not long before the Senate unanimously approved mental health parity, and nearly 100 of my colleagues in the House signed a letter to the Speaker in support of it. Yet when the final bill reached the floor it was gone; shame on this House.

With this motion to recommit we have a second chance to end discrimination against mental illness and help remove its stigma. Mr. Speaker, we must not let this opportunity to do what is right slip away yet again. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, but I will yield myself 2 minutes by way of closing to make a minor point.

Mr. Speaker, I think the House should know that this motion to instruct does involve a number of very important policy areas, instructing the House to take action as conferees dealing with the other body. In the area of mental parity, for example, there are some very real costs that are involved. While in the 1997 year those costs are difficult to measure over a period of 5 years, there will be an absolute cost of somewhere near 550 millions of dollars.

□ 1300

That would be a cost obligation extended forward without any discussions at the authorizing committee level, and without any real debate or light of day in terms of the pros and cons related to that very important subject area.

As we deal with questions that relate to the newborn, a similar problem. These are issues that through the appropriate authorizing committees could very well have been discussed thoroughly. But suddenly in this motion to instruct we have a package here that, over time, is going to cost a minimum of $110 million. We have identified ways to pay for it without any kind of thorough review.

One of the suggestions, as indicated by the other body, is that we might sell Governor's Island, a little spot in New York that is of interest to some of my colleagues. I am not sure if the Members who have had the Governor's Island near their territory have been consulted at all. I think probably not. My colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], indicated to me that there had been very little consultation as far as she personally is concerned. I understand Governor's Island may be in another Member's district. If I asked him, I am sure he was not consulted about that transfer.

Further, there is another little item that makes up a big part of that package. We are going to sell the airspace rights above Union Station as a mechanism for providing funding for this new solution that the House must face as we try to conclude this bill that is the only train leaving town. It is not the way to carry forward our business, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, I do not feel obligated to follow the letter of this procedural motion, as this chairman goes forward.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the time being allocated to me by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the fact that he has sponsored what I consider to be a very important motion to instruct the conferees on the bill.

I have always respected the work he has done, and I do want this body to know of my great respect for the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], who chairs the subcommittee and who has done such an exemplary job and is so humane.

This particular motion would include three critical and humane provisions that have been incorporated by our colleagues in the other body. I think they do have bipartisan support. There is no doubt about it.

First, it would incorporate the mental health parity compromise that was accepted by the Senate. This compromise is a critical step towards finally treating mental illness like the disease it is. I heard from the President of the American Psychological Association, Dr. Eist, who testified before the Civil Service Subcommittee last week on mental health parity. He emphasized what we already know: Mental illness is treatable, and treating mental illness saves money and increases productivity.

Mr. Speaker, this compromise is really quite modest. It provides parity for annual and lifetime caps. It includes a

provision included by Senator GRAHAM to ensure that it will not cause premiums to rise by more than 1 percent. In light of the last CBO report that estimated that premiums will rise less than one-sixth that amount, I think it is highly unlikely we would ever reach that ceiling.

Second, the motion incorporates the 48-hour postpartum care provision that has been discussed. I am a cosponsor on the House side of the Solomon version of that very important bill. I would like very much to see it in the VA–HUD bill. As managed care becomes increasingly prevalent, we are seeing mothers and their newborns in and out of the hospital in as short a time as 12 hours.

Many illnesses in newborns are not detectable until the first 48 hours. Those first 2 days are absolutely critical. Guidelines of the American Pediatric Association and ACOG specify that mothers should stay in the hospital for 48 hours for normal delivery and 96 for cesarean delivery. This provision would ensure that this happens.

My State of Maryland has enacted similar legislation. Although many insurers are finding loopholes to get around it, it is having a very positive effect on those who are now able to stay the full 48 hours, and federally this would enhance what the State has done.

Third, this motion to instruct would include the agent orange spina bifida provision. Surely our Government should be responsible for the health care of children with spina bifida if one of their parents was exposed to agent orange during the Vietnam war. It is the only responsible and humane thing to do.

I urge my colleagues to pass the motion.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] for yielding time to me.

I rise in favor of this motion to instruct on all three provisions, which I think are vital; but, if I could speak to the one dealing with mental health parity, I think this is crucial legislation. Let me give the Members some examples why.

Currently many insurance policies have lifetime caps of $1 million for various diseases: cancer, heart, et cetera. However, the lifetime limits for mental illness are often set at $50,000 or less; $1 million here, $50,000 here. Additionally, insurance plans impose annual caps of sometimes $10,000 or less on treatments of mental illness, but these caps are usually not imposed on other medical conditions.

What happens then is that these limits on mental illness cause individuals not to seek the treatment or to pay out of pocket. They must rely on public mental health facilities, or if they can afford it, to pay themselves. This is important language because, while we were not able to get parity in the health reform legislation that passed this year, we do have a chance at limited parity this year. I would urge my colleagues to support that.

Mr. Speaker, are there good reasons why? Let me give the Members some statistics why this is so important. Mental illnesses and disorders cost our society over $270 billion annually each year in lost productivity and treatment costs. Roughly almost 20 percent of our adults in this country suffer from mental or addictive disorders in any 6-month period, but only 20 percent of the 20 percent, one out of five, will get any kind of treatment.

Seven and one-half million American children are plagued by mental disorders, such as depression, autism, and learning disabilities. In 1985 and only 30 cents was spent on research for every $100 of costs imposed by mental disorders. Let me repeat that; 30 cents was spent on research for every $1,300 of costs imposed by mental disorders. In comparison, 73 cents and $1.63 respectively were spent on research for every $100 of costs in heart disease and cancer.

Insurance programs, including Medicare, continue to discriminate against individuals with mental illness by requiring a higher copayment than other services. In my own State of West Virginia, we found that almost 42,000 West Virginians receive some type of mental health treatment. There are 1.8 million people in West Virginia. In other words, only 2.3 percent are getting any kind of treatment.

Mr. Speaker, this is crucial legislation. It is not enough. I am very grateful for the gentlewoman from New Jersey, Mrs. MARGE ROUKEMA, chair of the mental health working group, who with the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. PETER DEFAZIO and myself, have cochaired that organization, a bipartisan organization. I am thinking back to Syl Conte, who for so many years fought for the decade of the brain, and all the gains that has brought those suffering from mental disabilities and mental afflictions.

The fact of the matter is that this is money well spent, and this is important legislation. I urge Members to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am leased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in favor of this motion to instruct. I agree, of course, with all three provisions that are being specified here. But I particularly want to make reference in support of the newborn and mother's health, with a 48-hour minimum hospital stay, addressing the so-called drive-through delivery problem that increasingly we see around the country with various insurance companies.

My own State of New Jersey requires a minimum stay of 48 hours for normal delivery and 4 days for a C-section. But I have to say that, even though there are a number of States like New Jersey increasingly that are passing State laws for minimum hospital stays for newborns, there are also a lot of loopholes.

For example, in New Jersey, where a lot of people work in New York City or work in Philadelphia, many times the insurance coverage is excepted from the State law because the person, mother or father in this case, works out of State.

In addition, some of the insurance companies that are based out of New Jersey have claimed that they do not have to abide by New Jersey's law with regard to minimum hospital stay. We do need Federal legislation. Let no one suggest this can be handled strictly by the States. It cannot. We do need Federal legislation to guarantee minimum stays for mothers with newborn children.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to relate my own experience with this situation. Both of my children were born by C-section. When my daughter, who just turned 3 years old, was born, our insurance company, our policy, allowed for 4 days for a C-section. But when my son was born, he is now 18 months, the policy had changed. The insurance company only allowed 2 days for a C-section.

Some people say it is up to the doctor, the doctor can always make an exception. But what happens in these cases is that the doctors are basically told by the insurance companies that, if they make an exception and let the child or mother stay an extra day or two, then they are basically penalized. They are told, if this continues, they may lose their hospital privileges or they may not be covered anymore.

We were basically told we only had the 2 days for my son. What happened is just before he was to be released from the hospital they found that he had jaundice, so they let him stay. They let my wife and him stay another day, for the third day. But that is an excellent example of the type of disorders that can be found, or that are not found unless a child stays the extra day. Jaundice is something that is not discovered very quickly, and many times children and mothers who are released from the hospitals go home and they found that they have jaundice, and they have to come back into the hospital again.

I am very supportive of this legislation and this motion to instruct. There is no question in my mind that mothers should have at least 48 hours for a normal delivery and they should have the 4 days for a C-section. It is the only right thing to do. The choice should be with the mother and the doctor, not with the insurance company. I fully support this motion to instruct.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], a highly respected and hardworking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Mr. STOKES for presenting this motion to instruct conferees on the VA–HUD appropriations bill. As Members know, and others have attested to, the motion instructs the conferees to agree to three meritorious Senate provisions. The first is the Daschle amendment, which would authorize the VA to provide benefits to children born with spina bifida if one of the parents was exposed to agent orange during the Vietnam war.

Spina bifida is a debilitating birth defect resulting when the fetus's spine fails to form properly. Fortunately, we can help improve the lives of the children involved, with the benefits.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very important provision.

The second provision is the Domenici-Wellstone amendment to begin the important process of increasing coverage for treatment of mental illnesses. This limited provision simply requires any group health insurance that covers mental illness to provide the same amounts on annual and lifetime coverage that the plan provides for physical illness.

Much more needs to be done to ensure equity for coverage for mental illness, but this is a good beginning. Anyone who has had mental illness in their families can attest to the importance of moving toward a more equitable insurance coverage. The pain caused by mental illness is immense. The loss to productivity is staggering. We need to do more, and we need to do it now.

Next, I come to the third area, where Congress by this motion to instruct has the opportunity to end the shameful practice of drive-through deliveries. I feel most comfortable talking about this issue, I say proudly to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], as the mother of five children, and soon to be grandmother. I see the difference in how mothers were treated when they went to the hospital to have babies when I had my children, and what my daughter faces now, and many other young women face now.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen that we are privileged to serve with in this body should all listen to the women on this issue. When it comes to delivering babies, we know of what we speak. We have been there. We have done that. Twenty-four hours simply may not be enough in many cases.

I have received a great deal of mail from my constituents on this subject, so I do not speak only from personal experience, but from the pleas of new mothers for more coverage. The Bradley amendment would require insurance companies to cover at least 48 hours of hospitalization for a conventional delivery and at least 96 hours for a cesarean section.

□ 1315

In California 1 out of every 6 births are covered by insurers limiting coverage to 24 hours. This attempt to limit coverage is associated with increased complications requiring women to have to return to the hospital, so they are not saving any money. I will submit for the record an example which I have received from my constituent, as I urge my colleagues to give our babies a healthy start and our mothers a good start, too, on that wonderful adventure of motherhood and support the Stokes motion to instruct.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN], the distinguished ranking member on the Subcommittee on Health and Environment of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding me some time so I could speak in favor of the motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to remedy a serious mistake this House made when we failed to act to assure parity of treatment for mental health care benefits in earlier legislation. There is simply no excuse for the continued discrimination against people with mental health problems.

The Republican majority refused to allow the inclusion of the Domenici-Wellstone compromise in the conference agreement on the Kennedy-Kassebaum health insurance portability bill. It was wrong then, and it would be compounding the error to refuse it again.

The losers because of our failure to act are the American people. It is every person and every family who has known the tragedy of struggling with mental illness and having no adequate insurance coverage for the services needed to treat it.

The proposal before us is a modified one that only assures parity for mental health benefits in terms of annual and lifetime limits on benefits. It is affordable, it is necessary, it is right. We cannot say no again to taking this vital, important step.

Let us send a clear and strong message to our conferees to adopt this provision and bring some fairness and sense to our treatment of mental health benefits. I hope that all Members will instruct the conferees to go along with this provision, and that the conferees come back with a recommendation to use this opportunity to put in these provisions, to move down the track to assuring what ought to be complete parity between mental and physical health insurance coverage.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CAMP). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, this motion to instruct, although offered by our side of the House, is certainly offered in a bipartisan manner. I think it is evident that it has strong bipartisan support by virtue of the fact that I have yielded both to Members on this side and the other side of the aisle.

That is as it should be, because that is also in keeping with the manner in which I try to work on the subcommittee with the chairman of this particular subcommittee, a man for whom I have the highest regard and whom I deem to be a good friend and with whom I have enjoyed working. It is in that vein that I am working with him and look forward to working with him in conference to bring back to the House a bill that both he and I will continue to support, as I supported the bill which he brought to the floor a month or so ago. Working with JERRY LEWIS is one of the finest experiences I have had in the House, and I want to continue and will continue working with him on that bipartisan type of basis.

I said originally that the procedure here does deviate somewhat from the norm. I wish that we had had more time for he and I to sit down and discuss this, but in working with the leadership on this side, I gave him notices as quickly as I could do so. I apologize to him personally for any inconvenience that caused him in any respect.

I hope that the Members of the House will vote on these three very important issues. This is the only opportunity that our body has had to endorse these very important issues. I think it is important that we go to conference having been instructed by the House on the importance of these three issues on a bipartisan basis to all of the American people. I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in making an effort to conclude this discussion, I just wanted to mention for the record that the motion to instruct is quite unusual. It involves three areas that are really new to this subcommittee, areas that really do not involve our field of jurisdiction. They were included because it is an election year and these items are of concern to many groups out there, and it does sound like good policy.

The public should know that if these provisions become law, there are very significant implications in terms of the premiums that consumers and businesses would have to pay across the country to meet this new mandate from the Federal Government. Uncle Sam is not giving us anything for free in this process.

Having said that, I do know a little bit about some of this subject area because of my own professional background in the life and health insurance business. I am very disconcerted that we would even be considering these measures in this form without giving them the kind of serious hearings by committees of jurisdictions that they truly deserve.

My colleague from California who spoke earlier, HENRY WAXMAN, and I have worked together for many, many a year. He is a very talented Member,

without a doubt. Yet over the years when he was the chairman of the subcommittee that did have responsibility in these areas, I did not see measures coming forth from that subcommittee reflecting those expressions that we heard today on the floor.

Indeed, it is very close to election, only 8 weeks away. At this point in time, I believe, as the House votes on this, all the Members will understand that we will go to conference on these issues that are not under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3666, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, today Congress has the opportunity to put an end to the insidious practice of insurance companies sending moms and babes home before they are ready to go.

Hurried discharges after childbirth fly in the face of established medical practice, insult the precious institution of motherhood, and greatly increase the likelihood that newborn babies could suffer irreversible brain damage or require emergency medical care for illnesses within hours or days after discharge. These abbreviated stays also put mothers at risk.

Mothers and doctors are not seeking cadillac health care coverage, they are merely demanding similar coverage to that received by mothers and infants in every other industrialized nation on Earth.

Efforts by insurers to arbitrarily limit maternity stays for mothers and newborns should be of concern to all of us. Decisions on how long mothers and newborns should stay in the hospital should be made by doctors and patients together based upon medical and health care needs and not primarily by the short-term business predictions of shortsighted health insurance providers.

Mr. Speaker, the former CEO of U.S. Healthcare, Leonard Abramson, earned $20 million in a single year. Following the recent acquisition of U.S. Healthcare by Aetna, Mr. Abramson made a personal profit of approximately $1 billion. With an additional night in the hospital for a mother and her child costing between $700 to $1100, Mr. Abramson's take home pay and bonus could provide as many as 1,020,000 babies and their mothers an extra night in the hospital. To put it another way, one man's salary and bonus is enough to provide one-quarter of all the babies born in America and their moms an extra night in the hospital.

In August of 1995, the House of Representatives passed a resolution that I introduced which called upon the insurance industry as a whole to abide by the established discharge guidelines of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists an the American Academy of Pediatrics until there is clear and convincing evidence to demonstrate a need for a change in these guidelines. Unfortunately, the insurance industry has done nothing in response to congressional resolve on this matter, except organize opposition to such coverage.

Today Congress has the chance to require insurance companies to pay for appropriate maternity stays for mothers and their newborns by supporting the motion to instruct on the VA–HUD bill. I encourage my colleagues to support the motion to instruct and stand with American families.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion offered by Mr. STOKES, particularly with regard to two important provisions that will have great benefits for American families—the provisions to protect new mothers and their infants by ensuring minimum maternity benefits; and provisions that begin to address the very serious problem of health insurance discrimination against persons with mental illness.

I was the first Member of Congress to introduce legislation to stop drive-through deliveries when it became apparent in my home State of California, where managed care is widely used, that short hospital stays for maternity was a good way to save insurers money. Such short stays were having serious consequences for the health and well-being of new mothers and their babies, and it was clear that legislation was needed to prescribe a minimum period for insurance coverage to stop insurers from dictating what should be a medical decision. At least 29 States have agreed and adopted such laws or regulations.

We must guarantee that this minimum standard be applied nationally, and include so-called ERISA plans, and the only way we can do this is through the amendment to the VA–HUD appropriations bill that was adopted unanimously by the Senate under the able leadership of Senator BRADLEY. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and I join in a bipartisan effort to promote the Bradley/Kassebaum/Frist babies legislation that was moving in the Senate and in the House by jointly sponsoring H.R. 3226. At last count, 111 of you have signed on to this bill, and the President has repeatedly urged its adoption.

As far as the mental health parity provisions are concerned, they are an important first step to equalize health insurance plan coverage for the treatment of mental illnesses and other medical conditions. The evidence is clear: severe mental illness is every bit as debilitating and treatable as physical illnesses. When is this country going to stop the unfounded prejudice against the mentally ill? When are insurers going to stop perpetuating this myth that coverage for mental illness will somehow break the bank and that this somehow justifies insurance discrimination against millions of citizens? The Senate has seen the light on this issue and has voted three times this Congress for mental health parity. While the provisions most recently adopted in H.R. 3666 do not go as far as I would have preferred, I do believe they establish a critical new protection for individuals who suffer from mental illness who need catastrophic insurance coverage, and for their families.

I am happy that the gentleman from Ohio has brought the attention of the House to these important provisions that were added to H.R. 3666 by the other body, and urge my colleagues to support his effort.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. STOKES. 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 392, nays 17, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim

King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—17

Campbell
Cooley
DeLay
Doolittle
Ehlers
Geren
Hancock
Herger
Johnson (CT)
Knollenberg
Largent
Lewis (CA)
Rohrabacher
Scarborough
Shadegg
Stump
Thomas

NOT VOTING—24

Bilirakis
Brown (FL)
Collins (IL)
de la Garza
Ganske
Graham
Hayes
Heineman
Hilleary
Houghton
Istook
Johnston
McCarthy
McNulty
Mollohan
Norwood
Pastor
Portman
Riggs
Scott
Solomon
Torkildsen
Wilson
Zeliff

□ 1345

Messrs. KNOLLENBERG, THOMAS, and LEWIS of California changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. CRAPO, CHRYSLER, and SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 407, the motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 3666, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.'' I ask unanimous consent that my statement appear in the RECORD immediately following rollcall vote No. 407.

□ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, and Messrs. WALSH, HOBSON, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, NEUMANN, LIVINGSTON, STOKES, MOLLOHAN, CHAPMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1996

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XX, and by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to debate the motion to go to conference?

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is the customary request which will enable us to go to conference on this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2202 be instructed to recede to the provisions contained in section 105 (relating to increased personnel levels for the Labor Department).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognzied for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

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

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, the motion I am offering would instruct conferees to retain the provisions in the Senate-passed bill that provides for 350 additional Department of Labor wage and hour inspectors and staff to enforce violations of the Federal wage and hour laws. It is no more complicated and no less simple than that.

The reason is that the cornerstone of our efforts to control immigration must be to shut off the job magnet that draws so many undocumented aliens into the country. Increasing border patrols is of course important, but that can be done through the appropriations process, as we have been doing for the last 2 years. But it is imperative that we enhance the authority to prosecute those employers who knowingly hire illegal workers instead of American workers.

For example, we know that each year more than 100,000 foreign workers enter the work force by overstaying their visas. No amount of border enforcement will deter this, since they enter legally with passports and visas. No amount of border enforcement will deter the desire, the magnet that draws people into this country, and that is to seek jobs. The only way to deter this form of illegal immigration is in the workplace, by denying them jobs.

Case in point: In the 14-month-old Detroit newspaper dispute we have reports of illegal immigrants, not replacement workers from within the United States, but people without a valid passport, no right in this country, are coming in and they have been investigated, INS is conducting investigations on them. It is a serious incursion and a serious charge and it is being investigated by INS now, but this gives reason for the instruction motion that I would urge that we adopt in as large a number as possible.

We must enhance the authority to prosecute employers who knowingly hire illegal workers instead of American workers, and there can be no doubt that an increased number of Labor Department inspectors will reduce the possibility that employers will hire illegal workers. The Jordan Commission, remembering the late Barbara Jordan, recommended this increase, since studies show that most employers who hire illegal workers also violate labor standards.

This goes together. We want to deal with this problem and the only way is to move to the Senate-passed version that authorizes 350 additional inspectors to enforce these violations or alleged violations of Federal Wage and hour laws.

The report of the Jordan Commission concluded with this statement: The commission believes that an effective work site strategy for deterring illegal immigration requires enhancement of

labor standards enforcement. Now, I expect that the 350 additional inspectors would be used to enhance enforcement of labor standards in those areas where high concentrations of illegals are employed.

In fiscal years 1993 through 1995, the Department of Labor recovered nearly $60 million in unpaid minimum wages for more than a quarter of a million workers and another $300 million in unpaid overtime for more than a half million additional workers.

More can be accomplished with these additional personnel. And just as importantly, increased enforcement will help level the playing field for those honest employers who play by the rules and hire American workers and pay them a fair wage.

So all of the Members who like to talk about preventing illegal immigration, please, let us all repair to this motion to instruct. It is an important one, it is critical for maintaining good labor standards in this country, and I ask my colleagues to join with me in voting yes on a more tough and effective workplace enforcement.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the motion to instruct conferees.

The appointment of House conferees for H.R. 2202 marks another important juncture on the road to immigration reform. Hopefully it also means that the final destination is very close.

The Immigration in the National Interest Act is just what it says, an effort to fundamentally reorient national immigration policy so that it protects first and foremost the needs of American workers, taxpayers, and families.

We worked long and hard within the Committee on the Judiciary to bring this bill to the House floor where it passed by a margin of 333 to 87. Other Senate colleagues also labored intensely to bring forth a slightly different version of this legislation, passed by a vote of 97 to 3. These lopsided majorities clearly reflect the will of the American people, that Congress get serious about immigration reform. Not tomorrow. Not next session. But now.

Illegal immigration has reached a crisis. One million permanent illegal aliens enter the country every 2.5 years. Half of these illegal aliens use fraudulent documents to wrongly obtain jobs and government benefits, and one quarter of all Federal prisoners are illegal aliens.

Think of the human cost in pain and suffering to innocent victims. Think of the financial cost to taxpayers of incarceration in the criminal justice system.

H.R. 2202 will better secure our borders by doubling the number of border patrol agents and cracking down on repeat illegal border crossings. It will increase interior enforcement and make it more difficult for illegal aliens to take jobs away from American citizens.

□ 1400

And it will reduce the number of criminal aliens and the flow of illegal drugs into our country.

The bill adopts the most comprehensive overhaul of our deportation system in this century. Deportation procedures are streamlined, and opportunities for illegal aliens and criminal aliens to ''game the system'' in order to stay in the United States disappear. Aliens who show up with no documents to legitimately enter the United States will be quickly turned back, rather than be given lengthy immigration hearings to which a vast majority new show up.

H.R. 2202 also tackles the pressing problem of immigration and welfare. Our official national policy for almost a century has been that aliens should not be admitted to or remain in the United States if they become a ''public charge''—dependent on welfare.

Today, that presumption is turned upside down. Noncitizens receive a disproportionate share of welfare benefits in large States such as California. When all types of benefits are included, immigrants receive $25 billion more in benefits than they pay in taxes. The number of immigrants on Supplemental Security Income increases by 50 percent each year. We cannot continue down this road.

America's generosity towards those immigrants who want to work and produce and contribute will continue. But we should not admit immigrants who will live off the American taxpayers.

H.R. 2202 ensures that sponsors of immigrants will be legally responsible for those they bring into the country. The bill also ensures that sponsors first have the means to meet this financial commitment. It makes no sense, as current law allows, for sponsor who are themselves on welfare to promise that they will keep the new immigrants they sponsor off of welfare. Obviously, this is a promise that cannot be kept, and the taxpayer foots the bill.

This is truly landmark legislation. And it is long overdue. It's time to put the interests of American workers, taxpayers, and families first. It's time to push through to the finish, and complete passage of the Immigration in the National Interest Act.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration, who more than any other member on the committee fought to protect American workers, who started out with the Smith-Bryant bill, got cut out by the leadership and we now meet here at this juncture before we go to conference.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time and for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, a bill that began as a bipartisan effort to address a very difficult problem for our country, the problem being immigration and illegal immigration, has at this stage, I think it is fair to say, degenerated into a bill that is now going to be a partisan contrivance designed to somehow isolate certain Members and make them subject to political attacks and maybe try to do the same thing to the President.

I heard the comments of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] a moment ago about the difficulties this country faces with immigration. I agree with every one of the things he said. But the problem is that the bill, apparently, the conference committee proposal that will be taken up tomorrow, the provisions within it do not address the problems. It is just that simple.

Consider this: Much has been made of the Jordan commission report because of the enormous credibility Barbara Jordan has in this country and in this institution. This bill was advertised over and over, both by me back when I was proud to cosponsor it because at that time I think it was a constructive action, Mr. SMITH and others, as a bill designed to implement the bipartisan recommendations of the Jordan commission. Yet on point after point after point, the bill has abandoned those important provisions and yet kept the name and the implied sponsorship of a great woman who led a commission that did a very good job.

The most recent apparent abandonment of those provisions is the fact that the Jordan commission observed that studies show that most employers hiring illegal workers also violate labor standards. Accordingly, the Jordan commission recommended that we increase the number of Labor Department wage and hour inspectors to help us stop that and directly help us stop illegal immigration. What happened?

We came out of the committee with 150 additional inspectors, just as the Jordan commission reported, but before it came to the floor, the Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH, the gentleman from new York, Mr. SOLOMON, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the powers that be, while listening to the whisperings in their ears of lobbyists for employers, said we are not going to let that stay in the bill.

So by the time the bill got to the floor, the 150 new inspectors designed to help us deal with the problem Mr. SMITH was talking about were gone. The U.S. Senate passed the bill. When the U.S. Senate passed the bill, there were 350 additional Labor Department wage and hour inspectors. But we saw the draft of the Republican conference committee proposal that will be taken up tomorrow. What does it have? Zero.

The question is whether we are going to legislate here in the interest of the American people, write legislation that really deals with the problem that we are facing, and it is a big problem, with regard to illegal immigration and the displacement of American workers or whether we are going to do what the lobbyists tell us to do.

I urge the Members of the House to come to this floor and vote in favor of the Conyers motion to instruct and to tell whoever it is that is calling the shots behind the scenes, we want 350 wage and hour workers back in this bill. We want them to be able to augment the efforts of our other Government agencies in trying to fight illegal immigration. We want a bill that does what the advertisers and the sponsors of this bill say they are trying to do. And that is stop people who do not live in this country, who are not supposed to be in this country from taking the jobs of working Americans. Vote for the motion to instruct.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY], chairman of the House task force on illegal immigration.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical challenges facing the 104th Congress is the passage of comprehensive and effective immigration reform legislation. For many years the American people have expressed frustration that its leaders in Congress have failed to enact policies to eliminate the unacceptable high levels of illegal entry into our country.

Under the able leadership of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, the House of Representatives will soon consider a conference report which finally addresses the public concern over this problem in a serious and comprehensive manner.

One of the most important elements of this conference report is the so-called Gallegly amendment. This provision is really quite straightforward. It simply eliminates the ability of the Federal Government to force States to provide a free public education to illegal immigrants.

This unfunded mandate is especially disturbing considering that 95 percent of the cost of providing a public education is born by State taxpayers. In addition, my amendment has been modified to make absolutely sure that illegal immigrant children who are already enrolled in public schools will not be removed from those schools. This compromise provides that illegal immigrants who are currently enrolled in a public school will continue to receive a free public education through the highest grade either in elementary or secondary school.

For example, an illegal immigrant student in 2d grade could get a free education until the 6th grade or an illegal student in the 7th grade could continue through the 12th grade, provided they remained within the same school district.

It is important to keep in mind that all these provisions dealing with illegal immigrants currently enrolled in public schools apply only to the States that choose to deny illegal immigrants a free public education. If a State, be it New York, Oregon, or any other State, wants to continue to provide a free public education to illegal immigrants as they currently do, they would be perfectly entitled to continue that policy.

Mr. Speaker, California alone spends over $2 billion per year to educate illegal immigrants, and our Nation spends over $4 billion in this unfunded mandate. It is time that we at least give the States this important tool for reducing incentives for illegal immigrants to stay in our country.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree that this is a very important subject. I agree that we should be acting to try to diminish illegal immigration. It is for that reason that I deplore as seriously as I can both the method by which this bill has been considered and the substances.

I am a member of the Subcommittee on Immigration as I have been since coming to Congress. I am very proud of the bipartisan efforts in which I participated in 1986 and in 1990 and at other times to deal with immigration legislation. For the first time in the 16 years I have been a Member of Congress, gross partisanship has run this process. Those of us who participated in good faith have assurances from the chairman of the subcommittee that this would be done in a bipartisan way in the deliberations at the committee stage. Those of us who were Democrats were completely excluded from the process to the point where, despite our repeated requests, we could not even see a copy of this complex legislation until 9:30 last night.

My colleagues will remember that the Republican leadership was ready to push this bill through before the recess, and only our objection stopped it. They were going to put it through without our having a chance to see it. Then, despite the fact that it was ready to be passed in August, they withheld it from us, despite our requests to be able to look at it until last night.

This substitution of partisan exclusion for a bipartisan process is the reason why we may very well not have a bill. The fault will lie at the feet of those who changed a tradition of bipartisanship. I believe the chairman of the subcommittee when he said, do not worry, we are just talking among ourselves. We will have a participatory process.

That apparently consists of us seeing the bill last night and then trying to run it through conference tomorrow. That is their participatory process. Now, I understand why they did it that way. There are in this bill several provisions which do not deal with illegal immigration, they deal with discrimination. They make it easier for people to discriminate against American citizens of Hispanic or Asian origin in particular.

In 1986, back in the bipartisan days, now long over with us, we adopted legislation that said, if you hire people who are here illegally, you will be punished. We feared that that would lead to discrimination. People would say, I better not hire anybody who is Hispanic or Asian who might be foreign because they might be here illegally. We had a variety of safeguards in there including antidiscrimination provisions which were unanimously agreed to finally by the conference.

We put provisions in there that said, if you are denied work by someone who is motivated by fear of sanctions, despite your having done the right things, we are going to protect you. And we said to businesses, you cannot use the rules against hiring people illegally as a justification for saying, Mexicans are too much trouble, Asians are too much trouble.

This bill weakens that. This bill deliberately, clearly and intentionally, to use the word this bill likes, weakens those protections for Hispanics. By the way, we had a study by the General Accounting Office. They said the provisions were not strong enough. The General Accounting Office said, yes, the sanctions have led to discrimination. Understand, we are not here talking about keeping out people who are here illegally. We are talking about Mexican-American citizens, Asian-American citizens. And some employers say, I do not want to mess with you guys because you might be here illegally. We said, you cannot do that. You cannot simply refuse. You have to give them a chance to prove that they are here legally.

We had provisions there that protected people. They now changed that law. Those provisions are not before us. This sanction proposal, we are not dealing with that. What they did in this bill is gratuitously go back to the 1986 law and weaken the antidiscrimination provisions by saying that you will be found guilty to discriminating only if the Government proves intent. In other words, if you are by now dumb enough to use bigoted words, we can do it. but if it is overwhelmingly clear from the way you have behaved, from your work force, et cetera, that you are discriminating, we will not be able to protect you.

We also have problems from people who apply and are illegally turned down because the Government makes a mistake. We said, what if somebody said, I will hire you if you are here legally and the Government makes a mistake. My friends on the other side talk frequently of the fact that the Government makes mistakes. We know the Government makes mistakes. So we said, if you are in fact someone who is here legally and you are refused a job because the Government made an error, we will allow you to recover damages from the Government.

Do my colleagues know what they did? They knocked that out. What does

that have to do with illegal immigration? We put provisions in there to protect people who are lawfully here, American citizens, people who may have been born here. We put in provisions to protect them from harmful error. My colleagues knocked it out.

□ 1415

No wonder they did not want to let us see it until last night. They weakened anti-discrimination provisions that have been in the law for 10 years, that the GAO said should have been strengthened. They weakened out ability to have Americans get money back from the Government.

We passed the Taxpayers Bill of Rights for the IRS. But if the IRS and the Social Security Administration, somebody else, makes a mistake about one's eligibility to work, and they lose a job because of it, they do not get any help, and do my colleagues know what the Republican answer was? ''Oh, well, there's a reciprocal problem there because you, if you were illegally turned down for the job, you lost the job, but the employer has also been hurt because the employer didn't get to hire you.'' That is the kind of equivalence we get here.

We have legislation that addresses an important subject, and up until the committee process we dealt with it in a bipartisan way, and once it got out of committee somebody made a decision, and I do not know; we could not find out who. Everybody I talked to thought it was a terrible decision. Apparently the decision was made by the ether. But the decision was to withhold from the Democratic members of this subcommittee and full committee and others in the House, and I am told this happened on the other side as well, any chance to look at this complicated bill.

We got it at 9:30 last night, and they plan to pass it tomorrow, quite contrary to the assurances I received from the chairman of the subcommittee and others, and they also, having let us play games, having apparently made us feel good, pretending they were paying attention to us, it seems to me, during the committee process, they then systematically weakened or took out of that bill everything that would protect American citizens against discrimination, American citizens against government error.

Mr. Speaker, we do not stop illegal immigration by diminishing the rights of Americans citizens, but that is what this bill does. I do not like the amendment offered by the gentleman from California regarding education. The right of children to go to school the second to the sixth grade does not seem to me a great right, and if my colleagues believe that education stops at the sixth grade, I guess it does to my colleagues, too.

But I want to say that that is not the only provision of this bill that bothers me and there are provisions of the bill that systematically reduce rights that are now available to American citizens who, if they happen to be Hispanic or Asian, might get caught up in the web. I am very disappointed that the Republican leadership choose a partisan method and choose to give in to these kinds of fears because they will be responsible for the likely result: no legislation.

We pass immigration legislation when we do it in a bipartisan and cooperative way. We defeat it when we use these kinds of partisan methods, particularly when they are used to diminish rights that already exist among American citizens.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] who has been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary for a considerable period of time and is widely reputed to be an expert on immigration.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member of our Committee on the Judiciary for yielding me this time.

I rise in support of the motion to instruct the conferees. It is a funny situation when we deal with a provision in the bill that is the critical increase in the number of wage and hour inspectors in order to make immigration reform meaningful by giving us the resources to go to the work site where the big problem is, and the Senate bill provided, I believe, 200, 300. The House bill provided 150. It was taken out by a floor amendment that had nothing to do with the issue of wage and hour inspectors. It dealt with collapsing from a meaningful verification program to a weak verification program, and that was taken out, and now we come back with a proposed draft, the rumors are, and it is more than rumors. The proposed conference committee document that has very kindly been shown to out side of the aisle before the conference indicates there will be no increase in wage and hour inspectors.

If my colleagues want to get a handle on the issue of illegal immigration, putting all of the rhetoric aside, there are some key steps. At the border, meaningful verification; right now employer sanctions are a joke, and a systematic effort to take those industries and employers who systematically recruit and hire illegal immigrants because of their desire to violate wage and hour standards and take a very exploitable work force and utilize them in order to produce their product at below average scale and capture the market in that fashion.

This bill goes along with the Clinton administration's effort to increase the border patrol, does a whole bunch of other things which in some cases are very incendiary, dilutes its initial attempts to provide meaningful verification, thereby rendering fairly ineffective, to my way of thinking, all of the efforts to deal with denial of employment or public benefits to illegal immigrants and strips away any serious increase in wage and hour supporters, wage and hour division inspectors, which could provide the kind of policing of those employers who want to hire illegal immigrants in order to exploit them in callous disregard of Federal law knowing that those people will never utilize the remedies available to them.

So the motion to instruct is a very important one.

The other larger question which I think the majority has to consider is do they want the bill? They are insisting. The Governor from California came out yesterday and joined the Speaker of the House in a press conference, insisting on including a provision in this bill, an amended form of the Gallegly amendment that all law enforcement tells us is crazy, that all educators tell us is bad, which requires that the children of people who came here illegally at one point or another be refused admission or kicked out of the public schools.

The President has made it quite clear that that will result in a veto.

When I read that the Governor of California came back to Washington, came back to Washington to insist on a provision which he knows will require a veto, I tried to think why, since he ballyhoos himself as somebody who is trying to do something about illegal immigration. I think Ron Prince, who was the chairman; he was the chairman of the committee to pass proposition 187, probably put it most accurately when he indicated that there are some Republicans in this House and in the Senate and in the Republican campaign who want to veto a bill. They do not want to do anything about illegal immigration. They want an issue. So they take the one provision that has drawn a clear statement of a veto and insist that that provision be kept in the bill even though it is bad public policy, even though all of law enforcement says that it will make their job much more difficult. All educators, nearly all educators oppose the provision. I wonder what the agenda is of the people who would make that the condition for this conference report.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot let the statement pass, and I thank the gentleman for yielding, that all law enforcement opposes it when I know my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], knows that not to be true. In fact, just 3 days ago one of the largest law enforcement agencies in the country, the California Sheriffs Association, strongly endorsed it. The National Alliance endorsed it. A large portion of the rank and file of the Fraternal Order of Police endorsed it. So I would say to the gentleman the cops on the street support it.

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I should amend my statement. The vast majority of leadership

and individual chiefs of police of jurisdictions most affected by this provision think it would be a terrible idea.

Now I am trying to understand what the motivation is for someone like Governor Wilson to come to Washington, hold a press conference, urge passage of a bill with a provision that he knows will draw a veto. There is two cynical, but perhaps accurate, interpretations of the motivations for this action.

One is again to have an issue rather than a law. All the time and effort spent by the chairman of the subcommittee and Senator SIMPSON to try and improve our ability to deal with illegal immigration will be a waste of time if this bill is vetoed. Those people want an issue.

The other even more cynical interpretation of the motivations of the Governor is what happened on both the House and Senate floors. Actually the Senate did not even take it up. The large growers in California hate anything which makes efforts to enforce our laws against illegal immigration tougher because they have historically relied on bringing in undocumented workers to pick the crops. They came in with a rather brazen effort on the House floor to try and create a new 500,000 farm worker-guest worker amendment to bring in these people. That amendment got trounced on a bipartisan basis. My view is that those same growers do not want to see this bill pass, but no one can be against this kind of a bill from that community. So instead they and the Governor, as their representative, comes here and insists on a provision he knows will result in a veto.

It is a pretty cynical story. It is a pretty sad story. It means a lot of important provisions in this bill, provisions providing for reimbursement for health care institutions, provisions that at least go down the road toward some meaningful verification, hopefully all of those will go down the drain because of an insistence on this one provision.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GALLEGLY].

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

With all due respect to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], I just could not let some of these statements stand without some form of rebuttal, as he referred to the element of farm worker issue being drowned.

I have to remind the gentleman that it was only 3 months ago that this very body passed the bill that we are discussing, only a much tougher bill, 333 to 87, including the education issue, and in fact on a stand-alone vote, whether we should give the States the rights to make the decision for themselves, it passed by almost a hundred votes, stand-alone.

The people of California have been crying for this support, and the issue, the issue of where we were 3 months ago with a 333 to 87 vote; how many votes do we have in this body that we get that many folks to agree on? Just let me finish this, and I will be happy to yield. Three hundred thirty-three to eighty-seven this body voted to support this immigration bill including a provision, unmodified provision, that would allow the States to deny a free public education to those that have no legal right to be in this country. Since that time we have modified it to the point of giving a grandfather clause to all of those in K through 6 and those in 7 through 12, watered it down considerably, and now even with a much more modified version the President of the United States is saying he would veto something that almost a 4 to 1 margin in the House supported, a strong bipartisan vote, and the people of California in an initiative 2 years ago voted by almost a 2 to 1 margin. It appears to me the President of the United States, if in fact he really is talking seriously about a veto, is not listening to the people of California.

And further I would just like to add that with all the due respect that I have for our President, he has talked about vetoes in the past. Sometimes he does what he says; sometimes he does not. I am just saying that I do not believe that he would veto this bill, I do not think that it is the right thing for him to do, he knows it is not what the people of California want.

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

□ 1430

Mr. BERMAN. The gentleman misunderstood me. First of all, the 333 votes the gentleman referred to included a number of us who made it very clear that we want a great part of what is in this bill, we do not want, with all due respect, the gentleman's amendment in the bill, and that we would move it on to conference in the hope that a conference committee would convene and decide to pull that amendment out, since it was not in the Senate.

The second point I wanted to make was my point about the growers had nothing to do with the 333 vote. It was why would the Governor of California do that, with a chance to get meaningful provisions.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], this issue is very clearly I think an issue that the gentleman, my good friend, would agree is something that I have worked on for many years.

I have 20-some provisions in this bill that I strongly believe in. We have modified, we have cut back. We have made compromises that quite frankly I do not think we should have made, but for the sake of moving the bill ahead, I have supported it. I think we have come to the point where we cannot continue to chisel away and have a real bill.

The people of California can no longer afford to provide a free public education to everyone. It has a denigrating effect on the citizens of our States in providing an education to the children of legal residents and citizens. I think that issue has been sorely missed in this debate.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I in no way question the sincerity of the gentleman's commitment to his amendment. I think he is wrong, but I think he is sincere. He has always had this position. He has pushed for it for a long time.

I just wish that, given that he had two strong efforts in this bill, major efforts, one for a meaningful verification system that could give some meaning to employer sanctions, and what I think is a somewhat crazy scheme on how to try and help deal with the problem of illegal immigration by kicking kids out of schools, he had been able to prevail on the first and yielded on the second, rather than yielding on meaningful verification and insisting on his provision.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute and 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for this leadership, and the leadership of the members of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the Committee on the Judiciary. I certainly want to acknowledge the bipartisan approach of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, in the effort to distinguish and separate illegal immigration from legal immigration.

However, it is important to note that we still have an open question. Even now there is just a GAO study about taking rights away from citizen children. It is a study with the intent, of course, that we ultimately may deny the children born in the United States their rights.

Then I might say, as I rise to support the motion to instruct of my ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. CONYERS], how can we eliminate the Labor Department inspectors that would in fact be able to eliminate some of the very problems that the Honorable Barbara Jordan from Texas, as leader of the President's commission, indicated we had to do to protect workers, and to avoid the paying of wages below the minimum wage and unsafe working conditions?

We have already determined that the Labor Department and its inspector division has found some millions of dollars of situations where minimum wages were not paid, or unsafe conditions. It seems if we are truly sincere about reform in immigration that we will have those inspectors.

Last, let me say how unfortunate it is that if some of our citizens who have to be verified, particularly Hispanic citizens with Hispanic surnames, find out that they are legal and then they have no remedy, no way to address their grievances, I would say we need to look at making this a better reform and do a better job. I rise to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was give permission to revise and extent his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, when we get carried away in this body, we really get carried away. If ever I heard overkill, we are talking about overkill today.

In the conference agreement you have agreed to 900 new people in INS over a 3-year period, 900. I know what the Members are going to say, but they do no check on wage and hour. No, but if they do their job, there is no necessity for anybody to be checking on wage and hour. We are giving them 900 new people over a 3-year period.

Second, in the conference agreement you have agreed to the new workplace verification rule. Let us give them a chance. Let us give the 900 a chance, and let us give the new workplace verification system an opportunity to work. Then we can determine whether we need anything else.

I do not know how much experience you have with wage and hour people, but I have had a lot of experience in the school business. In fact, I had to threaten them, to tell them never, ever to step in again to my business manager's office, that they will come through the superintendent. Why? Because he was very, very valuable to me and to that school system. I could not have him have a stroke over the insensitivity of the gentleman who appeared there and said, do not tell me you are not doing anything wrong. I will stay here until I find it. He went all over my district doing the same, until I got him transferred to the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE]. I figured he would have a tougher time up there.

Now, let us get back again to the point: 900 new people in INS. If they do their job, and we are giving them the opportunity by giving them more people, then we are getting to the root of the problem we are talking about, and we have eliminated that problem. That is what we have done. Also you have done it if our new verification system works the way we hope it will work.

So let us not get carried away and add 350 more here and another thousand some other place. Let us, as a matter of fact, see whether we have not gotten to the root of the problem, and solved the problem with the 900 and with the new verification system.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania is understandably confused, because he thought we were using regular procedures. He kept saying, you have agreed in the conference report. No, there is not any conference report. There was an internal Republican discussion, and they produced something that they intend to ram through the conference in a day. But in fact the gentleman mistook the current situation for regular legislative procedure.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. XAVIER BECERRA, who I have asked to conclude this discussion by saving him for last to use the remaining time on our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] is recognized for 2 minutes and 45 seconds.

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

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of problems with this so-called conference report, not least of which is the backroom deals that occurred on the majority side of the aisle in both Houses which did not allow anyone from the Democratic side of the aisle to participate in any of the negotiations that took place over the last 3 to 4 months.

Now we are going to try to pass out a bill in about 48 hours, never having seen or had a chance to discuss any of these so-called changes. It is upsetting to see that the Republicans have decided to weaken protections against discrimination for U.S. citizens. They are gutting even a compromise that was reached in the light of day in committee, and the backrooms deals were cut, and that language that protected people from discrimination was removed.

It is sad to see that this Congress has now reached the stage where it is going to blame children and punish children for the acts of adults. I have never seen that happen in a court of law, but here we go, not punishing adults for the acts of children, but punishing children for the acts of adults. That is what this Congress wishes to do by denying kids the access to education.

By the way, talking about unfunded mandates, doing what they want to do in this bill will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to the schools throughout this Nation. That is not my statement, that is the statement of the California School Board Association, which is opposing the Gallegly amendment.

What is worst about all of this is jobs. The reason people come into this country, whether with or without documents, is to get a better paying job for their family. This bill, unfortunately, does little, if anything, to try to preserve and protect American jobs. We had a provision in the Senate bill that said, let us provide 350 investigators to make sure we inspect the workplaces in this country to make sure jobs are held for American citizens.

We have right now a total of 750 investigators nationwide to cover 6 million places of employment. That is about 8,000 places of employment per investigator, to investigate to find out if someone is hired with the authorization to work in this country.

The Senate, including the Republicans in the Senate, said let us give the Department of Labor the opportunity to do a better job of investigating. Why? Because we have found we have been able to recoup money for a lot of American citizens that would have otherwise not been employed, and those people who are not employed and are in jobs that are not authorized, to get them out and leave the jobs for the American citizens.

What we find is that that was all gutted. This so-called conference report that Democrats have never even seen until today does not include any funding for that. Why? If we are really out to protect jobs for Americans, if we are really out to reform our immigration laws, then let us do the thing that most Americans wish to see most, jobs, jobs for Americans, or those entitled to work in this country. This bill does not provide that type of protection.

I am amazed, we found somehow the capacity in this Congress to give moneys, funds for 300 additional border patrol agents more than even what the administration, the Clinton administration, requested. The President requested about 700 new border patrol officers. This Congress said, we are going to give you 1,000. When the administration said we need more investigators to make sure people are employed because they are authorized to work, this Congress said no, you cannot do it. So there we have.

We are going to find a situation, unlike what the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities said, that you can stop them all at the border. I wish it was true but it is not, because almost half of the people undocumented in this country come legally through a visa, a student visa or a work visa. Then they overstay and become illegal after that. They are the ones you will never catch. Half of the people, they will continue to be employed and you will not have the investigators to spot them. Bad bill. Vote against this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CONYERS. 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 181, nays 236, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

YEAS—181

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Campbell
Cardin
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Serrano
Skaggs
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—236

Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brewster
Browder
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Dickey
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Martinez
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Brown (FL)
Buyer
Collins (IL)
de la Garza
Ganske
Hayes
Heineman
McNulty
Mollohan
Norwood
Pastor
Portman
Riggs
Scott
Torkildsen
Zeliff

☐ 1503

Mr. TANNER, Mr. BAESLER, and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ALLARD, MCINNIS, and LUTHER changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. HYDE, SMITH of Texas, GALLEGLY, MCCOLLUM, GOODLATTE, BRYANT of Tennessee, BONO, CONYERS, FRANK of Massachusetts, BERMAN, BRYANT of Texas, BECERRA, GOODLING, CUNNINGHAM, MCKEON, MARTINEZ, GENE GREEN of Texas, SHAW, and JACOBS.

There was no objection.

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 on Tuesday, September 10, 1996, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Resolution 470 by the yeas and nays; H.R. 3863 by the yeas and nays; H.R. 3539, de novo; and H.R. 3759 by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

MONITORING OF STUDENT RIGHT TO KNOW AND CAMPUS SECURITY ACT OF 1990

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 470.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 470, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 409]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing

Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—20

Bono
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Collins (IL)
Conyers
de la Garza
Ganske
Hayes
Heineman
McNulty
Mollohan
Norwood
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Portman
Riggs
Roybal-Allard
Scott
Torkildsen
Zeliff

☐ 1521

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, 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.

STUDENT DEBT REDUCTION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3863, 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3863, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 1, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 410]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant

Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NAYS—1

Williams

NOT VOTING—18

Bono
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Chenoweth
Collins (IL)
de la Garza
Ganske
Hayes
Heineman
McNulty
Mollohan
Norwood
Pastor
Portman
Riggs
Scott
Torkildsen
Zeliff

☐ 1533

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.

FEDERAL AVIATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3539, 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 Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3539, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two-thirds of those present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 398, noes 17, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—398

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—17

Allard
Barr
Canady
Cooley
Cox
Hefley
Hyde
Largent
Meyers
Myrick
Sanford
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Souder
Stockman
Stump
Wolf

NOT VOTING—18

Baker (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Collins (IL)
de la Garza
Ganske
Hayes
Heineman
McNulty
Mollohan
Norwood
Pastor
Portman
Riggs
Scott
Torkildsen
Weldon (PA)
Zeliff

☐ 1543

Messrs. MCINTOSH, ROHRABACHER, ROYCE, and SCARBOROUGH changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

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.

EXPORTS, JOBS, AND GROWTH ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3759, 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 Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3759, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 157, nays 260, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]

YEAS—157

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bishop
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehner
Brewster
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TN)
Callahan
Calvert
Cardin
Castle
Christensen
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Danner
Davis
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dreier
Edwards
Engel
Ewing
Fattah
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Forbes
Franks (CT)
Frisa
Frost
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Houghton
Hoyer
Hyde
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
King
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)

Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy
McDade
Menendez
Meyers
Mink
Moakley
Moran
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Quinn
Rangel
Richardson
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sawyer
Schiff
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Smith (NJ)
Stenholm
Studds
Tanner
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Vento
Ward
Watt (NC)
Weller
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—260

Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blute
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brownback
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chrysler
Clay
Clement
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Deal
DeFazio
Dellums
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fawell
Fields (LA)
Flanagan
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Gillmor
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Greene (UT)
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jacobs
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
Kim
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
LaFalce
Largent
LaTourette
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Luther
Markey
Martini
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Obey
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Paxon
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pombo
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schumer
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stockman
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Thornton
Tiahrt
Towns
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
White
Whitfield
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—16

Brown (FL)
Bryant (TX)
Collins (IL)
de la Garza
Ganske
Hayes
Heineman
McNulty
Mollohan
Norwood
Pastor
Portman
Riggs
Scott
Torkildsen
Zeliff

☐ 1551

Mr. BAESLER and Mr. BILBRAY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mrs. KELLY changed her vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of a death in my family, I was not in attendance for rollcall votes Nos. 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, and 412.

Had I been in attendance, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes Nos. 407, 409, 410, and 411, and ''nay'' on rollcall votes Nos. 408 and 412.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3816, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1997

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight, Wednesday, September 11, 1996, to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 3816) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1669) to name the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Jackson, MS as the ''G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center,'' and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1669

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

SECTION 1. NAME OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER, JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI.

(a) NAME.—The Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Jackson, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the ''G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''. Any reference to such medical center in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect at noon on January 3, 1997.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1669.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business, the Chair will entertain requests for special order speeches.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 West Virginia [Mr. WISE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WISE 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 Washington [Mr. METCALF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

CLINTONOMICS VERSUS REAGANOMICS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, just before the August recess, the Wall Street Journal published an op-ed written by economist Alan Reynolds of the Hudson Institute.

That op-ed, entitled ''Clintonomics doesn't measure up,'' urged presidential candidate Bob Dole to embrace a return to supply-side economics based on what was portrayed as anemic economic growth during the past 4 years.

Reynolds argued that key statistics showed economic performance was superior during the supply-side years of President Reagan than it has been since President Clinton was elected to office.

As I read the article, it became clear to me that Mr. Reynolds, a long-time advocate for supply-side policies, was not providing objective analysis of this situation.

Calling on the resources of the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, I conducted extensive research into Reynolds' economic analysis and the statistics he used to make his case.

I was not surprised to find that the analysis was orchestrated in a manner that proved to be generous to the supply-side years and not so generous to the Clinton years.

First, Reynolds conveniently began his analysis in 1983, the third year of Reagan's presidency, rather than in 1981, the year in which the Reagan tax cut was actually enacted.

The huge budget deficits resulting from those tax reductions forced up interest rates in 1981 and plunged the economy into the deepest recession since the Great Depression.

Unemployment reached almost 11 percent nationally, and the strong recovery in the years that followed must be seen from that perspective: from that economic nadir, we had nowhere else to go but up.

In addition, Reynolds also excluded the Bush years from his analysis despite the fact that supply-side policies were continued throughout that era.

The Journal recently printed a letter I authored in response to that op-ed that included a more complete comparison of economic performance since 1992 and that during the full Reagan-Bush 12 years.

The analysis showed the economy has in fact performed better since 1993 than it had during the previous 12 years of supply-side economics.

Under Clinton, the economy has grown more rapidly, employment has risen at a faster rate, per capita income has increased more quickly, and the deficit is smaller relative to the economy.

Gross domestic product growth has been 2.5 percent under annually since 1992, as opposed to 2.4 percent Reagan-Bush.

Employment grew at a rate of 2.6 percent each year since 1992, a full percentage point higher than in the years from 1981–1992.

And finally, the deficit has averaged 2.9 percent of the size of the economy under Clinton, while it averaged 4.3 percent under Reagan and Bush.

Last month's unemployment rate of 5.1 percent provides further evidence of just how healthy the national economy has become in recent times.

Mr. Speaker, I am not arguing that all areas of the Nation have experienced equal economic progress during the last 4 years.

There are areas such as the Hudson Valley and the Southern Tier in my State that continue to experience significant economic anxiety and widespread underemployment.

While there is much left to do to help get people to work, even these areas have experienced improvements in their local economies since 1992.

Mr. Speaker, we owe much of our economic progress to the success of the 1993 budget reduction law that was enacted by the Democratic Congress.

It has reduced the deficit by 60 percent, from $290 billion in 1992 to an estimated $117 billion this year.

The law has resulted in four straight years of deficit reduction for the first time in about 100 years.

And the deficit this year is expected to be at its smallest size relative to the economy since 1974.

In addition to the historic deficit reduction which has occurred, the law also significantly expanded the EITC program providing tax cuts to families earning less than $28,000 annually.

According to the U.S. Department of Treasury, in my congressional district, an estimated 31,974 working families have received tax breaks averaging $480 this year due to the expansion of the EITC.

By any measure then, whether it is economic performance, deficit reduction, or tax relief to working families, the 1993 budget law has been a great success.

Despite all of these positive statistics on economic performance that were included in my Wall Street Journal piece, I am disappointed to say that I was not successful in convincing GOP candidate Bob Dole that a return to supply-side economics would be unwise.

Last month, Dole released his $550 billion tax plan with breaks targeted to only the wealthiest families in our Nation, and paid for by a magical economic growth dividend.

This morning, Senator Dole held meetings in the House of Representatives to peddle his supply-side economic plan to reluctant Republican Members of this body.

The American people must know that history speaks for itself on supply-side economics: the Dole plan will bankrupt our Nation, undermine economic growth, and increase worker unemployment.

It is time that we pay tribute to the 1993 budget law which has been a tremendous success in reviving the economy and creating good, decent-paying jobs for millions of Americans.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO H.C. ''LADD'' HITCH JR.

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with a solemn heart that I rise today to share with my colleagues the passing of H.C. ''Ladd'' Hitch of Guymon, OK.

A pioneer cattleman and prominent Oklahoma Panhandle businessman, Ladd was truly a remarkable man who left an indelible mark on his community, his State, and his industry. He was the third-generation patriarch of a family that settled and prospered in what once was called our Nation's ''No Man's Land.'' The fact that a thriving agricultural economy has developed on this once barren land is a testament to his family's frontier spirit.

The Hitch's settled in the Oklahoma Panhandle in 1884. Ladd was born in 1918 and by the time he reached adulthood, he and his family had revolutionized production agriculture in the region. As the Hitch legacy in the region grew, the family's visionary business practices never waned. They introduced one of the first irrigation systems in the Panhandle region. This innovation supplied the ability to produce an abundant feed supply and led to the establishment in 1953 of one of the Southwest's first large-scale cattle feedlot operations. Last year, the National Cattleman's Association listed Hitch Enterprises as the ninth largest cattle feeding operation in the country.

Mr. Hitch was one of the founding members of the Oklahoma Cattleman's Association, was the first recipient of the National Cattleman of the Year Award, was named ''Feedlot Magazine's Commercial Feeder of the Year,'' and was selected as a ''Stockman of the Century.'' His activities were not just limited to agriculture. During his life, he served as the chairman of the Board

of Regents of Oklahoma State University, was the former director of the University of Oklahoma Research Center, was a member of the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, and had been a trustee of the National Cowboy Hall of Fame.

As a cow calf operator from western Oklahoma, a former member of the Oklahoma State Legislature, and now a member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to deal with Ladd Hitch on many different issues both business and legislative. He was a man of integrity, drive, and vision. Ladd died on July 29, 1996, while attending the Oklahoma State Cattleman's Association in Oklahoma City at the National Cowboy Hall of Fame. The site of his death memorializes many of the greatest aspects of life. Ladd will be missed.

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

TEEN DRUG USE SKYROCKETING UNDER CLINTON

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House once again, and I have been before the House before, to talk about the problem of drug and substance abuse and the problem with our young people in this country, and the problem of the drug epidemic across this Nation.

Tonight I want to again call to the attention of my colleagues these absolutely startling statistics that have come out within the last month about teen drug use skyrocketing, particularly in the years since 1992 to 1995, under this administration.

If we look at the overall drug use and abuse, particularly, again, among our teenagers, 12 to 17 years old, it is up 78 percent. Marijuana use, 1992 to 1995, is up 105 percent. LSD use, up 105 percent also. Cocaine use is up 166 percent.

Even in my area, a wonderful, calm, traditionally family-oriented area of central Florida, heroin use and abuse is skyrocketing, particularly among our young people. I am alarmed as a parent, I am alarmed as a father, and I am alarmed as an American about this trend.

It is easy to trace this trend. In the Clinton years, from 1992 to 1995, we saw the steps that led to this. First we saw the firing by the new President of two-thirds of the drug czar's staff. Then we saw the appointment of Joycelyn Elders, the chief health officer for the Nation, who said: Just say maybe; just say maybe try it.

We saw the dismantling of our drug interdiction efforts to stop drugs, cocaine and heroin, at the borders and at their sources, almost a total dismantling proposed by this administration.

And then finally, a great insult, we saw the lowering of the standards in the highest office in this land, the While House. The White House, which is supposed to set the standards, in fact, lowered the standards, and we saw the records of people being employed that were so bad that they had to institute a drug-testing program at the insistence of the Secret Service.

Mr. Speaker, that is the problem. This is the situation. What do we do about it? This Congress, this new majority, and I, as a parent and an American, think we must act. This Congress is taking steps. Under the leadership of this new majority, we are restoring money to the drug czar's office. We are working with a new drug czar to see that that is an effective office.

We know that we must fight drugs on four fronts: by education, interdiction, enforcement, and treatment; that we cannot, as this administration has said and proposed and done, just treat the wounded in battle. That is what we are doing by putting all of our sources and resources in treatment only.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to restore those funds, and we are going to make a four-pronged approach. We are going to lick this problem, but it is going to take everyone from the White House to the courthouse, every parent, every concerned citizen, and every Member of Congress to join this effort, because we are losing a generation. We cannot afford to lose our young people in this war on drugs. We must band together. This Congress must act in a positive fashion. We must approach this in a bipartisan manner. Then we can take back our children, we can take back our streets, we can take back our neighborhoods.

We have 1.6 million Americans incarcerated in this land. Seventy percent of them are in jails and prisons because of drug use and abuse. This is the problem we have created. This is the problem we need to address. We must join together to start with our young people and bring this drug epidemic facing our Nation and our youth under control.

Mr. Speaker, I urge your cooperation in this effort, and that of my colleagues.

DOLE-GINGRICH ECONOMIC PLAN CONTAINS TAX BREAKS MOSTLY FOR THE WEALTHY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. The same folks who brought us the Government shutdown, the two Government shutdowns earlier this year and late last year, are back. Former Senator Dole and Speaker GINGRICH are bringing us a $500 billion economic package, have proposed a $500 billion economic plan tax break package, mostly for the wealthy, that will result in more cuts to Medicare, more cuts to student loans, more cuts to Medicaid, and more cuts to environmental programs.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at a bit of history as we discuss this Dole economic plan, and as we discuss the cuts in Medicare and what all of that means, and what that meant last year.

Last year the plan of the Speaker, the Gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], and Senator Dole was to give some $245 billion in tax breaks mostly for the wealthy, and they planned to pay for this plan by making $270 billion of cuts in Medicare and several billion, about $180 billion cuts in Medicaid, several billion worth of cuts in student loans, and several billion of cuts in environmental protection.

This $245 billion tax break mostly for the wealthy, which would result in the $270 billion in Medicare cuts, was the beginning of the unraveling of the Medicare Program. Let me quote what Speaker GINGRICH said about Medicare, and let me quote what then-Senator Dole said about Medicare.

Last October Speaker GINGRICH, speaking to a group of insurance executives, all of whom would benefit greatly from this dismantling of the Medicare Program, said, ''Now we didn't get rid of Medicare in round one, because we don't think that is politically smart. We don't think that is the right way to go through a transition. But we believe that Medicare is going to wither on the vine.''

The same day, speaking to another group, a group called the American Conservation Union, then-Senator Dole, who was leading the fight for the Medicare cuts in the Senate, said, ''I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, one of 12, because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965.''

Since that time, the same people that tried to, on the one hand, say they are here to try to defend Medicare and save Medicare, are attacking Medicare under their breath, attacking Medicare behind closed doors in Republican caucuses, and occasionally letting it slip and attacking Medicare in public.

One prominent member of the Committee on Ways and Means called Medicare socialized medicine. The majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], said that in a free society Medicare would not exist, whatever that means. Other prominent Republicans have labeled Medicare a program of socialism, a program that does not make sense for people, a program that we simply do not need.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that this crowd, GINGRICH, Dole, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. ARMEY, the leadership of the Republican Party, not mainstream Republicanism, which most people in this country that are Republicans I think are more likely to believe in, and not the mainstream Republicanism that supported Medicare

in past decades, but this new extremist crowd of GINGRICH and ARMEY and the gentleman from Texas, TOM DELAY, and some of the other leaders in the other House are simply opposed to Medicare. They wanted it to wither on the vine. They bragged about voting against it.

It is pretty clear that this $245 billion tax cut they proposed last year and paid for by the $200-some billion tax cuts in Medicare are the way they can end the program of Medicare, end the programs of student loans, end some of the environmental protection measures.

□ 1615

That brings us to the point today, to the Dole program today he has proposed in the Presidential race. I might add that Senator Dole and his running mate, Mr. Kemp, came to the Republican Caucus today to talk about how they were going to pay for the major tax break, mostly for the wealthy, and talk about how they were going to do the Medicare cuts.

A few Republicans have stood up and been honest about what the Dole economic plan means. If you are going to provide $500 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the rich, then you are going to have to cut Medicare even more than then-Senator Dole and Speaker GINGRICH proposed last year. That simply means that if it was $270 billion in cuts in Medicare last year, they are going to propose even more cuts this year, once they are honest with the public.

What that really means is those senior citizens that are now paying $46 a month for Medicare premiums will have their premium at least doubled, to $90 or $100 or maybe $110 a month to pay for their premium. It also means that deductibles will be higher. It also means that copays will be higher. So that this party, this GINGRICH-Dole party that says they are against tax increases, clearly want to put this senior citizen tax on Medicare beneficiaries. It is not $46 a month, which is what it used to be, or $5 or $10 copayments, what it used to be, or $50 deductible, what it used to be. All of a sudden it is probably going to be double that in order to pay for this huge $500 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the wealthy.

At the same time they are going to go right at the heart of student loans and end the student loan program that students in this country have been accustomed to, raise the prices on other kinds of student loans and student grants, cut student grants and raise the prices on other student loans, and in order again to pay for this $500 billion boondoggle, mostly for wealthy taxpayers, to go after programs that protect the environment, something the American people clearly will not stand for.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to visit with the gentleman tonight and talk about this $548 billion tax cut that has become a political issue around the country. In fact I know the gentleman mentioned that Senator Dole was here today talking to the Republican leadership, and during that time I heard that he had mentioned that this whole campaign is about trust. I thought it was appropriate in that trust is important, whether you are running for the White House or Members of Congress or whatever elected office you have. But I noticed he wants us to believe that the $548 billion tax cut will not lead to higher budget deficits and increased interest rates.

The gentleman mentioned earlier that the tax cuts will not work without getting into social programs like Medicare and maybe Social Security. But let us look at history. The gentleman mentioned the $245 billion tax cut last year where Medicare was on the table to be cut. This year, at least this fall, nobody is talking about it on the Republican side because they want to wait until after the election before they come back and put that on the chopping block.

But since Senator Dole talked about it, this campaign is about trust. It is really kind of hard, with what you have said, to talk about trust when you see what happened last year with the $245 billion tax cuts and the $270 billion, even using their terminology, the $270 billion cut in growth in Medicare spending.

But again let us talk about that growth in Medicare spending. If you have 10 million, for example, people receiving Medicare today, and 5 years from now you have 25 million that may be expected, these are numbers we pick out of the air, and we are not planning for that growth, then it is a cut.

I know it is sometimes hard to explain that to folks. But let me mention today I saw in the New York Times the architect of the Reagan tax cut plan in the early 1980's, Murray Weidenbaum, said of Senator Dole's proposed tax cuts: Cutting income taxes alone is not going to energize the economy sufficiently to prevent a rise in the budget deficit.

This last Sunday on ''Meet the Press,'' another architect or budget adviser, Richard Darman, who worked under both Presidents Reagan and Bush, reminded us that Reagan had to raise taxes five times after enacting the very popular 1981 tax cuts to make up for that lost revenue, and we still had our debt and deficit mushroom in the 1980's, even after five tax increases, after 1981.

If my colleagues are building a campaign on trust, then let us look back at the past decade or two decades and see where that trust would be. I think the gentleman mentioned it, Senator D'AMATO mentioned that under the Dole plan, funding for such programs like Medicare would definitely be affected. In fact his quote is, he went so far as to say: ''I'm not running this year so I can say it and tell the truth.''

I do not think that is what people in America want when they talk about trust, when they talk about all of us want a tax cut but we also want to balance the budget.

Let me even quote another former U.S. Senator. Senator Warren Rudman from New Hampshire agrees when he says, ''Unless you are willing to do some major reforms in entitlements, there is no way you can do this.''

What is an entitlement? That is a word in Washington we use but in our districts, entitlements are Social Security, they are Medicare, they are programs that people depend on to make sure they can have the quality of life that they should have.

My concern is why is Senator Dole not telling the American people that that is what he wants to do for $540 billion in tax cuts, when they got burned last year by trying to do $245 billion, so they doubled it almost? And they are still going to attack Medicare, education, student loans. If you are building a campaign on trust, let us talk about that. Let us talk about it before November 5, instead of waiting until after a new Congress comes in, and then making those cuts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Retaking my time for 1 moment, to my friend from Texas, that is exactly the point. Last year they proposed $245 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the wealthy, and the way they wanted to pay for those tax breaks, cuts in Medicare, going right to the heart of cutting student loans, and cutting environmental programs, they could not do because the public rose up in opposition to it. This year Senator Dole, former Senator Dole, wants to give a tax break, again mostly to the wealthy, of twice that amount, but they are not telling us how they are going to pay for it. It is clear the only way they are going to pay for it is go twice as hard at Medicare, twice as hard at student loans and twice as hard at the environment. But they look at us and say, ''Trust me until after the election is over, we'll tell you after the election.'' It is clear what they are going to do, go after the same programs the public would not stand for in 1995 and 1996 which they shut down the Government over, saying if we cannot have our Medicare cuts we are going to shut down the Government. What is this crowd going to do? If Senator Dole wins the election and GINGRICH and the Republicans in the Senate take control, how are they going to run the Government then? Go right after Medicare, student loans, and the environment one more time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Going back, let me say something else about budget cuts, obviously Medicare and student loans, but they have to go to discretionary spending if they do not do entitlements. Some of that discretionary money is Border Patrol, the FBI, crime control, airline safety. There are a lot of programs that would be on the chopping block. But again they doubled the tax cuts they wanted

in 1995 and 1996, they could not get them, and in Texas we call that a pig in a poke. Our folks are not going to buy it, and that is what this is. This proposed $500 billion tax cut is a pig in a poke.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] was here in 1965 when Medicare was created. At that time, half the senior citizens of America had no health insurance. Today only 1 percent of senior citizens have no health insurance because of Medicare. Medicare clearly has worked. You look at what Speaker GINGRICH has said about Medicare, that he wants to see it wither on the vine, and those are his words, not mine. You look at what the next top-ranked Republican in Congress has said, Mr. ARMEY, that in a free society you would not have Medicare. You look at what one of the top Republicans in Ways and Means has said, he calls it socialized medicine. You look at what Senator Dole said. He said, ''In 1965 I was there fighting the fight, voting against Medicare, 1 out of 12, because it wouldn't work.'' It is clear when 99 percent of the elderly in this country have health insurance and can live the last years of their life with dignity knowing that most of their health care will be taken care of that it is a program that works. I resent, as I think everybody on this floor resents, the kind of talk that Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. ARMEY and some of the others have said when they belittle Medicare and belittle what it has done for people in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. First of all, this is a very important discussion. Let me say as one who was here, as the gentleman said, when Medicare was created, one of the unintended results that has come out of Medicare is that old age is now much kinder than it used to be. It is much more humane than it used to be, and Medicare itself has lifted millions of older folks out of poverty. But one of the unintended results that we never dreamed would happen is it has created in the American economy an infrastructure that can take care of the particular needs of old people. That is what has done so much.

Medicare is going to have to make some changes to make sure that it is fiscally sound and in place for the people in the future. Those changes do not need to be radical. Essentially we need to get tough, effectively tough on cutting out the waste, fraud, and abuse. Then after we have done that, if there is any need to change the financing system, it should be changed. But we have a good program, it is very important that we maintain it, and it has really helped many millions of people in the United States.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Florida. There have been efforts by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] and me in the Committee on Commerce, and by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] to deal with the fraud questions, because we can save $80 or $90 billion in the next 7 years simply by attacking fraud, waste and abuse in a systematic way. That is the first step, not making these major cuts in Medicare in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comments and for taking this special order out and for my friend from Florida, Mr. GIBBONS, who has been a champion for Medicare and for elderly people in this country today.

I would like to embellish a little, if I could, on what SAM GIBBONS has talked about and how important this is, and comments you made about how important this is to our seniors and what a difference it has made over a period of time since 1965 when it became law.

One of the things that has aggravated me in this debate the most was the fact that most people in politics and in the country do not seem to understand what the income level is of the people who are receiving Medicare today.

The Department of Labor study that Secretary Reich released about a year ago, within the last year, indicated that 60 percent of our seniors have income of $10,000 a year or less. That includes their Social Security and their annuity if they have one. Ten thousand dollars a year or less. That is why this is such an important and, as it turned out, volatile issue in American society today.

I have got a woman in my district, and she is a good friend of mine. I do not want to mention her name in this special order, but let me just put it this way. Margie is her first name. She was a riveter and made the B–29's that helped us win the Second World War. She is close to 80 years of age now. She worked all her life, helped us win the war and now she lives on her Social Security. After she gets done paying her rent, her Medicare, her medicine and her MediGap insurance, she has got $130 left for that month and that has got to go for food, for heating, for all her utility bills.

That is why we have fought so hard to make sure that people like her do not have to pay an extra $700 a year in the next 4 or 5 years for Medicare, because they cannot afford it. It is a huge part of their annual income.

Now we have got this proposal that Senator Dole and Mr. Kemp and Mr. GINGRICH have put together that would cut taxes 15 percent. But the problem with that is, besides most of it going to the folks, very folks at the top, is that it would either blow a big hole in our deficit, and we have brought this deficit down from $290 billion 4 years ago to $116 billion now. We have brought it down by 60 percent.

□ 1630

It is going to blow a big hole like we did during the eighties when we spent on defense and then cut the revenue out of the Government. Or the other option is you are going to have to cut from education and programs like Medicare.

So the approach that the President has suggested and we are suggesting, where you target your tax relief to education, $10,000 tax deduction or $1,500 credit for years 13 and 14 in school; you target it on kids; or on the sale of your home, so the middle class gets a capital gains relief. Those things are more modest, although each in themselves is a rather large component, but they are much more modest than an across-the-board cut, and they target people who need it.

So I thank my colleague for raising the issue of Medicare and how it fits into this debate. We are going to be there, protecting it, making sure it is solvent, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] has talked to us about, and making sure that it is there for people. There is no reason why we cannot make sure that this program is there in the future.

We, as you have correctly pointed out, have taken two generations out of poverty when they became seniors because of Medicare in 1965, and your numbers are absolutely on the mark: 30–40 percent of the people in this country who became seniors went into poverty, before Medicare. Now that number is down considerably from that figure, and it has been a wonderful program for many, many people. We are going to do all we can to maintain its viability, its solvency, and make sure it is there for future generations.

I thank my colleague for his comments.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would add, before yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], that it is important to keep in mind what he said when he talked about Marjorie in Macomb County, or I talked about people that I know in Lorraine or Medina or all over my district, that the proposal last year would have raised premiums, the monthly premium, from $46 to $85 or $90. It would have raised the deductible, now $250 a year, somewhat higher, and would have raised the copays, which are typically $5 or $10, to some higher amount.

What is important about that is that they were cutting Medicare $270 billion to pay for a tax cut of about that amount. Senator Dole proposes twice the tax break, again, mostly for the wealthy. Does that mean the premiums are going to go up from $46 to $110 or $120 or $130 a month? Does that mean that the deductible will go from $250 to $400 or $500, or the copays will go to $15 or $25? We do not know that. They are not telling us.

In order to pay for a tax break of $550 billion, it is pretty clear the Medicare premium is going to go well over $100 a month, and you are talking, what Mr. BONIOR said, that 60 percent of Medicare beneficiaries are living on less than $10,000 a year. While going from

$46 to $100 a month might not be very much for Mr. ARMEY, who talks about Medicare being socialism, or Mr. GINGRICH or Mr. Dole or a Member of Congress, it is a lot for somebody living on $10,000 a year.

I yield to my friend from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, who has done more to protect Medicare and fight these cuts and NEWT GINGRICH's ''wither on the vine.''

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman for what he said. I just wanted to follow up on what he and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said.

It is amazing to me how the other party, the Republican leadership, keeps trying to talk about these changes in Medicare and these cuts in Medicare as if they do not really have an impact on real people. But they do.

When both of you were talking about some lower-income seniors, I had the best experience with that when I had a senior forum in 1995, at the time when the Republican leadership was talking about eliminating the Medicaid payment for Medicare part B. In other words, if you are below a certain income so that you are eligible for Medicaid, right now Medicaid pays your part B Medicare premiums, which is for your doctor bills, to pay for your insurance so your doctor bills are covered.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In other words, that $46 payment, if you are especially poor, that $46 payment the government will help you with so you can qualify for Medicare.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. These were people that could not even afford to pay the $46 that the average person pays now for Medicare part B to pay for their doctor bills. Under the Republican proposal that was considered by this House, and actually passed by this House in 1995, that money would have been taken away. So essentially those really low income senior citizens would not have had Medicaid paying for that Medicare part B premium.

I was talking to people who could not afford to pay another $7 or $8 a month.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think it is important to remember that the people that need help on paying their Medicare premium, the $46 a month, are not usually people that have been on welfare all their lives. They are usually people that have been working all their lives, that never made a lot of money, that want to live their last year in dignity.

I remember in the Committee on Commerce the gentleman and I and others worked on an amendment to at least, as bad as the Medicare bill overall was, to at least put that part of the Medicare law back into place, that Government would help those people that worked all their lives in perhaps minimum wage or slightly above, to help them with their Medicare premium, so they in fact would qualify for Medicare. If I recall, that was voted down on a party line vote because Speaker GINGRICH did not want it in the law.

Mr. PALLONE. Not only strictly party line, every Republican voted against it, but if you remember when it came to the floor, Speaker GINGRICH had said he was going to correct it and he never did. He actually came here one day in the well and said he was going to correct that, and it was not going to be in the bill when it came to the floor, and he never did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I recall, he said he had corrected it initially. Then a staff person said, ''NEWT, come over here,'' and he explained he had not. And he ignored it and said, ''We will take care of it later.'' It has not been. Fortunately, a Presidential veto stopped it from happening.

Mr. PALLONE. We are primarily talking about widows, elderly women whose husbands had passed on and who did not have any pension or anything to pay their way, and were therefore eligible for this, what they called qualified Medicare beneficiaries.

I only mention that again by reference to the comments that the two of you have made, which is whenever you have these Medicare cuts, there is no free lunch. Essentially what it does is drive up costs in every other way.

You mentioned about the higher premiums for Medicare part B that were proposed by the Republicans in 1995. You mentioned the higher deductibles. You mentioned the higher copayments. But we also had this year, in 1996, actually as part of the budget that the Republicans passed in the spring, the idea of eliminating balanced billing.

In other words, essentially, if you decided you wanted to stay in traditional Medicare, you did not want to go into an HMO or managed care, under the present Republican budget for 1996, the one that passed in 1996, you could actually be charged an unlimited amount by the physician over and above what Medicare could pay.

So if it is not a question of a higher premium or a higher deductible then there are going to be overcharges. They basically have that right on the table now as we speak in 1996, that doctors can charge unlimited amounts over and above what Medicare could pay, now pays, if you stay in your traditional Medicare plan.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, taking back my time for a moment, the changes that Speaker GINGRICH and Mr. Dole put into the Medicare and Medicaid bill, will go the exact opposite direction of where we wanted to go in detecting fraud, waste, and abuse, rooting it out and eliminating it.

There is the balanced billing issue, there is the issue that allows a doctor, which is prohibited now under the law, but which they want to allow a doctor to be able to refer a patient to an MRI facility or some other diagnostic or clinical facility that the doctor owns, and then go ahead and charge the Government for the referral and the original visit, and then the diagnostic equipment and treatment at that center. It was one issue after another issue that they opened up to more fraud, waste, and abuse, in a system that already has 10 or 15 percent fraud, waste, and abuse.

The first thing we need to do with Medicare and Medicaid is not make cuts to pay for a tax break for a relatively small number of very wealthy people. The first thing we need to do is root out the waste, fraud and abuse. Then we can deal with the fiscal issues with Medicare. But do not charge senior citizens, raise their premium from $46 to $110 a year, and raise the deductibles and copays.

Mr. PALLONE. I wanted to raise three other instances. It is not just seniors that are going to end up paying more because of these cuts; the general public will as well. First of all, the fact, I do not think you mentioned it, you may have, the fact when you cut Medicare, and it is already happening, those that have supplemental insurance, most seniors carry supplemental, Medigap type insurance, the cost of that keeps going up.

I see the gentlewoman from Connecticut is here, who has been so much involved and taken a leadership role on this issue. In our States, New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut, Medigap insurance costs have gone up from 11 to 14 percent every year in the last few years, all time highs. A lot of that is attributed to the cuts in Medicare. If you cut Medicare, then you are going to see higher costs for your Medigap insurance.

Also in New Jersey, let me give you an example, most of the hospitals that I represent in my district rely on Medicare and Medicaid for a majority of their reimbursement, a majority of the money they are taking in. When there is a shortfall, either they close or they find some other way to pay for things. We have seen arise in uncompensated care. We actually have a tax, if you will, on uncompensated care, that we end up paying.

So the general public ends up paying for the difference too. Taxes and costs go up for the general public, because the hospitals are not getting the reimbursement rate they were previously getting. So it is not just seniors that are going to pay more. Everyone is going to pay more, and they are going to pay it in various ways that maybe are not as obvious, but they still end up paying.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I really am delighted to join with my colleagues tonight, and I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his leadership on this effort. Just in listening to the conversation, there is not anyone who has suggested that we should not be looking at making the Medicare program a stronger program, a better program, in a variety of ways. No one has their head in the sand to say that hey, it is good. It was started in 1965, we have now insured 99 percent of seniors. In the past that was 46 percent of seniors

who had health insurance. But how do we go ahead and make it better?

My colleagues were talking about the issue of fraud and abuse. There is in the system, I have introduced legislation, others have introduced legislation, to try to correct that problem. We did not remove the monitoring mechanism and the way to make sure that these restrictions on fraud and abuse would be lifted, rather than to look at them and refine it, the whole issue of holding down the costs, because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will say they are trying to hold costs down.

What is amazing to me is they only want to hold the costs down for America's seniors and for working families. You can hold the costs down, but in order to hold the costs down all over in the health care system, you have to hold the costs down in insurance companies, on hospitals, on doctors, on pharmaceutical companies, and everyone else. Why are we just singling out seniors to do that with, and thereby increasing their premiums and deductibles? They are not talking about doing anything about holding costs down in any other place in the system.

Also, another point, where they held up their trustees' report and talked about how the trustees said we had to fix the program, that was $90 billion. We voted here for a democratic bill that talked about $90 billion, the difference now between $90 and $270 and that tax break of $245 billion for the wealthiest Americans. Now Mr. Dole comes up here and he says to us that he wants a tax cut, and he is going to look at $600 billion in a tax cut, and we know through CBO and others about that potentially $300 billion in a cut for Medicare?

My point is that we know there ought to be changes, but the question is, and I know my colleagues have talked about this already, but the litany from the leadership on the other side of the aisle about fixing this program ought to put the fear of God into the public and give a sense of who can they trust on this issue? Mr. Dole, who talked about being proud of being 1 of 12 that he voted against Medicare because it was a program that did not work? Our colleague, BILL THOMAS, who not just a month ago on this floor talked about Medicare as a socialist system? The majority leader on the other side, saying that this is a program that he would not be part of in the free world? Mr. GINGRICH, talking about it withering on the vine? Mr. D'AMATO, from the other body, talking about how with this new Dole tax plan, that he believes and knows that there are going to have to be drastic cuts in the Medicare program?

It is a question of who do you trust to fix the program, a good program that could be made better. That is what this is about. And that is why I think it is an education process for the American people to understand this debate and truly know who wants to fix it, and who ultimately would like to see it done in to their peril.

So I thank my colleague for giving me the opportunity of having this conversation with all of you tonight on this issue.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank my friend from Connecticut, who has done such a marvelous job in showing leadership, in not just protecting Medicare against major budget cuts from Speaker GINGRICH and Mr. Dole, but also offering alternatives to strengthen Medicare and make it work for the next generation.

I would add on one thing to what the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, when she talked about holding down costs. Mr. GINGRICH, in talking about Medicare withering on the vine and Mr. Dole saying it would not work when he voted against it 30 years ago, and Mr. THOMAS calling it socialized medicine, and on and on and on, they want to increase costs to senior citizens. They want to double the premiums and copays and deductibles. But they really see Medicare as sort of a piggy bank, that you have this big pot of money, a slush fund or piggy bank, whatever term you want to use.

□ 1645

Medicare is a big program. A lot of money goes through Medicare every year in taking care of tens of millions of seniors' health care. What has happened is they first want to raid this piggybank or slush fund to the tune of $270 billion in tax breaks, mostly for the rich. Now that Mr. Dole has proposed a bigger tax break, they want to cut it even more.

Mr. Speaker, they also want to raid it in another way, and that is some of the programs they have, so that Medicare does in fact wither on the vine. Mr. GINGRICH has proposed something called medical savings accounts, which allows insurance companies to raid this piggybank or raid this slush fund.

It is no secret or it is no coincidence, I should say, that, when Mr. GINGRICH made his little speech about Medicare withering on the vine when he said we did not get rid of Medicare in round one because we did not think it was politically smart to do that, and we do not think it is the right way to go through a transition, but we believe it is going to wither on the vine. When Mr. GINGRICH said that back in October of 1995, he was speaking to a group of insurance company executives, all of whom will benefit from his Medicare plan.

So, first of all, he takes money out of Medicare to go to a tax break for the richest Americans. Then the money that is left in Medicare will not be spent on senior citizen health care to the same degree that it is now. The money that is left, much of it will go to those insurance companies for bigger profits and more money for them.

So we see already a declining amount of money in Medicare as a result of the Gingrich tax breaks for the rich. We see a further diminishing of this Medicare pot that should go to people like Margie in Macomb County, or people like the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] was talking about. Instead of going to them, it is going to insurance executives. It is going to the people at Golden Rule, in Indiana, to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield. Those are the people that Mr. GINGRICH was speaking to that day. It is one thing after another that way.

Mr. Speaker, the reason Medicare will wither on the vine under the Gingrich plan is he will cut the amount of money in it with the tax breaks. We will see more of the health care dollars going to insurance companies so that senior citizens will have even less, and then the system literally does wither on the vine.

He was speaking correctly when he said it would wither on the vine under his proposal. He was not lying to the American people if he gets his way. But he is not going to get his way because the four of us and dozens of others in this body will continue to fight that. The President will continue to fight that. Clearly, the American people have been on our side because the Republicans shut the Government down in order to give this big tax break and make Medicare cuts.

So it is clear that the more people know about the Gingrich-Dole plan on Medicare, that they want to double premiums and increase copays and increase deductibles, the more the people will be unhappy about it.

I yield to my friend from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. I also wanted to say, I know the gentleman mentioned Medicaid as well, and we talked about that a little, and the same phenomena, particularly by reference to what it means for people other than seniors, their children and grandchildren. A part of the Republican leadership strategy from the beginning has been to also cut back on Medicaid, and the majority of the money in Medicaid right now pays for nursing home care. So, again, it primarily deals with taking care of the health care needs of the senior citizens.

We fought a very hard battle, you and each of the four people and the others that spoke here this afternoon, in trying to make sure that Medicaid was not cut back and also that it was not block granted. If it was block granted and it was cut significantly, I think what you would have seen essentially is that the States, in taking on more responsibility and relaxation of Federal standards and Federal requirements, basically would have shifted more and more of the Medicaid burden, the nursing home burden, if you will, to children, to spouses, to grandchildren.

Right now, as we all know and we have talked about this before, a State cannot go after a spouse for certain purposes. They cannot take their home. They cannot take their car. They have to leave them a certain

amount of living expenses if one's spouse is in a nursing home. They cannot go after children or grandchildren to pay for Medicaid nursing home expenses. But the Republican legislation that was before the House last year and again this year basically would have eliminated those requirements and allowed the States to go after those people in order to recover costs.

So what we would have seen is the cuts in Medicaid to finance these tax breaks primarily for wealthy individuals. More of the costs would have been shifted to the spouse, who is still living at home, to the children, to the grandchildren. Again, there is no free lunch. The end result of that would have been hardship for those people, hardship for children who instead of paying college costs, which are a big burden for them, for their children, would end up having to pay for nursing home care for their parents.

Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of shifting of costs that really bothers me. The other side of the aisle, GINGRICH and the Republican leadership, they want to give the impression that we can make these cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and it is not going to matter. It is not a big deal.

They keep saying we are really only cutting the growth, we are not doing anything that will harm anybody. But it has a direct impact in the shifting of costs not only to the senior citizens but also to their families. That is what I think we fought very hard against and we have to keep fighting for.

Mr. BONIOR. Would the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BONIOR. The gentleman makes a very good point. We are not talking here about something that will affect just seniors in this country, as he has so eloquently just stated. We are talking about the family who has kids coming up and maybe want to go to college, and they have aging parents who may need nursing home care or who may be on Medicare. When these things occur at that level of reduction, for our parents and our grandparents who are 65 and older, and who may need nursing home care and need that Medicaid payment, then those responsibilities and those pressures and those demands fall on people that are basically our age here who have kids and then who have parents who are getting up there in age.

That financial pressure is just quite incredible not only financially but mentally as well, the stress of having to make that decision whether you are going to send your son or daughter to college or you are going to take care of your parent.

Mr. Speaker, this was something that occurred on a very regular basis prior to 1965, before we had Medicare, before we had a Medicaid program in this country. What was occurring is when elderly people got ill, either their kids basically took care of them or they had to live in poverty. So what we are trying to do here is keep all the units of the family solvent. We are talking about kids who want to go to school. We want to support the student loan program. They wanted to cut it back.

We are talking about elderly parents who may need nursing home care. We want to make sure that it is there for them in terms of Medicaid. They wanted to repeal the whole program, not only repeal the program but do away with the regulations that allowed our parents and grandparents who may have to have nursing home care to live with some sense of dignity, where they are not tied up, where they are not gagged or fed improperly or abused, as they were prior to the government making regulations to stop this sort of abuse of our parents and grandparents.

So the gentleman from new Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is right on in terms of dealing with this question of the burden of leadership shift, and it will shift dramatically, as it has in instances already, to those folks at home who have children and who have aging parents as well.

Ms. DELAURO. If the gentleman would yield just on that point.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is so clear. Nursing home care and what the proposal was with regard to Medicaid really gets into the heart and soul of what families are struggling with today.

It is a very difficult decision to send a loved one to a nursing home. You make it with a sense of, am I doing the right thing for my elderly grandparents or parents; am I making the right decision for them, for me; what happens with my children?

And this whole Medicaid proposal that says the money goes to the State, States will make a determination and make a choice between whether or not they spend their Medicaid dollars on children or on seniors in nursing homes. They were going to remove the national standards on nursing home care, as has been pointed out, put the burdens on spouses and adult children.

Once again it was turned around. Suppose we find ourselves in a situation where our parent, if this went through, if we were not able to hold it back this time around, that the family would then, having made the decision of putting someone in a nursing home, have to take the person back into their home. What kind of cost is that? What kind of help do I provide——

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentlewoman would yield. The cost is about $39,000 a year for nursing home care. It is a phenomenal cost.

Ms. DELAURO. It really is. I went to speak to the Milford Senior Center yesterday. They have their club today. There were about 200 people. And we were talking about this, and we were talking about the nursing home care. After it, a woman came up to me. She says, you know, she says, I rely on the nursing home. My husband is there.

It was a very tough decision for her to put her husband in the nursing home. She said: He is getting wonderful care and they are taking good care of him. And she says: I would not be able to do that, I cannot do that if something should jeopardize all of that.

That is what we were looking at. And, quite frankly, my concern is that we beat that battle back one time. It was the American public, the outrage of the American public on what was going to happen. Now we listen to people over and over again coming back and talking about the same things again; that they are not——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The same thing, only worse, I would add, because now the tax break mostly for the wealthy is twice the size Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. DOLE originally planned, which means, I guess, they will not tell us, but we have to figure it will mean twice as large a cut in student loans, twice as large a cut in the environment and twice as large a cut in Medicare or Medicaid or twice as large an increase in premiums, deductibles and co-pays. They simply will not tell us.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. This goal of the Gingrich-Dole-Kemp plan here is indeed a bridge to the past, to pick up on a metaphor that has been thrown around the last few weeks. They are reaching deep into the past to a day where we did not have Medicare for our grandparents, where we did not have Medicaid that would take care of nursing homes, or we do not have help for our students.

It is quite bizarre, especially given the fact that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle consider themselves the epitome of futurism, the futurist ideas that they were espousing at the beginning of the Congress. And yet where do they want to take us? They want to take us way back when the security for the family was nonexistent basically in this country, in many ways.

So it is very, very perplexing. What we need to do is build on the programs that we have, streamling them, making them more efficient but making sure that they are there so that people will have the opportunity to lead productive and good lives.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Think about the programs, and there are certainly Government programs that have wasted dollars and Government programs that have not worked, but think of the two programs we are talking about most today, a couple or three programs, Medicare and student loans.

Medicare has lifted millions of the elderly out of poverty in the last decade or two or three of their lives. Student loans have provided opportunities for millions of middle class families to send their children to college.

Both programs obviously can use some adjustment, but it is clear from what Mr. Dole's campaign manager said, Senator D'AMATO said, what Mr. Kemp, what Mr. Dole, Mr. GINGRICH

said, that they really want to eliminate these programs in the next decade. They are two programs that work so very well for middle class America, for poor America, for everybody.

Mr. BONIOR. On top of that, let me tell my colleagues what is especially disturbing to me. I remember picking up maybe 18 months ago the first volume of the Progress in Freedom Foundation's newsletter, that is the foundation founded by the Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH. And in their newsletter, actually it was more of a newspaper as opposed to a newsletter, I remember vividly reading the headlines. And it was, for heaven's sake eliminate Social Security.

That is where they are going next. That is where they are headed next. And they have already got their think tanks working, they are already talking about it. And we told, folks, that they were coming after Medicare. And the proof is in their own words as we have mentioned here on several occasions this evening in this 1 hour special order: wither on the vine, proud to have voted against it, no place in the free world. And now they got folks working on getting rid of the Social Security System.

□ 1700

It has been a lifesaver for people in this country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There are the intellectuals, quote unquote, in the Gingrich revolution that sit over at the Heritage Foundation or sit over in their ivory towers and somewhere around the Capitol in one of these really fancy buildings and think up all these great ideas and are totally out of touch with Margie in Macomb County and totally out of touch with the woman that Ms. DELAURO talked about, that have real problems, living on $8,000 a year, that struggle, that were able to send their kids to college on student loans, that need their Social Security, that use Medicare in the last couple of decades of their lives. They are coming up with these ideas and then these are the ideas they are trying to foist on the American people out of some think tank. The Social Security, Medicare, student loans, we are going to keep fighting for it because those are important and those have made millions of Americans who have brought them into the middle class and kept them in the middle class. That is what all of us should be here for.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to follow up. It is funny you are talking about these Washington think tanks. I was just harking back to during the August district work period when we were not in Washington, I had a lot of senior forums. Over and over again, I just got these commonsense approaches from the seniors in my district about what to do to improve Medicare. And they all talked about long-term care, preventative measures.

In New Jersey, we have with the casino revenue fund. We refinance a program where if you are below a certain income, I think it may be probably close to $20,000 now for a two-family household, where if you are below that income, the casino revenue money pays for your prescription drugs. You have to pay like $5, but then you get the rest of the prescription drug for free, paid for with the casino money.

Also the State has experimented, I know other States have as well, with home health care. In other words, where over and above Medicare right now, they will pay for a certain type of home health care cost on an experimental basis. All the seniors kept telling me the whole time is, why are you guys talking about these negative changes, if you will, that the Republicans are proposing on Medicare. Why not think of some positive ways to save money through prevention or through dealing with long-term care problems. And it is true. There is no question that in New Jersey, once that prescription drug benefit came into play with the casino revenue money, which we were fortunate to have, that it saved a lot of money for people that did not have to be hospitalized or did not have to be placed in nursing homes or boarding homes. And the same with the home health care.

They have personal care, attendant service for certain people that come in so that they can stay in their apartment or stay in their house. Over and over again, studies have been done for the House of Representatives, for various committees, that show if you move in that direction, that ultimately you will save money because you prevent institutionalized care, which is so much more expensive. We do not hear about that from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They just want to talk about scrapping Medicare, having it wither on the vine.

Ms. DELAURO. That is such a relevant point, because what all of the data indicates is that the point was, in terms of health insurance, that you spread the risk so that the more people who are insured and who are covered, that is the way that you bring costs down. When you are operating in 2 systems, if you will, with people who have it and people who do not have it, people who do not have it get their health care from somewhere and that cost does not go into a vapor. Everybody else who does have it picks up that cost.

So the whole point has been, how do we get more people insured to lower the cost of health care. What we ought to be doing is thinking about that future, of insuring more people. We have only one system today where 99 percent of the population are covered, and that is Medicare for seniors.

And one of the items on the agenda, the Families First agenda that the Democrats have proposed for implementing after January 1 is to see if we can try to insure children from zero to 13 so that we have got another pool of people covered for insurance, again, to give parents the peace of mind that they have the opportunity to get insurance for their kids and make that more affordable.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And to ultimately save money so the 12-year-old child with the cold will go to the family doctor rather than waiting until she is sicker and going to an emergency room.

Ms. DELAURO. So the point is, where do we need to go, as my colleague from New Jersey said, with regard to improving Medicare. We need to look at home health care, which can save us money. We need to look at the cost of prescription drugs to bring that cost down. What is it, what is it in the mindset that says, let us unravel the one system that we have that is approaching coverage of most of the population, thereby holding the cost down and not build on it but rather unravel it and go back to where it is helter-skelter, when we ought to be moving in the direction of trying to cover more and more people today who are without insurance and to look at preventative measures. It is, as our colleague from Michigan said, it is a bridge to the past and not the bridge to the future that we need to be making in order to assure affordable good quality health care for everyone in this country.

Mr. BONIOR. I will try to answer your question in terms of the mindset. It is the same mindset that denies proper labor guarantees in this country so people can bargain and organize in this country. It is the same mindset that, because of that, allows the society to become one that hires people who are temporary employees. The largest employer in the country is temporary manpower services now.

It is the same mindset that has these folks working in our society without health insurance, without any pensions, certainly without any pension portability, and without many of the other benefits that were fought for, gained, and took us successfully, at the conclusion of the Second World War, into a very productive, most productive period in our history during the 1950's and 1960's.

There is a huge retrenchment, there is a huge bridge to the past, pre-World War II, pre-1930's, and it is very, very scary. It is very, very scary. Where the protections of working men and women in this country are gone and the educational opportunities for our young people are becoming harder and harder to realize. And of course this assault on our seniors, their attacks on Medicare and Medicaid, and eventually, I predict, Social Security, if they are continued in power. So it is something that is worth fighting for, that we have fought for and will continue to do so.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think, in summary, we have a couple more minutes, thinking about the bridge to the future and making the student loan program, particularly the direct loan program, work, make it available to people, make Medicare continue to improve

Medicare and Medicaid so that we can deal with the increasing costs but continue to cover people and continue to give people, lift people out of poverty, as we have done, contrasted with this bridge to the past that we have talked about where we do not want to go back to the days when, before the GI bill, when there were not opportunities for middle-class families to send their children or themselves to college.

We do not want to go back prior to the 1930's, when there was not a Social Security Program. We do not want to go back to the period before 1965, when there was not Medicare or Medicaid, when 50 percent, 54 percent, I guess, of senior citizens in this country had no health insurance prior to the mid-1960's, and now only 1 percent has no health insurance. There is no reason to go back. That is why we need to look forward.

I think the commitment, certainly from all four of us and many others here, is to continue to improve Medicare, continue to improve Medicaid, continue to improve the direct loan program, student loans overall, student grants, to take care of the elderly and to protect our natural resources by good environmental protection measures and to continue to give students opportunities, middle-class families, poor kids, give them opportunities that they can produce and they can give back to society.

I think that is what we are asking, and it is a rejection of these tax breaks for the rich to make all of these cuts in programs that matter, Medicare, student loans, environment, but instead to make these programs more efficient, make them work, bridge to the future so that students will have that opportunity so all of us can grow together.

I thank my friends from New Jersey, Michigan, and Connecticut.

WHITE HOUSE TASK LIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. COX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to talk about a document that was recently provided, very belatedly, by the White House to the Congress, a document now referred to as the task list. It is dated December 13, 1994, but it was just provided to the Congress in recent days. The task list shows 39 scandals that the White House staff in the West Wing, taxpayer supported staff, decided that they needed to work on because there was now going to be a Republican Congress. This memo was prepared just after the November 1994 elections.

I would like to read just briefly the scandals that the White House decided that it needed to task its own staff to work on. Some of these scandals are, of course, well known to the American people, but other scandals have only recently become known, even though this memo was written on December 13, 1994.

No. 1, Foster document handling. We will return shortly to the specifics contained in this memo on each of these. There are several admissions of illegality in this very memo.

Travel Office. We know all about Travelgate, of course. That has become a major scandal just as they predicted in here.

White House-Treasury contacts. Of course, we know about the illegal contacts between senior political appointees at the Department of the Treasury and the White House, tipping off the President, giving a heads up to the President and Mrs. Clinton about the criminal referral of the Whitewater matter.

Obstruction of justice, I am reading this from the White House internal memo, obstruction of justice re DOJ handling of criminal referrals. Use of White House resources for response efforts. Of course, that is what this memo is all about, but that is one of the scandals that is listed here. This entire memo is devoted to how to spin the press about the various scandals.

Foster suicide. Espy. Of course we know that Mr. Smaltz was assigned as an independent counsel to investigate the Mike Espy ethics question. We know about the criminal problems with Tysons there. Henry Cisneros, Ron Brown, Hubbell. Of course, we all know about the next top ranking man at the White House right underneath the Attorney General, Webster Hubbell, who is now in jail.

Ickes, union representation. And of course with Coia and all that ABC News has done on this scandal just in recent days, we now know why in 1994 they were worried about that.

Stephanopoulos, Nation's Bank. Again, this is a White House memo that they prepared secretly inside the White House using taxpayer resources and in the White House counsel's office, which they should not have been doing. That is not appropriate use of taxpayer funds. They have listed all of these scandals that they wanted to innoculate against and spin the press about.

The Stephanopoulos-Nation's Bank story was of course what the press widely described as a sweetheart, below market mortgage for George Stephanopoulos, the kind of deal that ordinary Americans could not get.

□ 1715

State Department passport files; another Clinton administration scandal that we are so familiar with.

Archives abuse of personal system. This is one scandal that they have not fully disclosed to us and that we will find out more about.

The Legal Defense Fund, and of course we know all about the ethical problems that the President encountered there, soliciting funds for the Legal Defense Fund when such solicitation is, in fact, in violation of the law.

The Health Care Task Force, and of course we know that that resulted in litigation against Hillary Rodham Clinton's task force. We know that a Federal judge ruled against the task force, and found that it was put together in violation of the Federal Advisory Committee Act and that documents were withheld from the public and from Congress when they should not have been.

Now there are 39 of these scandals that White House staff—there is a name of a White House staffer right after each one of these, after each one of these scandals, and they were all assigned and presumably are all still working at taxpayer expense on preventing the Congress from getting to know all of the facts in these things.

White House operations, drugs, passes, helicopters, and does that not ring a bell for so many of us? Each of those scandals, drugs in the White House, the passes being given to people without personnel clearances, the misuse of helicopters which resulted in the termination of White House staff; this is next on the White House, the Clinton, list of scandals that they were working on secretly in the White House.

Residence renovations. This is one that they believed was a potential scandal, but the American people do not yet know about it. We have just received this document.

Presidential immunity. Well, of course, we know that that is all having to do with the Paula Jones litigation, Paula Jones having sued the Governor of Arkansas for acts in his capacity, not as Governor but as a private individual apparently abusing the office, at least according to the allegations in the complaint, and the President has used not outside lawyers but taxpayer supported lawyers to make sure that his private civil litigation could be put off until afterward. This is, by the way, something that the courts have now reversed on and they have decided that President Clinton cannot put this off, but he has successfully put it off beyond the election.

White House Arkansans, Thomasson, Nash, Rasco; need we say more?

PIC surplus.

Improper electioneering at the SBA.

Now these are all admissions by the Clinton White House to themselves within the White House internally of what they were doing wrong.

GSA.

Value Partners. Now Value Partners was, of course, the partnership that Hillary Rodham Clinton invested in. Rather than putting their funds in a blind trust, they did not do so like President Bush did, like President Reagan did, like President Carter did; rather, ran their own investments, and Hillary Rodham Clinton was a partner in Value Partners, a hedge fund which sold short pharmaceutical stocks at a time that the pharmaceutical stock market was falling through the floor because of the Hillary Rodham Clinton

Task Force, and that was, of course, scandal number 7 or so up here on the list.

Presidential campaign, FEC audit.

Commodities.

Now of course we know what the commodities is all about. That is the miraculous fortune that Hillary Rodham Clinton made on the investment of a mere thousand dollars in the cattle futures market.

Gubernatorial campaigns; Lindsey, Wright, recordkeeping. There is more in this memo about that later on, but of course we know that in connection with the Whitewater criminal prosecution that Mr. Lindsey was named as an unindicted coconspirator.

Gubernatorial campaigns dash MGSL, and that means Morgan Guaranty Savings and Loan. The S&L at the heart of the Whitewater scandal was apparently involved in gubernatorial campaigns, gubernatorial campaigns back in Arkansas that the White House counsel were working on in this administration in the White House, 1994, December, with taxpayer funds.

And then the next scandal is Whitewater slash Morgan Guaranty Savings and Loan.

Other: MGSL slash McDougal, right below that.

Rose law firm, the next scandal. HRC, and that is Hillary Rodham Clinton, worked for Morgan Guarantee S&L.

David Hale slash Susan McDougal slash SBA, and there are different White House staffers assigned to it.

Tucker, and of course Tucker is now in jail, the Governor, or headed for jail.

Next: Lasater, bond deals, cocaine, Roger Clinton.

Now this is not a Member of Congress reading things to impugn the White House. This is a White House memo that says ''privileged'' on it because it is being handled by lawyers in the White House counsel's office at taxpayer expense for Bill Clinton, that was requested by the Congress and was not turned over to us until just now.

Lasater, bond deals, cocaine, Roger Clinton was the next scandal that they have tasked White House staff to work on.

Use of loans to achieve legislative initiatives. This is a new one that we were not aware of, but apparently they were working to cover that up.

Mena Airport. Well, we all know about the drugs and deaths surrounding Mena airport while Bill Clinton was Governor.

Troopers, another scandal, the so-called Troopergate scandal, and then there is a whole category here of scandal, women. That was during the Clinton campaign when President Clinton was running in 1992, his own campaign, not Republicans but his own campaign, referred to as bimbo eruptions.

Now this memo goes on in the case of each scandal to describe tasks to be performed and strategy for dealing with that particular scandal.

Let me give you one example.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield before the gentleman moves on, could I just clarify in my own mind what the gentleman is telling us about the memo itself? Do I understand the gentleman to say that this is not a memo prepared by any congressional committee or any organization here on Capitol Hill, or for that matter, any outside organization? Do I understand the gentleman correctly? This is a memo that was prepared inside the White House?

Mr. COX of California. That is correct. This document called the White House task list is dated December 13, 1994. It was compiled by an associate counsel to the President, Jane Sherburne. Her initials are on it, and it lists all of the scandals that she anticipated would plague the Clinton administration and that Congress was now likely to look into because in 1994 we had just been elected, a Republican Congress, not yet sworn into office, and this memo explains how they were going to make sure that Congress did not——

Mr. WALKER. That is what I wanted to clarify.

Now the date the gentleman has given us is December 13, 1994, which is a matter of a few weeks after Republicans have taken over the Congress. Now they had had no problem up until then because literally all of the calls for investigation of White House potential problems had been buried on Capitol Hill.

But now, if I understand the gentleman correctly, this memo is prepared because they now anticipated that they would have some problems with the new Congress that would obviously not be friendly on some of these issues and would actually likely investigate some of the scandals.

Is that the gentleman's impression?

Mr. COX of California. That is exactly right, and it is rather clear that Jane Sherburne, the associate White House counsel who personally drew up this list of all of these scandals, was prescient. While they were claiming no wrongdoing, behind the scenes they were putting together memorandums like this, and the result in the ensuring years has been that 5 of Bill Clinton's closest associates, including his Attorney General and including the Governor of Arkansas, have since been convicted of crimes.

Mr. WALKER. So what they were doing here was they decided that, ''OK, we've got a problem. We've got a Congress that is likely to begin looking into things that have gone wrong in this administration.''

And so is the gentleman telling us that what they did was they prepared a list of everything that they thought Congress might look into where they had themselves a big problem?

Mr. COX of California. That is exactly right, and furthermore, what I have just covered is the list of the names of these scandals, but the memo, which is quite lengthy, goes on then to describe the strategy for dealing with each of these scandals so that anyone trying to investigate would not be able to get to the bottom of it, and I will give you one example.

One page 4 of this memo there is a heading, ''Security,'' by which they mean White House security slash Livingstone issues.

Now keep in mind that this was dated December 13, 1994. You may recall approximately when Craig Livingstone came upon the national scene, became a household name because of that Clinton scandal. It was not in 1994, but in 1996, 2 years later. But listen to what this memo says back in 1994.

''Review Livingstone file.''

Now, presumably they did.

''Interview Livingstone.''

They wanted, apparently, to deal with Livingstone problems back in 1994, all of which were covered up so that the Congress and the American people did not find out about them and did not find out at all about Filegate, literally hundreds of files on Republicans who had worked in the White House in previous administrations, FBI files which had been collected by this White House under Craig Livingston.

Mr. WALKER. Okay, but if I can just follow up on the gentleman for another moment.

So what we have here is a memo that was prepared internally within the White House suggesting that they knew that they had a series of scandals that Congress was likely to investigate and that they had reason to be worring about.

Is that what we believe we have in front of us?

Mr. COX of California. That is precisely this memo. I will give you another example if you wish.

Mr. WALKER. Now, if this was an internal document within the White House, how do we now have it?

Mr. COX of California. Well, of course we had to subpoena it, we had to threaten to subpoena it, because we asked for all of the Travelgate memos to be turned over. Travelgate, which was another Clinton White House scandal, involved the firing and smearing, through the use of the EBI, of what we now know were honest and innocent White House civilian career employees.

Mr. WALKER. So the only way that this memo came to light was the fact that Congress was subpoenaing documents. Now, was this particular memo withheld from Congress for a while?

Mr. COX of California. For a very long while, The request for 3,000 pages was originally described not all that long ago by the White House as a request for toilet paper, that this was a trivial request, that they should not be asked for such documents. When finally we got the first 1,000 pages of the 3,000 that we requested, we got the famous list of all of the FBI files, the background files, the very, very confidential law enforcement background files, on people who had worked in the White House. These had been collected

illegally by the White House for patently political purposes.

Mr. WALKER. And so for a while the White House was claiming that this information was in fact information that no one had the right to know, not even the Congress, when originally the memo was prepared because they believed that Congress would want to know about these matters.

□ 1730

Mr. COX of California. Precisely. In fact, while we learn about this same process in what turns out to be pulling teeth from the White House, trying to get them to cooperate, because they are claiming executive privilege about all of these things so they do not have to do anything cooperative with the Congress, they first gave us 1,000 of the 3,000 pages. And in that first batch of documents which we got under a threat of subpoena, we found out about Filegate and all of the FBI files that had been collected on senior officials, including James Baker and others well known.

But we did not get this memo. It was only 2 weeks ago, on August 15, that we got this memo. This is brand new, and almost no one, even many of our colleagues here in Congress, has yet had the opportunity to read this, but it is clearly shocking.

Mr. WALKER. So while White House spokesmen like the press secretary, Mr. McCurry, and even officials within the White House, have gone to the American public and suggested to them that there is absolutely no substance to any of the scandals that have been discussed on Capitol Hill and that Congress should be embarrassed to look into these matters, they internally had prepared a document which suggested that all of those scandals were real, and in fact, that they were very worried about them?

Mr. COX of California. Correct. Not only were they very worried about them, but what is outlined in this memo is a specific step-by-step plan to keep the Congress and the American people from finding out the truth.

Mr. WALKER. So this is not just a listing of the scandals they are worried about, this is a listing on how they are going to cover it up?

Mr. COX of California. Let me read it. Here the issue is ''chain of custody re transfer of Clinton personal files.'' Of course, we are talking about the Whitewater files here, because these have not been turned over. They have not been made public. The President has not come clean and cooperated on this.

Here is an item on the to do list: ''Determine strategy re release of Whitewater file.'' They wanted to determine their strategy for releasing this. This was not a decision to share with the public, they want to find out how they can selectively make this available. I do not know what else a strategy re release of files is. If you were going to share the information and cooperate and show there was nothing to be concerned about, you would simply make the information public. But here they say they want to determine a strategy re release of Whitewater file.

''Under search of Foster office'', another heading, they have this item to do: legal research on the basis for resisting identification and production of all documents in Vince Foster's office and Bernie's safe. So they wanted to go and do legal research so they could come up with a legal pretext for resisting identifying and producing all documents in Vince Foster's office and Bernie's safe. That is the kind of memo.

Mr. WALKER. So what we have here is a memo designed to look into all of the ways in which they could resist any kind of investigation on Capitol Hill; and is it possible that some of this was also designed to resist any investigation by a special counsel?

Mr. COX of California. I do not think there is much question about that. Under the heading ''Obstruction of justice,'' and I have to repeat, because otherwise this sounds——

Mr. WALKER. They believed they had a problem with obstruction of justice?

Mr. COX of California. It is the very heading in their own memo, ''Obstruction of justice.'' This is prepared by the White House counsel's office, analyzing the legal problems of the Clinton administration.

Mr. WALKER. So in 1994 the legal counsel's office believes that the White House could have a problem with obstruction of justice?

Mr. COX of California. It does not say ''could,'' it says ''Obstruction of justice,'' and underneath that it says ''Delay in addressing criminal referrals, Department of Justice role.'' Under that it says, ''Determine usual process.'' Think of what it is that we are talking about here. The delay in addressing the criminal referrals, that was, of course, the delay in referring for criminal prosecution the whole Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan default and collapse at taxpayer expense.

The job for the White House counsel, and remember, this is now Whitewater, this is the real Whitewater business, with Madison Guarantee and the Whitewater loan transactions and so on. We have the White House counsel, the lawyers for the President of the United Stats in his official capacity, working at taxpayer expense to do this task: Determine usual process, so we can find out how they should have done it, because obviously they know they did not do it the usual way, so they had to look up, after the fact, what would have been the usual way to handle the Whitewater transaction.

Mr. WALKER. Is the White House counsel's office even supposed to be engaged in this kind of thing?

Mr. COX of California. This is one of the reasons why I am here on the floor this evening, because as senior associate counsel to the President myself in the White House counsel's office, I could not be more familiar with the distinguished history of the White House counsel's office and its authentic purpose.

The reason that the White House counsel has a five-decade history of serving Presidents from both parties is that its mission is to protect the President and the Presidency from illegal acts or from any kind of trouble arising during his course or her course, should we have a woman President one of these days, of administration during the course of office.

It is for the President's official activities, not for his tax returns, his personal tax returns, and certainly not for his private investments, and certainly not for the criminal investigation or prosecution of his friends and cronies from Arkansas or even elsewhere in the administration. But that is exactly what this White House counsel's office has been doing.

I will tell you, when I worked in the White House counsel's office in a previous administration, we did not look at the President's tax returns. That was done at the President's personal expense by the President's own private law firm. But in this White House counsel's office, Vince Foster at the time of his death was actually working on the Whitewater partnership tax return. That is what he was doing in the West Wing of the White House at Government expense.

It is a perversion and abuse of that function, and it is obviously all the more poignant when one reads this very long memo called the task list of some 39 separate scandals identified by the Clinton administration, all being handled in that White House counsel's office.

Mr. WALKER. If I understand what the gentleman has told us, you have the White House counsel's office preparing a memo on how to evade examination by the Congress of matters that they believed were of serious concern, and also how to evade potential legal prosecution for some of the things that may in fact be illegal?

Mr. COX of California. That is correct; and also how to conjure, after the fact, legal justifications and pretext for sins of omission and commission already occurred.

Mr. WALKER. Is there any precedent for the White House legal counsel's office, for the White House counsel's office, to be the perpetrator of a memo designed to bring about a cover-up?

Mr. COX of California. To the contrary. In past administrations, the role of the White House counsel's office has been to facilitate the flow of information, to make sure that when a question arises in connection with a potential scandal or an accusation of lawbreaking, that all of the relevant information is shared not only with law enforcement authorities or an independent counsel, but also with the Congress.

I can tell the Members that in the Bush administration, in the Reagan administration where I served, and I am sure that this is true also of the Carter administration, the Ford administration, that if there was a question of the President breaking the law, if there was a suspicion that the White House staff might themselves to be complicit in law-breaking, then no claim of executive privilege would be used to shield that person from proper inquiry by the law enforcement authorities or by Congress in fulfillment of its oversight responsibilities.

To the contrary, this administration has asserted executive privilege, up until August 15; over this very document. Executive privilege is not meant to be a shield for White House staff who are accused of criminal misdeeds. Neither is it supposed to be a shield for the President's own personal investment problems. Rather, it is meant to protect the Nation and the national security.

Mr. WALKER. Am I not correct that a number of people who are tasked on this memo, it is called a task list, as I understand it, a number of the people who are listed as having the task of doing these jobs that are designed, as the gentleman points out, for cover-up, are in fact employees of the White House counsel's office?

Mr. COX of California. In fact, they are all of them employees of the White House, all of them staff of the President.

Mr. WALKER. Let me check with the gentleman. For instance, I see down here the name Kendall. Now, Kendall——

Mr. COX of California. David Kendall is an outside lawyer.

Mr. WALKER. But a number of the people who are given these tasks involved with trying to withhold information from Congress and also to cover up these scandals are in fact people who are employed at the taxpayers' expense in the White House counsel's office, is that correct?

Mr. COX of California. That is correct, in the White House counsel's office and in the White House staff, a total of 15 staff members, we have toted this up, earning an annual salary of $1.3 million. These people who are supposed to be doing the people's business, executing on legislation, policy, and the national responsibilities of the President of the United States, are instead on scandal detail, and what a long scandal list it is, 39 separate scandals identified in this memo, and strategy outlined not just for dealing with the Congress, not just for withholding documents, not just for coming up with legal pretexts for doing so, but also for dealing with the press. Because in almost each case, there is another item to do on the list: Prepare press strategy.

We have, for example, a heading ''White House/Treasury Contacts.'' You remember Mr. Altman had had to resign because of illegal contacts between the highest levels of the Treasury Department and the White House, tipping them off as to pending investigations, when that was a complete violation of normal procedure. ''Prepare press strategy'' is what they have on their list here.

So when you see a representative of the White House in the press room or a representative of the Treasury in the press room coming clean with the press, what they are really doing is executing on a strategy that was concocted all the way back in December 1994 to prevent the American people and the Congress from learning the truth.

Mr. WALKER. I think this is one of the more incredible documents that we have had released. Of course, it was released under duress. The committee literally was told for months that these kinds of documents did not exist in the White House, and that the committee had no right to be asking for them, and then only under extreme circumstances did this particular memo come to light.

Now we find out within this memo that, in fact, there was a plan being executed to try to see to it that such memos did get to Capitol Hill, and that responsible investigators were not able to understand anything about what was really happening inside the White House.

I find all of this extremely disturbing. It is one thing to claim executive privilege as a way of protecting vial national secrets that affect the operation of the Government. It is another thing to claim executive privilege and try to use it to cover up the misdeeds of people within the White House and within the administration, misdeeds that are so obvious that the White House counsel's office was able to prepare a list of all the ones that they thought that they were potentially guilty of.

It is a horrible manifestation of the use of executive privilege and is something which I would think in most cases should disturb anyone who looks at the willingness of public officials to come clean about potential problems within their jurisdiction.

Mr. COX of California. There is no question that this memo gives the lie to two claims made by the White House. The first is that they would be relying on outside counsel, which, of course, they should, because these are all scandals, private criminal problems of the people involved. Clearly they were still using the White House counsel's office, even after they hired their outside counsel. They were using some 15 members of the White House staff at an expense, an annual salary, of $1.3 million.

Second, when they said they were coming clean, when they said they were cooperating and trying to put all the information out for the public to see, what they were really doing was just the opposite, using legal devices to cover it up and stonewall. Unfortunately, now executive privilege in this administration is coming to be a synonym for coverup.

Consider just a few items on page 10 of the task force memo. We have under the heading ''Whitewater investment'', ''Press strategy.'' It is all sort of the Dick Morris spin of how are we going to pretend to be talking truthfully to the American people on these issues when, in fact, it is all a strategem?

Take a look here under the heading ''MGSL,'' Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan, where they say ''Rose Law Firm work, HRC,'' Hillary Rodham Clinton; A, conflicts; B, enabled Madison Guaranty to stay open longer than it should have. What an admission in a document we did not get until 2 weeks ago.

Mr. WALKER. I would agree with the gentleman, that is a fairly big item. In other words, they knew that some of the work done by the Rose Law Firm enabled the Madison Guaranty Savings & Loan to stay open longer than it should have, and those were the kinds of institutions, as I recall, that cost the taxpayers millions of dollars when these savings and loans stayed open longer than they should have and continued to eat up the resources.

□ 1745

Mr. COX of California. This is, of course, what this memo says, but we know what the public face has been, the public face of the White House, that Mrs. Clinton did no such work and in fact had nothing to do with Whitewater or Madison Guaranty Savings and Loan or the Rose Law Firm involvement in this, and in fact the collapse of Madison Guaranty had nothing to do with her.

But in this memo, which is not prepared for you or for me or for law enforcement but for each of the people in the White House, the heading is, ''Rose Law Firm work, HRC, conflicts enabled MGSL to stay open longer than it should have.''

This is the scandal that they are dealing with internally and this is their approach to each one of the 39 scandals listed in this memo: Develop a press or spin strategy.

The White House counsel's office rather obviously is being misused on the taxpayer's tab. The American people should not be asked to shell out for what amounts to coverup and back-and-fill strategy in the White House, the protection of Presidential cronies and the protection of people who ultimately, since 1994, have found themselves in jail and behind bars, being convicted of felonies.

Mr. WALKER. I found it kind of interesting, something on page 11, where it talks about Negative Associations, it calls it. Among the people listed are Jim Guy Tucker, David Hale, Jim McDougal, and Dan Lasater. Three of those names, we have become quite familiar with, as the trials have gone forward in the whole Whitewater mess, but obviously the White House had some very big concerns about the fact

that the President has, or the White House has some of those negative associations. But then behind Dan Lasater's name, there is a parentheses saying ''bond deals, cocaine, and Roger Clinton.'' I mean, we obviously have a range of people here that the White House counsel's office was very worried about, thus these negative associations.

Mr. COX of California. This, remember, is a task list. So presumably after receiving these instructions from Jane Sherburne on December 13, 1994, the people who were listed here followed through on those tasks. That means that the White House internally, at taxpayer expense, went out to put together information on Dan Lasater's bond deals, information on Dan Lasater's involvement with cocaine, and that is according to this memo, and Roger Clinton and his involvement with the foregoing, with Dan Lasater, bond deals and cocaine, all or some of the above. But those documents that were most assuredly prepared, if people followed through on this task list, have not been provided to this Congress nor apparently to law enforcement authorities. Each one of these 39 scandals with its subsidiary task listed on this memo is something that the White House, at public expense, using the White House lawyers and the counsel's office, has decided to build a wall around, to stonewall, so that the American people, law enforcement, and the Congress cannot find out about it. That of course is exactly why this memo was prepared just after the election of the Republican Congress, and that is why the press has so reported.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. If the gentleman would yield for a question, I have not read these documents. But of course both of us worked in the Reagan White House, so we are somewhat familiar with the internal workings of the White House and also the relationship between the White House and the Congress.

Would the gentleman answer for me, does this memo in any way indicate that the higher levels of management in the White House, the White House staff, had prior knowledge of the FBI Filegate scandal?

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, there is a heading in this memo concerning security/Livingstone issues. It appears at page 4 of the memo. Two of the tasks under that heading are: Review Livingstone file, and interview Livingstone. Obviously the White House counsel's office had a problem with Livingstone and security in the White House at that time.

Apparently his FBI and personnel files, and the result of any search of his background and the result of any search of the issues that have all exploded onto the national scene since then obviously must have been that they knew in 1994 what was going on. Yet, as we know, those FBI files on your colleagues and mine who worked in the Reagan and Bush White Houses, all of those files were kept there and not returned to the FBI. They had been improperly obtained by some political thugs to begin with, and they were kept apparently with the knowledge of at least the White House counsel's office.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, so this document seems to indicate that the senior staff of the White House knew there was something wrong and was looking into this situation that would have led them to investigate what was happening with what a year later became, actually more than a year later, became the FBI file scandal. Is that correct?

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Let us remember what happened when the information about the Filegate scandal came out originally. Correct me if my memory is faulty here. Did the President not act like he did not know anything about this? In fact, did the President not say: Well, we are only talking about 39 files, and it has something to do with a military fellow that was over here on some sort of a transfer over here to the White House? So, in other words, this was all an act on the part of the senior staff of the White House, perhaps the President.

Mr. WALKER. If I recall correctly, they called it a kind of a bureaucratic snafu.

Mr. COX of California. I believe my colleague would be correct if he had said that that was a precise quotation from the President. He described this as a bureaucratic snafu. This was a couple of years after the White House counsel's office began investigating the whole thing according to this very memo and identified it as a scandal in the making. Only, they identified it just to themselves, not to anyone else. Yet when it first burst upon the national scene, it was for the President to say, this is merely a bureaucratic snafu. Now we know that the administration was at least criminally incompetent if not malevolent in abusing the privacy of scores of honest public servants.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. The first figure we were given by the White House was, I think, 39 or something like that, FBI files were involved, they in fact knew that the number that they were giving out at that time was incorrect. This indicates that they had done a study, at least they had red-flagged this a long time before, and that was probably an intentional, I would say, error, or intentional misinformation, when eventually the figure came out of 900 FBI files. So this is indicating that they were looking into that matter. When the number 39 went up to 900 FBI files, this is all part and parcel of something the White House had thought out a long time before.

Mr. COX of California. What we know specifically from this memo is that the White House had reason to be concerned about Craig Livingstone himself in December 1994 because not only were they worried about security issues for which he was responsible but the task, the specific task on this list is to interview Livingstone and look at Livingstone's file. You would not look at Livingston's file unless you thought he was a problem.

Any kind of competent search about Livingstone, since we have all read about him in the newspaper and his unsavory background, would obviously have yielded the result that such a person ought not to have been placed and maintained in a position requiring professionalism and trust. We know nonetheless the result. This political hack was maintained in this position, this very sensitive position in the White House with access to FBI files on so many Americans for 2 years.

Mr. WALKER. In fact was given raises as I recall.

Mr. COX. of California. And described by George Stephanopoulos as a very able, competent person, who they loved having in the job.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. And this man had been involved with opposition research during political campaigns prior to this time?

Mr. COX of California. Well, of course. And he was a bouncer.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, having our background in the White House, let us examine this angle of the story. What has happened in other White Houses that we could actually compare it to? Did Chuck Colson not have something to do with an FBI file?

Mr. COX of California. He possessed one FBI file, it was learned, and therefore he was convicted and sent to prison, for one file.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So Chuck Colson, in the Nixon era, when we had a Republican in the White House, was found guilty of mishandling one FBI file and went to prison. And today we know that there were probably up to 900 FBI files in the possession of a person who had been involved with opposition research for the Democratic Party, yet this question does not seem to be asked of the President by the press anymore.

Mr. COX of California. The comparison is not apt if we just leave it at that. The truth is that the White House counsel's office in its current incarnation is literally a response to Watergate. They decided that no longer would the lawyers for the President be kept in a small office in the Old Executive Office Building across the street. There were only two of them in the Nixon administration.

We all remember John Dean's testimony about his inability to come across with the President and convince him of the gravity of these things. The White House counsel's office was then moved right into the West Wing of the White House. It became a significant law firm, with very, very professional people who have acquitted themselves with great distinction through the Carter administration, through the

Ford administration, through the Reagan administration and the Bush administration, to keep the administration out of trouble, to prevent things like this from happening. But what goes on in this White House counsel's office? They are the engines of these misdeeds. It is the White House counsel's office that was coming up with these FBI files, multiplying one hundredfold the crime for which Mr. Colson was convicted during Watergate.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I seem to recall some years ago a press secretary in a Republican administration who got fired for having made up a quote along the way. Now you look down through this memo, and this memo has a press strategy for purposely misleading the public. The level of question that arises from this kind of task list is pretty substantial.

Mr. COX of California. It does trouble me that with respect to each one of these 39 scandals, one of the items to do, on the to-do list for the White House counsel's office, the legal counsel of the President of the United States, is to develop a press strategy. If we are coming clean, if we are trying to share with the American people all the relevant facts so that their minds can be put at ease that no illegality is occurring at the highest levels of our Government, one would wish that, rather than a press strategy, we simply had a procedure by which the documents were shared and made public.

Mr. Speaker, they ought to be shared with law enforcement, shared with the American people and with the Congress. Instead, each time we have a scandal listed here, whether it is Ickes' union representation, Stephanopoulos, Nations Bank, improper electioneering at the SBA, Presidential campaign and FEC audit, commodities. There are 39 of these.

Mr. WALKER. The use of time and White House resources for response efforts. In other words, what they are admitting to there is they have got this problem. They are using the taxpayer dollar. They are using the White House itself and taxpayer dollars for essentially political responses.

Mr. COX of California. That is precisely it. The press strategy seems to be the preoccupation of the White House counsel's office, whereas they are supposed to be paid by the taxpayers and they are for the benefit of the President to keep everything on the level, to keep the President and the highest levels of our executive branch out of trouble.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. So we can assume through this memo, can we not, that basically the White House and the upper echelons of the White House were red-flagging every possible problem so that they could build contingency plans in case these things came to the public's attention. So when things like the FBI scandal or perhaps even the billing records scandal, the billing records that miraculously appeared in the living quarters of the first family in the White House, that were lost for so long, that perhaps that was not just an accident. Perhaps actually a strategy was developed on how to handle this crisis. Maybe there is another file someplace else that basically details how to handle all of these problems that are red-flagged.

Mr. COX of California. The gentleman is being very circumspect and charitable, having now received this memo, to say ''perhaps.'' It is obvious that the purpose of this task list is to marshal all of the efforts of the White House staff, led by White House lawyers, to prevent Congress from investigating each and every one of these 39 scandals.

One of the headings in this memo is Research Re Limitation on Legislative Power to Investigate. What the White House counsel's office is doing here is coming up with legal arguments that will prevent the Congress from getting to the bottom of what they have already identified as scandals.

□ 1800

''Research re: limitations on legislative power to investigate.'' Under that heading, we have DNC, DCCC, DSCC.

For those of us who are uninitiated, the DNC is the Democratic National Committee, the DCCC is the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, and the DSCC is the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Under that they have ''surrogates.'' So they are going to be using all of their political machinery. This is a taxpayer paid memo, and taxpayer paid lawyers inside the White House wrote this memo about DCCC, DNC and DSCC, to use them as surrogates to announce to the American people that there are legal reasons, that the White House counsel then went out and researched and came up with, that Congress cannot and should not be investigating these 39 scandals, which are neatly itemized in this secret memo.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Could this be characterized again, and you looked at these things legally, Mr. COX, and you are a trained lawyer and I am not, I have a journalistic background, but would it be inaccurate to suggest that this was a game plan for a coverup?

Mr. COX of California. As I said earlier, it appears chiefly from this brand new memo, which we have had only for a few weeks, and also from all of the context of the administration's nonresponse to our request for those 3,000 documents, which they referred to as a request for toilet paper and which eventually yielded the information about Filegate and all the FBI files on earlier administrative personnel that they obtained for political purposes, that executive privilege, which has been their basis for refusing to turn over these documents, is increasingly becoming a synonym for coverup.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I think it is important that those people who are reading this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or hearing this over C–SPAN should understand that none of the information we are talking about in this memo, or, I might add, many of the other revelations we have discovered, whether it is the FBI files or the billing records we were trying to find for the Rose Law Firm in dealing with this S&L scandal which the First Lady was in some way attached to, these things would not have been ever disclosed to the public, nothing about this would ever be known by the public, except for the fact that the U.S. Congress changed hands.

This memo, it appears that this memo is a recognition that the administration recognized very early on that the game was up in terms of hiding everything from the public. That they could have kept all of this information, if the Democrats would have maintained control of the House and the Senate, and there was no way the public would ever have known about this.

Which also suggests one other thing, and this is a point I would like to make and the public should understand: The liberal Democrats, who controlled both Houses of Congress and control the executive branch today, have a total disdain for the press. They do not believe that the press can uncover anything. They in fact trusted that the press would not even try to uncover any of these things.

It was only when the House of Representatives changed hands and we had the power then to subpoena and ask people under oath questions about these types of misdeeds, that the administration became cautious enough and became frightened enough to try to look at what their potential vulnerabilities were. If we would not have had control of the House, they would not fear a thing from us.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, I think the gentleman from California makes an excellent point, because actually Chairman CLINGER, at that time a ranking minority member of the committee, attempted to pursue the Travelgate scandal while a minority member of the committee, attempted to get the committee to look into the problem at that time. He was told by the Democrats that it would not be done. In fact, I think, I do not remember exactly, but I think they actually voted him down and suggested to him that he was not going to be able to pursue the matter. It was not until he became chairman of the committee that he was able to pursue the matter, because specifically that committee decided to permit the White House to cover this matter up and not take it up before the proper congressional committees.

Mr. COX of California. It is at least true that prior to the revelations, so many of which have occurred since the election of an opposition party to get to the bottom of this in the White House, that there was an attitude by the Democrats in power in Congress at

the time that they simply did not want to know the answer to these questions, because, after all, we had not seen this document until just a few weeks ago. But now that we have it, I think any fair-minded person, any Democrat or any Republican, would have to say, this is a virtual roadmap to scandal.

If the majority party in Congress were to put together a list of scandals of the administration that ran to more than a dozen, it would be called a partisan exercise. Yet here we have, prepared by the White House staff itself, by President Clinton's own staff, a secret memo for their own privileged consumption, stamped ''privileged'' on the cover, a list of 39 scandals, with detail of each, and some rather damaging admissions about each.

Let me point our just one such that we have not referred to in this brief colloquy, and that is the scandal labeled Hubbell, and that is, of course, Webster Hubbell, the acting Attorney General. ''Webster Hubbell's cooperation is to be monitored.''

Now, why would we be concerned with this? This is right before ''determine press strategy.'' Why would we be concerned with monitoring Webster Hubbell's cooperation, if we were willing to let the special prosecutor do his job?

The answer is, of course, the administration was very concerned about just how far Webster Hubbell might go in cooperating with that special prosecutor. As we all know, Webster Hubbell was subsequently convicted and sent to jail.

Mr. WALKER. And right below that is ''Ickes's union representation.'' We know that one of the unions and one of the individuals that Mr. Ickes had a relationship with now now somebody who has been under congressional investigation, and where we have FBI data calling him a criminal associate of the mob, this person who Mr. Ickes was associated with. I see they were assembling a binder with summary and key documents with regard to that union representation.

Well, since the White House has had this direct relationship with this person, Mr. Coia, who has been called by the FBI a criminal associate of the mob, that could be a very damaging kind of question that is raised as a part of the scandal memo prepared at the White House.

In fact, ''ABC News'' has done quite an exposé on this. It turns out the scandal itself was under active investigation by the White House Counsel's Office on December 13, 1994, and it is highlighted in this White House task list.

Mr. WALKER. But since that time, the President has continued to have direct association with the person involved, the gentleman described as a criminal associate of the mob.

Mr. COX of California. I think at this point it would be appropriate, because each of our colleagues should have the benefit of this memo in full, that I ask unanimous consent to include the memorandum in its entirety in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, subject to the rules of the House.

There was no objection.

TASK LIST—DECEMBER 13, 1994

1. ISSUES

a. Foster document handling (Nemetz)
b. Travel Office (Cerf)
c. White House/Treasury contacts (revisited; report) (JCS)
d. Obstruction of justice (DOJ handling of criminal referrals; Jay Stephens; RTC whistleblower reprisals)
e. Use of White House resources for response efforts (Nolan)
f. Foster suicide (Nemetz)
g. Espy (ethics; expanded Smaltz inquiry re Tyson's, Hatch Act) (Mills/Nolan)
h. Cisneros
i. Brown
j. Hubbell
k. Ickes/union representation
l. Stephanopoulos/NationsBank
m. State Department—passport files
n. Archives—abuse of personnel system
o. Legal Defense Fund (Mills)
p. Health Care Task Force (Neuwirth)
q. White House operations (drugs, passes, helicopters) (Mills/Nolan)
r. Residence renovations (Neuwirth)
s. Presidential immunity (Sloan)
t. White House Arkansans (Thomasson, Nash, Rasco)
u. PIC surplus
v. Improper electioneering (SBA)
w. GSA (Roger Johnson)
x. Value Partners (Neuwirth)
y. Presidential campaign (FEC audit)
z. Commodities (Kendall)
aa. Gubernatorial campaigns (Lindsey, Wright)—record keeping (Kendall)
ab. Gubernatorial campaigns)—MGSL (Kendall)
ac. Whitewater/MGSL (Kendall)
ad. Other MGSL/McDougal (Kendall)
ae. Rose Law Firm (HRC work for MGSL; Frost Case, FSLIC representation) (Kendall)
af. David Hale/Susan McDougal/SBA (Kendall)
ag. Tucker
ah. Lasater (bond deals; cocaine; Roger Clinton)
ai. Use of loans to achieve legislative initiatives
aj. ADFA (political favors; Larry Nichols)
ak. Mena Airport
al. troopers
am. women (Kendall/Bennett)

2. PRELIMINARIES

a. Identify key republican objectives and routes for achieving them—e.g.
  i. sustain shadow on WJC character
  ii. hype HRC threat to white men, traditional women
b. Identify guiding principles for responses—e.g.
  i. nothing to hide
  ii. stick to the facts
  iii. get it right the first time
  iv. keep it simple
  v. resist harassment
  vi. govern America
c. Executive privilege research
  i. OLC state of the play
  ii. comments by republicans re assertion
  iii. protocol
  iv. strategy/principles for asserting
d. Research re entitlement of Congress to HRC/WJC transcripts of depositions given to Fiske
e. Research re congressional subpoena power
  i. reach (HRC/WJC)
  ii. precedents
  iii. committee rules
  iv. procedures
f. Research re limitations on legislative power to investigate
  i. legislative purpose
  ii. overreaching precedents
g. Learn new Hill committee jurisdiction, membership
h. Courtesy visits to Hill—member and staff level (e.g., Frank, Sarbanes, leadership; Harris, Meek, etc.)
i. Consultations
j. Offensive structure
  i. FEC legal research
  ii. W&C
  iii. DNC/DCCC/DSCC
  iv. surrogates
k. Representation of Administration officials by private counsel
  i. compensation
l. Research re proper role of OWHC with respect to pre-inaugural issues with an aim toward articulating principles for determining who should be principal spokesperson on a particular issue and the extent to which each (private counsel/OHWC) should participate.

3. FOSTER DOCUMENTS HANDLING

a. Independent counsel inquiry
  (1) identify options with respect to issuance of report—(a) precedents
  (2) inquire about status and timing
  (3) HRC/WJC depositions
  ii. status check with counsel for individuals
b. Congressional hearings
  i. identify likely committees (Senate Banking; House Banking, Gov Ops, Judiciary)
  (1) identify friends—key Members and staff
  (2) identify leadership
  (3) identify key republicans
  ii. congressional visits
  (1) Daschle
  (2) Sarbanes & other Banking
  (3) house
  iii. prepare background materials
  (1) assemble public record
  (2) talking points and fact memoranda
  iv. determine how to handle representation of individual White House staff
  (1) outside counsel
  (2) attorney fees
  (3) assertion of privileges
c. Press strategy
d. Surrogate role
  i. Hamilton
  ii. identify others
e. Offensive research
f. Issue specific tasks
  i. security/Livingstone issues
  (1) debrief Joel
  (2) review Livingstone file
  (3) consult with Randy Turk
  (4) interview Livingstone
  (5) fact memo
  ii. inconclusiveness re Williams removal of documents
  (1) confer with Ed Dennis
  (2) debrief Joel re security officer
  (3) assemble public reports of document removal on 7/20 and statements attributed to White House officials
  iii. chain of custody re transfer of Clinton personal files
  (1) complete interviews
  (a) Carolyn Huber
  (b) Linda Tripp
  (c) Deborah Gorhan
  (d) Bob Barnett
  (e) Syvia Mathews
  (2) fact memo
  (3) assemble public record
  (4) determine strategy re release of White H_2O Devel Corp. file
  iv. search of Foster office

(1) assemble public record
(a) including any relevant testimony at Senate hearing on Foster suicide in July 1994
(2) fact memo
(a) obligation to seal the office immediately
(b) obligation to cooperate with law enforcement authorities vs. protection of privileged material
(c) basis for protecting disclosure to Congress of privileged material in VF office
(3) legal research
(i) basis for resisting identification/production of all documents in VF office and Bernie's safe
v. Delay in surfacing suicide note
(1) complete interviews
(a) Gergen
(b) Burton
(2) assemble material in public record
(3) fact memo
(4) legal research
(a) obligations to disclose a note to law enforcement authorities
(i) if not obviously a suicide note
(ii) timeliness requirements

4. FOSTER SUICIDE

a. Chris Ruddy/Center for Western Journalism
b. Causes for suicide
c. Monitor Senate report; coordinate with Hamilton
d. Develop press response

5. OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE

a. *Delay in addressing criminal referrals*; DOJ role (D.C. and Paula Casey)
i. determine usual process
ii. develop chronology/fact memo with key
(1) Charles Banks
(2) Paula Casey
(3) (track Lewis correspondence released by Leach)
iii. identify Committee interest (D'Amato; House)
iv. assemble public record
b. RTC/Kansas City investigation (suspension of Jean Lewis, Richard Iorio etc.; April Breslaw; pre-1993 activity)
i. develop chronology of known facts and key documents
ii. interview Breslaw
iii. identify Committee interest (Leach; Senate)
iv. examine last day of House hearings for offensive help
c. Jay Stephens retention
i. track public record
ii. identify efforts to give IC civil jurisdiction
iii. identify Committee interest (D'Amato; House)

6. WHITE HOUSE/TREASURY CONTACTS

a. Senate Report
i. review/comment on Report
ii. keep in touch with Minority Report developments
iii. prepare press strategy
iv. identify surrogates
b. White House investigation of White House/Treasury contacts (receipt of information about RTC investigation; work product; redactions)
i. prepare file memorandum describing use of unredacted transcripts
ii. determine continuing Bond interest
c. Truthfulness of White House and other Administration witnesses (referral of testimony to Starr—Ickes, Stephanopoulos)
i. consult with lawyers
ii. identify areas of vulnerability
iii. research on perjury
iv. press response
d. Heads-up policy
i. surrogates
ii. uniform application
iii. Treasury status
iv. press strategy for release of Committee report
v. work up background paper on precedents
e. Recusal policies/OGE/Executive Orders
i. press strategy for release of Committee report
ii. background paper
iii. consult with OGE
iv. consider Executive Order or other response to Committee
f. Contacts policy (Executive Order)
i. press strategy for release of Committee report
ii. background paper
iii. consult with OGE
iv. consider Executive order or other response to Committee
g. Rikki Tigert
i. determine her first likely congressional appearance in the new congress
ii. assemble public record
iii. interview Gergen, Tigert and Klein re communications on the subject of recusal
(1) determine response to allegations of ''pressure''
(2) determine response to allegation that Klein misled the committee
iv. determine press strategy/talking points

7. SMALTZ INVESTIGATION

a. Espy—ethics (Mills)
b. Beyond Espy ethics (Hatch Act, Tyson's)
i. determine charter, scope of inquiry
ii. determine press strategy
iii. identify congressional interest
iv. assemble public record
v. fact gathering

8. WHITE HOUSE WHITEWATER RESPONSE EFFORT

a. Legal research
i. the appropriate role of White House staff with respect to issues arising pre-inauguration (see above)
b. Fact development (scope of effort, etc.)
c. Determine press strategy/develop talking points
d. Assemble public record
i. Lindsey involvement pre-1994
ii. Ickes' Ward Room undertaking (1/94)
iii. Polesta damage control effort

9. CISNEROS

a. Gather facts
b. Establish contact with counsel
c. Determine press strategy/develop talking points
d. Identify source of congressional interest
e. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

10. BROWN

a. Establish contact with counsel
b. Determine press strategy/develop talking points
c. Identify source of congressional interest
d. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

11. HUBBELL

a. Monitor cooperation
b. Determine press strategy/develop talking points

12. ICKES (UNION REPRESENTATION)

a. Monitor
b. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

13. STEPHANOPOULOS (NATIONSBANK)

a. Monitor
b. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

14. STATE DEPARTMENT (PASSPORT FILES)

a. Identify issue
b. Determine congressional interest
c. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

15. ARCHIVES (ABUSE OF PERSONNEL SYSTEM)

a. Identify issue
b. Determine congressional interest
c. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

16. SBA (IMPROPER ELECTIONEERING)

a. Identify issue
b. Determine congressional interest
c. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

17. GSA (ROGER JOHNSON)

a. Identify issue
b. Determine congressional interest
c. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

18. FEC AUDIT

a. Determine congressional interest
b. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

19. FIC SURPLUS

a. Identify issue
b. Determine congressional interest
c. Assemble binder with summary and key documents

20. MGSL-RELATED

a. Whitewater Investment
i. assemble public record
ii. review documents, including work of accountants and tax returns; Lyons reports
iii. develop fact memo and chronology
iv. press strategy
b. MGSL
i. assemble public record
ii. review W&C documents
iii. develop fact memo and chronology
iv. fact memo
(1) why MGSL failed; relationship of campaign contributions to failure
(2) Rose Law Firm work (HRC 1985)
(a) conflicts
(b) enabled MGSL to stay open longer than it should have
v. surrogate strategy
c. Rose Law Firm
i. fact memo
(1) status of conflicts inquiry
(2) Frost case
(3) Rose services to FSLIC related to Lasater brokerage firm (HRC 2 hours in 1987, signed pleadings for VF)
(4) billing practices
ii. assemble public record
iii. determine press strategy
d. David Hale

21. OTHER PRE-INAUGURAL

a. Gubernatorial Campaigns
i. identify issues
(1) whether expenditures and loans were properly reported under state law
(a) Lindsey role
(b) Betsey Wright
(2) role of the Bank of Cherry Valley
(3) Starr looking at 1984, 1986, 1990
ii. interview Kendall; review Kendall documents
iii. interview Snyder/Lindsey
iv. fact memo
v. press strategy
b. Negative Associations
i. Jim Guy Tucker
ii. David Hale (SBA)
iii. Jim McDougal
iv. Dan Lasater (bond deals, cocaine, Roger Clinton)
c. Mena Airport
i. identify issue
ii. determine congressional interest
iii. assemble binder with summary and key documents
d. ADFA
i. identify issue (political favors)
ii. determine congressional interest
iii. assemble binder with summary and key documents
e. Use by Governor Clinton of loans to further legislative initiatives
i. identify issue

ii. determine congressional interests
iii. assemble binder with summary and key documents
f. Commodities
i. determine congressional interest
ii. assemble binder with summary and key documents
g. Paula Jones
i. assemble binder with summary and key documents
h. Troopers
i. identify issue (job for silence, other)
ii. determine congressional interest
iii. assemble binder with summary and key documents

Mr. COX of California. I thank the Speaker.

The memo is quite extraordinary. It is single-spaced, goes on for 12 pages, and, as I said, lists 39 scandals, most of which, now, 2 years later, are known to the American people, but a few of which are actually brand new. It actually details how each of these scandals was assigned to White House staff, 15 such staffers, and according to the press, these staffers earned a total salary of $1.3 million. This is taxpayer money, all of which is being misspent because that is not the appropriate function of the White House Counsel's office. That is not the appropriate function of the White House staff. Working on these matters inside the West Wing of the White House is itself a scandal of the first order.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I have not read this memo, obviously. I appreciate the gentleman making this available to me and available to the other Members. But just a quick glance shows you that one of the issues red-flagged in this memo is how to deal with questions about the Vincent Foster suicide. One wonders why, if this was just a straight up and down suicide, which we have always, the news media and everyone else wants to just steamroller anyone who has any questions, serious questions about basically some of the facts behind the suicide and the time immediately thereafter. It just notes here that they are taking, red-flagging Vincent Foster, and red-flagging ''obligation to seal the office immediately.'' And, B, ''to cooperate with law enforcement authorities versus protection of privileged material.''

What we have here is basically an outline for something concerning the death of Vincent Foster and the prevention of certain information from getting to the public. It appears to me, and again I would have to study this further to relate this to other facts of the case and see how it really plays together, but it appears to me what they are doing here is trying to set down a legal strategy for justifying things they did to prevent information about Vincent Foster, coming from Vincent Foster's office or about the suicide, from coming to public attention.

Mr. COX of California. In fact, on page 3, under the heading ''Foster Document Handling,'' there is a subheading, identifying friends for the congressional hearings, key members and staff, and the list of names of our colleagues, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. SARBANES, develop a press strategy, and then there is a heading ''Offensive Research.''

This is not a memo prepared by a White House willing to cooperate. This is a memorandum prepared by a White House that has carefully outlined 39 separate scandals and the strategy for covering them up.

ECONOMIC GROWTH UNDER PRESIDENT CLINTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, former Senator Dole, now the Republican candidate for President, said in his radio address, ''The Congressional Joint Economic Committee reports that last year 66 countries had economic growth rates that surpassed ours. The President may think that when it comes to economic growth 67th place is good enough, but I do not. I want America to lead the world again in terms of economic growth, rising incomes, and greater job opportunities.''

In building his bridge to the past, Mr. Dole must have overlooked the present. Just look at the good news about the economy that came out in the 2 weeks before he spoke. One week before his speech, the Commerce Department's Bureau of Economic Analysis revised the second quarter growth rate of the gross domestic product upward to 4.8 percent. Exports and business investments showed strong upward movement.

Tuesday before he spoke, the conference board reported the index of leading economic indicators, which projects the economy's health for the next 6 to 9 months, reached a record high.

Last Friday, before the Joint Economic Committee, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that 250,000 jobs were created last month. This builds on the nearly 200,000 jobs we created in July, and on the 10.5 million in the President's first 3½ years in office.

A report in the June issue of the monthly Labor Review, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics publishes, shows that between 1993 and 1995 jobs in relatively higher earning occupations and industries grew at almost twice the rate as jobs in comparatively lower earning occupations and industries.

In August, the share of women with jobs reached a record high of 57.2 percent, the highest employment record for women in our Nation's history.

Mr. Dole promises fiscal responsibility. However, look at the record. Before leaving office in 1993, President Bush's Council of Economic Advisers left an economic report for the President. In it they forecasted how well the economy would perform and what the size of the Federal budget deficit would be following President Bush's economic program.

The most optimistic forecast was for the deficit to be $201 billion by 1996. Under President Clinton's leadership, the Congressional Budget Office projects the deficit to be $116 billion in 1996. That is $85 billion less than the rosiest projection President Bush promised.

After 3½ years under President Clinton, we have the lowest combined rates of unemployment, inflation, and mortgage rates since the 1960's, which is the biggest tax cut of all for working Americans and retirees on fixed incomes.

□ 1815

Now, let us listen to the words of the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Alan Greenspan. Testifying before the Joint Economic Committee in January 1994, Dr. Greenspan clearly stated what he felt was the cause of the speedup in economic growth. He said, and I quote, ''The actions taken last year to reduce the Federal budget have been instrumental in creating the basis for declining inflation expectations and easing pressures on the long-term interest rates.''

''What I,'' and again I am quoting Dr. Greenspan, ''argued at the time is that the purpose of getting a lower budget deficit was essentially to improve the long-term outlook, and that if the deficit reduction is credible, then the long-term outlook gets discounted up front. Indeed, that is precisely what is happening.''

''I,'' and again I am quoting Dr. Greenspan, ''think a substantial part of the improvement in economic activity and the low rates of inflation can be directly related to a changing financial expectation that we might finally be coming to grips with this very severe problem.''

That was in January 1994. He is not crediting shutting down the Government and holding needed Government services hostage to unfair budget deals for making financial markets believe that new and better fiscal management was finally in place. Dr. Greenspan was crediting the Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, with the, and again I quote him, ''substantial part of the improvement in economic activity and the low rates of interest.''

I agree with Dr. Greenspan. I am proud of the economic record President Clinton and the Democrats have accomplished in the last 4 years. We still have a great deal more to do, but we are on the right track.

As President Clinton says, we must build a bridge to the future. It is not a toll bridge, because it will be a bridge paid for by careful planning. We do not need a bridge to the past built with IOU's and growing deficits that will mortgage our future, and we do not need to go back to slow job growth and fewer opportunities. We need to look forward.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROTH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am joined by one of our colleagues, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JACKSON], who will talk along with me on the subject of HBCU's, historically black colleges and universities.

Mr. Speaker, on September 23 of this year, historically black colleges and universities all across the country will celebrate Black College Day, and on that day many colleges across the country will recognize some of the great contributions of historically black colleges and universities. But to put this whole discussion of HBCU's in the proper perspective and the proper context, I would like to talk about the history behind historically black colleges and universities.

HBCU's are defined as any historically black college or university established prior to 1964 whose principal mission was and is the education of black Americans and is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association determined by the Secretary of Education.

There are 103, Mr. Speaker, historically black colleges and universities; only 3 percent of all colleges and universities in this country. They are located in the Southeast, in the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands. They include 41 public 4-year colleges and universities, 8 public 2-year universities, 46 private 4-year schools, and 8 private schools with 2-year curriculum.

Most of our colleges are more than 100 years old. Cheyney University of Pennsylvania being the oldest, founded in 1837. Historically black colleges and universities enroll only 16 percent of African-American undergraduate students, however they graduate about 30 percent of all African-American students nationwide.

To show the contributions that these schools, colleges, and universities have had and the impact they have had to the African-American community and to societies as a whole, with marginal resources HBCU's have been able to accomplish a lot. Federal moneys for research and development to HBCU's in 1990 was $101 million; only 1.1 percent of the total Federal money dedicated to research and development across the Nation. But yet in spite of the lack of resources, these colleges and universities still were able to produce doctors and lawyers and scientists and engineers.

However, with limited resources, 37 percent of all the students attending HCBU's come from families with incomes of less than $25,000. Retention and graduation rates at HCBU's are higher than non-HCBU's in this Nation. Enrollment has grown, Mr. Speaker, at historically black colleges and universities from 70,000 overall in 1954 to 200,000 in 1980, and from 239,000 in 1988 to 257,000 in 1990. So you see the trend of HCBU's, the enrollment rather, on these colleges and universities.

HCBU's also noted an increase in transfer students from other institutions. Seventy-three percent of all transfer students in the fall of 1993 went to historically black colleges and universities. This shows the quality of these schools across the country. Many students are transferring to these colleges and universities across the country.

On the graduate level, from 1977 to 1990, the amount of doctoral degrees awarded by HCBU's increased by 214 percent. In sciences, 44 percent of the bachelor degrees awarded to blacks were from historically black colleges and universities; 41 percent of the math degrees awarded were awarded from HCBU's; 38 percent of the computer science and life sciences degrees; and 25 percent of the engineering degrees were awarded to blacks by HCBU's.

In my State, Xavier University in New Orleans ranked second in placing black students in medical school. In fact, over the last 10 years, 93 percent of all of Xavier graduates who entered medical school received their medical degrees.

Remembering that HCBU's enroll only 17 percent of all black college students nationwide, this statistic is very encouraging. Moreover, HCBU's maintain low tuition. The average tuition with fees in 1992 and 1993 was $5,008, less than half of the average cost of private colleges and universities nationally.

Historically black colleges and universities educate almost 40 percent of the country's black college graduates, 75 percent of all black Ph.D's, 46 percent of all black business executives, 50 percent of all black engineers, 80 percent of all black Federal judges, 50 percent of all black attorneys, 75 percent of all black military officers, and 85 percent of all black doctors.

So you see the impact of HCBU's as relates to the medical community and the black community as well as engineers, doctors, lawyers, and military officers alike.

For example, many individuals who serve in government today, in public office, graduated from HCBU's. In the Congressional Black Caucus, for example, 16 of the Congressional Black Caucus members in this Congress serving today graduated from historically black colleges and universities.

The gentlewoman from Florida CORRINE BROWN, graduated from Florida A&M, the gentlewoman from North Carolina, EVA CLAYTON, North Carolina A&T; the gentleman from South Carolina, JAMES CLYBURN, graduated from South Carolina State; the gentleman from Maryland, ELIJAH CUMMINGS, Howard University; the gentleman from Tennessee, HAROLD FORD, Howard University; the gentleman from Florida, Congressman ALCEE HASTINGS, graduated from Florida A&M and Howard University; the gentleman from Alabama, Congressman EARL HILLIARD, graduated from Morehouse College as well as Howard University; the honorable distinguished colleague who is with me tonight, the gentleman from Illinois, JESSE JACKSON, Jr., graduated from North Carolina A&T; the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman WILLIAM JEFFERSON, graduated from Southern University; the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman JOHN LEWIS, Fisk University; the gentlewoman from Florida, Congresswoman CARRIE MEEK, graduated from Florida A&M University; the gentleman from Mississippi, Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON, Tougaloo College and Jackson State University; the gentleman from New York, Congressman ED TOWNS, graduated from North Carolina A&T; the gentleman from Maryland, Congressman ALBERT WYNN, Howard University; and, of course, I graduated from an HCBU as well. I graduated from Southern University in Baton Rouge, which so happens to be the largest historically black college in the entire country, with a system of over 14,000 students with colleges located in Baton Rouge, Shreveport and New Orleans.

It is the largest historically black college in the country. And in a real sense, for all of the public HCBU's, Southern University to some degree set the tone in terms of what will happen to other colleges and universities as relates to Federal funding and as relates to State funding as well.

I am pleased tonight to be joined by a very distinguished colleague of this House, Congressman JESSE JACKSON, Jr., who graduated from North Carolina A&T, who will enter into a colloquy with me to further talk about the need to preserve historically black colleges and universities and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let me first begin by congratulating the distinguished gentleman from the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana, who I had the privilege of meeting in 1983 while he was a student at Southern University in Baton Rouge, LA, and I was a student at North Carolina A&T State University.

We prided ourselves, as aggies, in our ability to beat Southern University in football and every other possible athletic endeavor that we engaged in.

There is a serious camaraderie that exists amongst those of us who are graduates of historically black institutions, and I want to take this opportunity as a product of those institutions to certainly engage in this colloquy and in this special order with the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman CLEO FIELDS.

Many Members of this institution probably do not know that while Congressman CLEO FIELDS is the youngest African-American to have ever had the privilege of serving in this institution,

he served the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana with great distinction and will not be in the 105th Congress due to attacks on the Voting Rights Act and gerrymandering in the State of Louisiana that has undermined the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana.

The people of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana have been served with great distinction. Young African-American men, including myself, have been inspired by the example that Congressman CLEO FIELDS has laid for all of us.

I saw Congressman CLEO FIELDS during special orders, while I was the field director of the Rainbow Coalition, knowing that he was the president of the Student Government Association of Southern University who subsequently ran for State senate while he was a student his senior year, and was elected by the people of that particular district to serve in the State senate, having just finished his senior courses at Southern University.

He served in the State legislature with great distinction and then subsequently earned his way on to the reapportionment committee in the State of Louisiana, and consistent with the 1965 Voting Rights Act, was able to enfranchise literally hundreds of thousands of people in the State of Louisiana who had been heretofore without representation.

□ 1830

So Congressman CLEO FIELDS, as the youngest African-American, has earned his place in history, but it is really a larger statement about the quality and the caliber of leadership that historically black colleges have created.

The first African-Americans arrived in this Nation on slave ships in 1619. There was a century's old struggle to end racism in our Nation and certainly racism that was legally enforced by law, the institution known as slavery. The very foundation of our Nation was a Civil War, a very bloody war between north and south over whether or not we should be individual States or united as a Nation.

After the Civil War, in 1863, when President Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation, ushered in a period known as First Reconstruction. During that period, 131 historically black colleges were founded to educate the newly freed slaves.

I might add, Representative FIELDS, during First Reconstruction, 22 African Americans were elected to serve in this institution, between 1863 and 1896. There was a direct relationship between their participation in this Congress and in State legislatures all across our country that made it possible for African-Americans to come to institutions like this Congress and fight for the kind of resources that would educate those who had historically been denied education in these institutions.

As Representative FIELDS has already indicated, more than 40 percent of all college graduates who are African-American still come from the remaining 102 or 103 institutions that presently exist. That was really the commitment that our Nation had made to newly freed slaves in our Nation. I might add that you indicated that in 1964, since 1964, that officially ended the period of officially designating colleges as historically black colleges and universities, not one historically black college or university has been founded since that reconstruction period.

One of the reasons I commend you and commend other members of the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus and Members of this institution who continue to fight to sustain these institutions is because they know that the products of these institutions, once people become educated and become integrated, if you will, through that education in the society, they can then continue the desegregation of the society which really was a testament to this movement.

Sixteen Members of Congress are presently graduates of historically black colleges and universities. EVA CLAYTON and ADOLPHUS TOWNS are graduates of North Carolina A&T, where I had the privilege of attending that institution. I might add, Congressman FIELDS, that it is really the mission of historically black colleges to train, to educate, and provide the kind of environment during the formative years of students through which they can learn.

I remember I went to a predominantly white high school here in Washington, DC. While I had tremendous professors who worked very hard toward my academic development, when I went to predominantly white high schools, and I have nothing against predominantly white universities or colleges or high schools, I attended several of them myself, but for me as a young African-American male in this society, to have Dr. Liston as a psychology teacher and to have professors who were African-Americans, to see African-Americans who could be chancellors or universities and heads of math departments and Dr. Quiester Craig at North Carolina A&T as the head of the business department, to see Dr. Howard as a mathematician who worked in the business department at A&T State university during my formative years between 18 and 21 years old, for me to be able to see African-Americans who had achieved at universities all across this country, it really fought stereotypes in my own mind about what I could be. And so I set at an early age, as a result of the mission of those institutions really to train its leadership, to allow it to have the free voice to move beyond the stereotypes and say that we can really make it, that we can really achieve.

This is really what the mission of historically black colleges has been. I would certainly hope that Members of this body would continue to support historically black colleges and universities. They represent the very best that our community has to produce. I am honored to have this opportunity to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his comments. The gentleman is right, not only is one inspired at an HBCU or can be inspired at an HBCU, but taking a moment of personal privilege, it also builds leadership. I often wonder today, had I not had the opportunity to attend Southern University and had the opportunity to be freshman class president and president of an entire student body and had to manage a budget in excess of $150,000 as a young college student, or had the opportunity to travel abroad, representing a student body of 10,000 students and then having the opportunity to compete to serve on the board of regents as the student representative, but for that foundation at Southern, I do not know if I would have had the opportunity to serve in the State senate at a very young age and serve now in Congress at a very young age.

Southern, that HBCU was a place to prepare me to be a young leader or to be a person who was able to be elected to public office, and the same thing it did to you and for you and for other Members of the CBC. That was really my first elected office. We had to run a campaign and you had to be responsive to constituents, the students, and that was a learning place for me.

That is why I would like to see CBC Members, you and I, as we have worked with the CBC, Congressional Black Caucus, to make this HBCU day, the 23d of this month, make it a significant day not just having a good program on a black college in this country but also show leadership among students where students register to vote in the hundreds of thousands across this country on September 23.

I am glad that this gentleman decided to initiate this program with the Congressional Black Caucus. I am glad that members of the Congressional Black Caucus, through your leadership and others, will be on college campuses across this country on black college day and certainly I urge SGA presidents, for example, to participate and get students registered to vote, because you have a civic responsibility on a college campus and young people who are sitting in a classroom on a historically black college need to know that there is a responsibility that goes along with that.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, there are some intangibles that come from being a product of a historically black college, some things we hardly even think of. When I was at North Carolina A&T, to expect that an African-American could serve as the president of the student body, that was not like a far-fetched idea. That was what was kind of expected, that we could run a student government association.

On the other hand, when I went to the University of Illinois, where I very fortunately received my juris doctorate degree, it was not necessarily expected that an African-American could serve as the president of the SGA and be responsible for a million-dollar budget in terms of student activities and student fees or that we could organize the student body in such a way as to bring about the kind of campus life that we thought was acceptable to most of the students or bring about the kind of programs and speakers that we wanted to come to the university. This is an intangible.

So I left A&T feeling that, yes, I can serve as the president of the SGA or, yes, I could be the chancellor of an institution. And so the gentleman is so correct when he says that the African-American historically black colleges serve as an incubator for African-American leadership. I look forward to traveling on September 23 to a historically black college either in North Carolina or certainly in my district or wherever it is that I am needed in order to articulate the significance that these institutions have had.

But I think the gentleman raises another very interesting point, that there is a relationship between the education of those who have been historically denied, those historically black colleges, and political participation.

During First Reconstruction, 22 African-Americans were elected to Congress and to State legislatures, all across our country, the byproduct of which elected officials whose students voted for at that time who could come and serve in these bodies and fight for more resources. When students do not vote, students do not participate in the process, they cannot elect people to representative bodies across this great democracy for the purpose of fighting for those resources. So one of the things I have encouraged students to do, whether they are Democrat or Republican, really it is a nonpartisan effort, not promoting one party over the other, in 1996, as a result of the passage of the motor voter law of 1993, people can simply dial 1–800–register and fill out the voter registration application card over the phone and it will be mailed to them, just dial 1–800–register and they are full participants in democracy.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. It is so simple now because of what this Congress did. It is so simple now to register to vote. There are organizations like Rock the Vote, for example, who travel all across the country and have a 1–800 number where a student in a dormitory room can get on the phone and dial 1–800–register and be a registered voter.

The motor-voter law did so much to encourage participation, particularly young participation in the process where young people could register to vote. So certainly a part of our effort with the CBC members traveling all across the country on September 23, actually participating in black college day, we will urge students to register to vote.

I will give you a scenario, something that happened to me when I was student body president at Southern.

Southern's budget, there is so much power in the vote and that student vote, that vote of 10,000 students sitting idly on a college campus can impact not only local policy but national policy as well. College students, HBCU or not, all across America, young college students can have a serious impact on elections and the outcomes of elections, if they simply exercise that constitutional right to vote.

When I was president of the student body at Southern University, there was a bill in the legislature to cut funding at Southern University by almost 20 percent. It was unbelievable and the student body, we had a meeting with the student senate and the student senate met and we all said, what we will do is we will march to the State capitol and in record numbers. And we will protest on the steps of the capitol and we will demand our legislators to come out of the session and speak to us and address this issue of higher education, not only at Southern but colleges all across Louisiana were being cut because the budget was tight and lawmakers saw fit to fund other areas and cut higher education across the board.

So we marched, about 5,000 students, and other college campuses met us on the steps of the capitol. We had 7,000 students on the steps of the State capitol in Louisiana protesting and demanding that legislators come out and address our concerns and also reconsider this across-the-board cut on higher education. We could not get a legislator to come out and address us.

And when we regrouped at the end of the day, college students and college presidents from all over the State, and we talked, why would not legislators address us, because politicians we thought look at three things, reelection, reelection and reelection. And then it dawned on us, how many of us are registered to vote? Of the 7,000 students we marched from all across the State to the capitol, we probably had 200 of them registered to vote. So we were talking loud and saying nothing, because we failed to use the power of the vote.

So what we decided to do was to think smart. We decided to have massive voter registration drives on all college campuses across the State of Louisiana and eventually presidents and Greek organizations, if they had a party, they had the party for a purpose, you had to be registered to vote to enter. We registered thousands upon thousands of students. Then it was not that easy because you had to actually take students, according to Louisiana law, back then to the registrar of voters office to actually register the student to vote.

So we had to use resources like buses and use moneys to rent buses to take students to register to vote. We registered 5,000-some odd students just on Southern's campus alone. And then the Governor and the legislators started calling the SGA presidents and wanting to know what they wanted in the appropriations bill.

□ 1845

So it just goes to show you the power in the student vote. Had we not exercised that power to vote we still would be marching, talking about saying nothing.

So you know I am just so excited that you are part of this HBCU Day where we encourage young college students on Black College Day, on the 23d, not just to have a program and talk about the significance of black colleges and universities in this country, but have the gall to be willing to protect them and stand by them by registering to vote and using that significant power by voting in all the elections. I mean that is just something that students all across this Nation should and must do.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. If the gentleman would yield, I would like to share a brief story I had experienced while I was at North Carolina A&T State University, a story that is similar to the one that the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana has mentioned. I was the vice president along with a good friend of mine by the name of Rick Bradley who was the president of a group that we founded on North Carolina A&T State University campus called Students United for a Free South Africa [SUFAFSA], and one of the things that we did outside of protesting various banking institutions in North Carolina that were still involved in doing business with South Africa, fighting for disinvestment or divestment of these various institutions, trying to get North Carolina A&T and the North Carolina school systems to divest their pension funds from businesses that were doing business in South Africa, we did a lot of research on South African issues. And it was not very long before international focus turned to more domestic issues, when we found ourselves fighting against apartheid in South Africa, but also as the most politically astute and aware group on campus with issues that affected us domestically.

Our struggle against apartheid in South Africa encouraged us and forced us to look at the role that our congressman, who represented North Carolina A&T State University at that time, was playing in South Africa, the free South Africa movement, and we found at that time that our representative did not represent the position of our organization, and we began registering people to vote on our campus. We would not let the Deltas, the Q's, the Alphas, Sigma Gamma Wu's, we would not let any organization on North Carolina A&T State University's campus host a party or an event on the campus unless they were registered to

vote and the students on that campus could prove that they were registered to vote, and as a result we registered of the 4,200 students, of North Carolina A&T State University's campus we registered more than 3,600 aggies to participate in the political process. And on election day, while we came very close to defeating that Member of Congress, we were only 60 votes away in the general election, and I will leave the gentleman's name anonymous for the purposes of my discussion, but when I was sworn into the 104th Congress as the 91st African-American to ever have the privilege of serving in this institution, that Member of Congress came up to me, congratulated me for my electoral victory, gave me an embrace, a hug, and said, ''You know, I am very familiar with you. You almost beat me on that day.''

And we were within 60 votes of beating that Member of Congress. As a result of that again I graduated in 1987. Students across the State of North Carolina were registered to vote and participate in the political process. The end result was a census taken in 1990, a reapportionment plan in 1991, the implementation of that reapportionment plan in 1992, and the by-product of which in 1996, the 12th Congressional district is now represented by Congressman MEL WATT, who represents North Carolina A&T as well as Winston-Salem and I believe as many as 6 other historically black colleges.

So it is possible, and I will yield back to the gentleman in just about 30 seconds.

Very few people know that they can register where they live. Students do not live in New York if they are at A&T. They do not live in Chicago if they are at A&T. They live in Greensboro, NC.

According to the law, you can register wherever you spend the last 3 nights in a row. That is home. If your name has changed, you are now an unregistered voter. If you just got married, your name was Smith last week, you married a Williams last week, you are now an unregistered voter because your name has changed, and as a result of efforts of many who fought and died in this country, Wiola Wheatson, a white woman, got her brains blown out at point blank range trying to register students to vote.

Martin Luther King, Jr., and Bobby Kennedy and others have died trying to reduce the age from 21 to 18. As a result of their efforts, you can now dial 1–800–REGISTER and become a full participant in this democracy, and I might add those who are interested in doing it ought to do it soon because the election is approaching.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Absolutely, and you know this whole voter registration among young people is really catching on.

I do not know if you are familiar with the shows called the Tom Journal Morning Show. It is a show that is on every morning on many of the syndicated shows on many of the ministations all across America.

I mean I was sitting in—I was driving in the car the other day, and I heard Tom Journal that morning talking about how people, particularly young people, need to register to vote, and he started this thing: You know, register five people to vote and call their names in and I will announce them over the air. And people were actually registering people to vote, and he was announcing the names over the air.

I just think that is so encouraging because a lot of people do not wake up in the morning, young people for example, who is about to go to a biology lab, who is on a college campus, not thinking about voting per se, interested in the future, interested in the outcome of elections, but not registered. As you stated, many college students, when they leave from Illinois and go to Los Angeles to register for college, they may be registered back home, but the likelihood of them going back to Illinois from California to vote on election day is not all that great. And so it is incumbent upon them to register to vote at that college, at that university because they are going to be there 4 to 5 years on the average.

So that is really home. That is where they are going to be during the local and State and perhaps Federal elections. So that is where they ought to exercise the power. They should never go powerless.

And I was just impressed with Tom Journal. I think that is the name of the show, the Tom Journal Morning Show. You know, encouraging people to register to vote.

I will give you an example.

Yes, we talk about, you and I debate night and day, for student loans and grants, Pell grants, to make sure that those opportunities are available to students today as they were available to us when we were in college. Why is it? I mean people that asked the question why is it that legislators would move on college tuition and raise college tuition or vote to cut higher education so that schools and board of directors have to raise college tuition and cut Pell grants and student loans and things of that nature? I mean let us look at it from a political perspective and preserve seniors on the other hand. Let us look at it from a political perspective.

If you look on the voter register rolls and you see most of the registered voters in this country are of the age of 55 to 65, and the fewest number of registered voters are between the ages of 18 and 35, then of course you are more likely to move on that age group than you are likely to move on the age group that is most registered to vote, but not just registered to vote, but more likely to go to the polls and vote on election day. Because it is one thing to register to vote, but it is another thing to actually go out and use the power by voting.

So college students—I mean we can fight. You and I and other Members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle, we can fight night and day about, you know, we need to keep student loans, we need to keep opportunities available to elementary, secondary, and higher education, but if we do not have students out there—they get enough of ire education, they get enough of a Pell grant, they thinking enough of student loans, that they are not exercising a power that they rightfully have by going to the polls and vote, especially after we passed this easy, easy, easy voter registration process.

I mean this bill that we have passed in this Congress. We passed a bill, as you stated, where a student government president, for example, can walk into a classroom and register every student. A teacher rather, a professor in a class at an institution, can say all right, first day of school, the first question:

How many of you all are registered to vote right here at this college?

And have the forms there. It is legal. OK, register to vote.

Do not have to dictate how you register, Democrat or Republican; that is irrelevant for registration purposes, or how you vote or who you vote for. You know, I am not going to advocate teachers do that. But it should be part of the learning process.

You talk about personal responsibility? One of the first basic personal responsibilities that individuals have is to claim citizenship by registering to vote, and then that teacher, that professor—I mean just think about if every college campus—just think about HBCU's, just take black colleges, for example, on Monday, the 23d. If every professor say, OK, what we will do this day is we will register every student in this class. When you walk into my class, you have the opportunity to register to vote the first 5 minutes, and I will personally turn these forms in. And the 100 percent voter registration on college campus, the kind of power, and not just HBCU's, historically black colleges, but all college students can have if they only exercise that constitutional right, and it is so easy to do.

I mean some can right now in their dormitories just dial 1–800–REGISTER and be registered to vote.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. If the gentleman would yield, and I thank the gentleman for yielding once again, you know this is a democracy. We claim to be the largest democracy in the world, the oldest democracy in the world, the most practicing and the most functioning democracy in the world, but nothing could be more tragic than to realize that fewer and fewer people are voting in our local, State, and national elections. There seems to be some kind of disconnect between the people's participation in this democracy and what takes place in the halls of this Congress and the State legislatures around our country.

And so when one even talks about voter registration, the reality is we

have sufficient enough technology in our country today. Whenever you get pulled over by a police officer, get pulled over by a state trooper or any law enforcement official, he can take your drivers license, and they can determine whether or not you are guilty or wanted of a felony or a misdemeanor in any of the 50 States. Because many of those police computers are connected to Interpol, we can find out within moments whether or not you are wanted for an international crime including terrorism or some international conspiracy. And so within moments we can find out whether or not you are guilty or wanted of some offense against this Nation or any nation around the world.

And yet to participate in this democracy there still remains so many barriers, including a 30-day cut off before the Federal election or the local election.

One of the States in our country that has the highest participation, which has absolutely no registration whatsoever, is the State of North Dakota. There is no voter register required. You just show up on election day, prove that you live in the State of North Dakota, can vote and keep right on about your business.

So even voter registration, which is obviously important for political purposes, is really an outdated method for including and encouraging people to participate in the political process.

But the gentleman touched upon something else that I want to, if he would not mind, allow me the opportunity to talk about for a moment, and that is the whole issue of why vote at all? Why participate in the political process?

When I was teaching political organizing classes and political education classes for the Rainbow Coalition before I became a Member of this body, I used to teach that there were really three types—two types of material power, but really three types of power. Spiritual power is obviously an important power, but it is not a material power. So for the purposes of this discussion we will leave spiritual power out; really two types of material power:

One is economic, and the other is political, and by definition poor people, disenfranchised people and increasingly growing body of students in our Nation, because they take student loans out to go to school, but at the end of school they cannot find a job, they cannot get the kind of employment that addresses the debt that they have received as a result of being a student; by definition poor people and disenfranchised people and students do not have economic power. What is available to them? The alternative is available. Political power.

And why is political power so important? Political power and the political system really is the distribution system for the economic system. It is in this institution and in State legislatures around this country that we determine how the economic system in our Nation is distributed. Some of us on one given day may talk about tax cuts; others may refer to them as entitlements for the poor.

□ 1900

Some of us may refer to them as welfare benefits. Others of us look at tax breaks for the wealthy. So it is called tax breaks if you are a wealthy person in this country, but if you are receiving a Federal benefit, it is called welfare. So even how it is labeled and what it is called in our society is the byproduct of how we define it politically.

So when people begin to see the relationship between their vote, it is easy to cut welfare in an election year. It is easy to attack the most vulnerable in an election year, because those who do not vote cannot defend themselves. Those who do vote will get a tax break. Those who do not vote will get their Federal benefits withdrawn, or even their constitutional rights violated or undermined, and I mean that by Democrats or by Republicans. We have to acknowledge that all of us, and many of us, have a political weakness when it comes to those vulnerable political, commercial type issues that could affect our reelection to this institution.

So once people understand and begin to appreciate that the political system is really the distribution system for our economic system, I might add that they begin to participate in great numbers. No long ago one of the Presidential candidates had suggested that, for example, he would propose an across-the-board 15 percent tax cut.

The next question I ask as an elected official is how is he going to pay for that tax cut. There is only one way to pay for it, do what General Powell said, eliminate the entitlement state as we know it. What are those entitlements? Those entitlements would be Medicare, Medicaid, and ending Social Security as we know it. That is really the only way to pay for a 15 percent across-the-board tax cut.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Or what about education?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. We talked about one of the President's plans to rebuild schools, the physical infrastructure, and leverage that money, $5 billion, leverage it four times, to $20 billion, to $23 billion, to rebuild the infrastructure of our public school systems. But if in fact we are not paying what we should be paying in terms of taxes and making sure that those resources are not going to an over-bloated military budget, but are being directed in a way that can help the average American to help change the quality of their lives, not for the rich but for those who are most vulnerable.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. You are a former student leader on your college campus. How did you and your colleagues encourage young people or get young people at North Carolina A&T registered to vote? Let us face it, there are a lot of students who are not from North Carolina, who really do not care about the local politics of North Carolina, some not even concentrating on national politics, either. They are at North Carolina A&T just to get an education. When I was at Southern, that was one of the big things I had to face, trying to encourage students to register to vote, though they were not from the State.

What did you do to encourage nonresidents, so to speak, though they are residents once they register for school, to take an interest in registering to vote and actually vote on an election day?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. One of the campuses in North Carolina, right in front of the library has a statue, a statue of a famous North Carolinian. On that statue there is a placard that reads ''This Nation is democratic in direct proportion to its people's education.'' I remember that from 11 years ago when I was a student at North Carolina A&T. ''This Nation is democratic in direct proportion to its people's education.'' And guess what, the converse of that statement is also true: This Nation is undemocratic in direct proportion to the level of literacy and intelligence and education or lack of education thereof of its people.

So one of the things that I found most valuable for getting students to participate is education. I simply tell them that they are the first generation of Americans who are graduating with a college degree, graduate with a college degree, and if they decide to go to graduate school, 3 years for law school or 4 to 8 years, however long it may take to get a medical degree, where they have so many student loans as a result of their college education that it fundamentally affects their career options and their alternatives.

I chose public service. Fortunately, I went to North Carolina A&T State University. I played football for North Carolina A&T State University for a year or so before I received an academic scholarship. I left college not owing any money, so my genuine desire to become a public servant was directly related to me not owing $80,000 or $90,000 in bills that are associated with my college education. Had I owed $100,000, $110,000, $120,000 as a result of graduating from the seminary and graduating from law school, I quite probably would have had to have assumed a role in private, in the private sector or in private America, just to make the kind of salary that would address these bills.

I share that with students, that when they graduate from college, that they are the first generation of Americans who are more than likely moving back home with their parents. Their moving back home with their parents is part of the political process. Many of them who are incubated by their college environment, when they leave college, they are finding for the very first time that there are more unemployed people

in this Nation with college degrees and Master's degrees than at any other point in time in our Nation's history.

They then engage the political system, and if they stop complaining about what they do not have and just start using what they have got, pick up their vote early one morning and exercise it, exercise it in an intelligent way, not just vote for exercise but exercise their right to vote and make a sound decision, this country will become more democratic.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comment. There are so many creative ways we used, so many creative ways to register young people to vote on a college campus. We used all kinds of techniques. We got all the professors involved, professors encouraged students to get on a bus. At that time we had to take the bus.

That is why I cannot even comprehend why a student is not registered to vote, because in 1994 when I was SU president, in 1984, rather, when I was SU president, you had to take students to register. I could not walk up to a student in Louisiana and say, or anybody, are you registered to vote; no, I am not. I could not register that student. But this Congress passed legislation where you can do that now.

If I was SU president I would walk around with voter registration cards in my pocket. For every student I came in contact with, I would ask the question, are you registered to vote? Because they empowered me as their student representative on the board of regents, their student representative as president of the student body, to speak with force to legislators to protect the institution and protect higher education statewide. Going back to talking about it and saying nothing, we can always complain about the problem, but you are part of the problem if you are not participating.

I was not as fortunate as you. Look at me, I am a little smaller than you. I could not play football, could not play many sports. I did not have an athletic scholarship. I had a book scholarship, a small academic scholarship, a book scholarship that only lasted 1 year that I received from the American Legion.

My family, my mom and my dad died when I was young, 5 years old. My mom raised 10 of us. There were 10 of us. I could not even afford to take out a student loan, to even entertain the thought of taking out a $5,000 student loan each semester. I could not even see how one could pay $5,000. At the end of the day, $20,000, $30,000, $40,000 after you graduate, I could not understand that.

I had the opportunity to participate in the Government's Pell Grant Program. I was able to get BEOG, the basic educational opportunity grant. Without that BEOG, quite frankly, since I did not have an athletic scholarship, I had a small academic scholarship that only took care of my books, so I do not know if I would have been able to attend college.

It would have been irresponsible of me as a recipient of the BEOG, a Government grant for higher education to assist me, because I did not have the kind of resources that other students may have had, to not vote. I wanted to protect my BEOG. Every time I heard of fights in Washington, DC, about cutting the BEOG and cutting Pell grants, I wanted to register even more students, because I wanted to make sure that this program was protected, because it is a program that gave benefits to so many students who, through no fault of their own, just did not have the resources and parents did not have the resources to send them to school.

Without it, I would not have gotten a higher education. Mr. Speaker, that is why it is so important. I am going to give a list of members of this Congressional Black Caucus who will attend Black College Day on the 23d of this month. I just think that is outstanding. I want to thank you for your leadership, that every member of the CBC, every last, every individual member of the CBC, the Congressional Black Caucus, will be at an HBCU on Monday, September 23, celebrating Black College Day, and encouraging young students to register and vote on all college campuses across America.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, it is really amazing when we talk about this process. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his leadership, and the leadership that he has shown oftentimes by himself on the floor of this Congress, toward trying to get young people to participate in the process.

Today, we passed in the U.S. Congress a bill under suspension of the rules called the Student Debt Reduction Act, which will go a long way toward reducing the debt of students who have taken out these various loans.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that we did not pass the Student Debt Elimination Act, which would totally wipe out the debt of every student who has ever had a student loan in this country. We can afford it. We are the richest Nation in the history of the world, we can afford it. If we education is a real priority, we can pass a student debt elimination act. But you know what, students are going to have to be mad enough about student loans as a collective body, a spirit is going to have to sweep across the Nation where students are calling for the elimination of debt. Because our Nation can afford to put children through college.

The President has a program for 2 years, others have proposed 4-year programs for students who desire to go to college. We can afford it if we consider education to be a National Defense Act. If our country is democratic in direct proportion to our Nation's education, then the defense of this democracy, education, must be seen as the defense of this democracy.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me just tell the gentleman where many of our colleagues will be on September 23. The gentleman from Georgia, SANFORD BISHOP, will attend Albany State College. I just think this is history making, having every member of the CBC at a historically black college in this country to talk about, listen, it is time to not just have a program, but to register to vote.

The gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN, will be at Bethune Cookman College and Edward Waters College, as well; the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. WILLIAM CLAY, Lincoln University; the gentlewoman from North Carolina, EVA CLAYTON, Fayetteville State; the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. ELIJAH CUMMINGS, a new Member of this body, Morgan State and Coppin State University; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CHAKA FATTAH, Lincoln University; the gentleman from Florida, Mr. ALCEE HASTINGS, Florida A&M; the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. EARL HILLIARD, will be at Alabama State University; the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Ms. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, will be at Howard University; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAM JEFFERSON, Xavier University in New Orleans; the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, the Paul Quinn College; the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, Texas Southern University; the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. JOHN LEWIS, AU Center; the gentlewoman from Florida, Mrs. CARRIE MEEK, will be at Florida Memorial College; the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOBBIE SCOTT, Norfolk State University; the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. BENNIE THOMPSON, Jackson State University; the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. ALBERT WYNN, Bowie State University.

I can go on and on. Every member of the CBC, and you are trying to make your alma mater, A&T, or North Carolina A&T, and a college in Illinois, in your district. There is so much energy among CBC members who want to participate, who want to be at a college on that day to get your people registered to vote. But the SGA presidents have a responsibility and the Greek presidents have a responsibility, and all the civic and social organizations have a responsibility. They have a responsibility to say, by the end of the day, we will register 100 percent of our student body. Professors have a responsibility.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. An achievable goal.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. College presidents have a responsibility. Most colleges, when I was going to school, we had what you call a convocation, and freshmen had freshmen seminars, something they had to attend every week. Every student had to attend convocation. You attended convocation.

What would happen if a college president said, OK, at this convocation, for the first 15 minutes, I want every student to be registered to vote; pass out

the cards, not influencing students as to how to vote or how to register in terms of party affiliation, but if you choose to register, you have 15 minutes to do so right now.

I passed a bill in Louisiana where registration, college registration, will incorporate voter registration, when the registrars or voters office has to be present during college registration on college campuses in the State of Louisiana; a way to register students to vote when they register for college.

You worked when you were a kid on a piece, and I remember talking to you, I was at Southern and you were at A&T, talking about registering students to vote when they graduate from high school; if they graduated with a diploma in one hand and the voter registration card in the other. I remember that, and that worked. I went back to Louisiana and I tried to institute the same thing. I said, OK, when you graduate from high school, you have to have a diploma in one hand.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Knowledge in one hand and empowerment in the other hand, that is correct.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Knowledge and power. I cannot overemphasize how important this is. For the 23d, it is HBCU, historical black colleges and universities, but listen, every college students, irrespective of what college they attend, ought to register to vote. SGA presidents have their responsibility.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. The old adage is true, if you do not vote, do not complain; really, do not complain if you are not voting, if you are not participating in the political process. The reality is that if you do not vote, you do vote. You vote by definition for the person you do not want to win. That is not a Democratic or Republican statement, that is just a statement of political reality. If you do not vote, you cannot complain. If you do not vote, you got what is coming to you that is coming to you, because it is coming to you.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Or if you use the excuse that I am not from Illinois or from Chicago, I am only here for school.

□ 1915

You live there, and you will be living there for the next 2, 3, 4 years.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Nor can you use the excuse that ''I don't trust politicians, I don't like politicians.'' Run yourself. Come up here and try some of this. If you want to engage in a debate, if you want to engage in some discourse about the future of our Nation and the future of our community. Don't vote for the politician of your choice. You run and find out how difficult it is to talk hope into people who are dispirited, to talk hope into the disenfranchised, and to bring them into the political process and see how difficult it is.

If I were a DJ in America, on the radio every morning talking jive, and you had no substance to your jive, beyond the jive that you are talking, there is something wrong with that, if you are just complaining.

I am a graduate of Chicago Theological Seminary, and I speak in a lot of churches. Just about every Sunday, my pastor, the pastor of the Salem Baptist Church in Chicago, the Reverend James Meeks, we have altar call in our church. You would be surprised. I had a meeting with some of the people at our church who counsel members of our church. And I asked them some questions about what do people share with them most to be their problems. Some people are concerned about losing their job when they come to altar call, some are concerned about their illness, whether or not they can check into a hospital, whether or not they can afford to add a burden to their family. People come to altar call to pray for a whole lot of reasons. Many of these things are resolvable if they are in the political process.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me ask the gentleman a question. If I were sitting at home tonight and I wanted to register to vote, in my dormitory, watching television, doing whatever, washing, and I just want to register to vote, what is that number that I can call right now if I wanted to register to vote?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I would look at that Jaguar from Southern University who is sitting at home.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. What is that number for my edification?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. 1–800–REGISTER. It is really simple. 1–800–REGISTER. And ''register'' is spelled R-E-G-I-S-T-E-R. It costs you nothing. It is free.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. I want to make sure I am doing it right. All I have to do if I go back to my office right now and I wanted to register to vote is pick up the phone and dial 1–800–REGISTER?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. That is all I have to do?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Unless you are from the State of Illinois.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. What will happen? They will send me a package or something?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. It is a toll-free call where they prompt, they ask you for your name, address, phone number, verify who you are through your State Secretary of State.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. They set this up, and then I have to sign it or something?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. That is all you have to do is sign it. It is postage paid, and returned to you.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD:

APPENDIX—SOME PROMINENT HBUC ALUMNI

Leaders of the Past

Nobel Laureate Martin Luther King, Jr. (Morehouse), Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall (Lincoln and Howard), educators W.E.B. DuBois (Fisk), Mary McLeod Bethune (Scotia Seminary [Barber-Scotia]), Lucy C. Laney ([Clark] Atlanta), scientist-educator Booker T. Washington (Hampton), Urban League leader Whitney Young (Kentucky State), NAACP leader Walter F. White ([Clark] Atlanta), writer Ralph Ellison (Tuskegee), poet-lyricist James Weldson Johnson ([Clark] Atlanta), and activists Medgar Evers (Alcorn State) and Rosa Parks (Alabama State).

And the Present

Writers: Nobel Laureate Toni Morrison (Howard), Alice Walker (Spelman), Nikki Giovanni (Fisk), the late Alex Haley (Alcorn State and Elizabeth City State), and Imamu Amin Baraka (Leroi Jones) (Howard). Opera singers: Jessye Morman (Howard and Leonryne Price (Central State). Historians: John W. Blassingame (Fort Valley State and Howard) and John Hope Franklin (Fisk).

Political leaders: Jesse Jackson (North Carolina A&T), former ambassador to the United Nations Andrew Young, Jr. (Dillard and Howard), former Virginia Governor Douglas Wilder (Howard), former New York Mayor David Dinkins (Howard), former Atlanta mayor Maynard Jackson (Morehouse), former Memphis mayor Willie Herenton (LeMonye-Owen), Secretary of Energy Hazel O'Leary (Fisk), former Surgeon-General Joceyln Elders (Philander Smith), former Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan (Morehouse), and many others such as * * * and NAACP leader Benjamin Hooks (Howard).

Enterainers: film director Spike Lee (Morehouse); actor-television host Oprah Winfrey (Tennessee State); actors Ossie Davis (Howard), Tim Reid (Norfolk State), Phylicia Rashad (Howard), director-actor Kenny Leon (Clark [Atlanta]), Esther Rolle (Spelman); musicians Roberta Flack (Howard), Lionel Ritchie (Tuskegee), Erskine Hawkins (Alabama State), Billy Eckstine (Howard), Billy Taylor (Virginia State), and Branford Marsalis (Southern).

Also journalist Carl Rowan (Tennessee State); astronaut Ronald E. McNair (North Carolina A&T); architect Tarlee Brown (Tuskegee); founder of a literary journal, Charles H. Rowell (Alabama A&M); kidney transplant specialist Dr. Samuel Lee Kounta (University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff); president and chief executive officer of Atlanta Life Insurance, Jesse Hill, Jr. (Lincoln); educator Marva Collins (Clark [Atlanta]); the first Black woman member of the American College of Physicians, Dr. Margaret E. Grisby (Prairie View A&M); jurists Joseph W. Hatchett of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit (Florida A&M) and Henry E. Frye of the North Carolina Supreme Court (North Carolina A&T), and coaches John Chaney (Bethune-Cookman), Clarence Gaines (Morgan State), Art Shell (University of Maryland Eastern Shore), and Eddie Robinson (Leland).

Military leaders: the late Daniel James (Tuskegee), the first Black four-star general; Russell C. Davis (Tuskegee), first Black Air National Guard general; Dr. Marion Mann (Tuskegee), medical corps general; Air Force Generals Lucius Theus, Tirus Hall, James F. Hamlet, Rufus L. Billups, and Charles B. Jiggets (all of Tuskegee); Army generals Eugene R. Cromarie (Florida A&M), Julitis W. Becton, Jr. (Prairie View A&M), Edward Honor (Southern), Guthrie L. Turner (Shaw), Henry Doctor, Jr., James R. Klugh, and George Price (all of South Carolina State); and Army nurses corps general Clara Adams-Ender (North Carolina A&M).[1]

[1] This list, by no means comprehensive, was compiled from information obtained by AAUP Committee L from the institutions listed, and from Christa Brelin, ed., Who's Who Among Black Americans, 1992–93 (7th ed.). Detroit: Gale Research, Inc., 1993, and from Leadership and Learning, An Interpretive History of Historically Black Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, 99–111.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

ALABAMA

Alabama A&M University
Alabama State University
Bishop State Community College
Concordia College
Fredd State Technical College
Lawson State Community College
Miles College
Oakwood College
Selma University
J.F. Drake Technical College
Stillman College
Talladega College
Trenholm State Technical College
Tuskegee University

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Baptist College
Philander Smith College
Shorter College
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

DELAWARE

Delaware State University

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Howard University
University of the District of Columbia

FLORIDA

Bethune-Cookman College
Edward Waters College
Florida A&M University
Florida Memorial College

GEORGIA

Albany State College
Clark Atlanta University
Fort Valley State College
Interdenominational Theological Center
Morehouse College
Morehouse School of Medicine
Morris Brown College
Paine College
Savannah State College
Spelman College

KENTUCKY

Kentucky State University

LOUISIANA

Dillard University
Grambling State University
Southern University and A&M College at Baton Rouge
Southern University at New Orleans
Southern University at Shreveport/Bossier City
Xavier University

MARYLAND

Bowie State University
Coppin State College
Morgan State University
University of Maryland Eastern Shore

MICHIGAN

Lewis College of Business

MISSISSIPPI

Alcorn State University
Coahoma Community College
Jackson State University
Mary Holmes College
Mississippi Valley State University
Rust College
Tougaloo College

MISSOURI

Harris-Stowe State College
Lincoln University

NORTH CAROLINA

Barber-Scotia College
Bennett College
Elizabeth City State University
Fayetteville State University
Johnson C. Smith University
Livingstone College
North Carolina A&T State University
North Carolina Central University
Saint Augustine's College
Shaw University
Winston-Salem State University

OHIO

Central State University
Wilberforce University

OKLAHOMA

Langston University

PENNSYLVANIA

Cheyney State University of PA
Lincoln University

SOUTH CAROLINA

Allen University
Benedict College
Claflin College
Clinton Junior College
Denmark Technical College
Morris College
South Carolina State University
Voorhees College

TENNESSEE

Fisk University
Knoxville College
Lane College
Lemoyne-Owen College
Meharry Medical College
Tennessee State University

TEXAS

Huston-Tillotson College
Jarvis Christian College
Paul Quinn College
Prairie View A&M University
Saint Phillip's College
Southwestern Christian College
Texas College
Texas Southern University
Wiley College

VIRGINIA

Hampton University
Norfolk State University
Saint Paul's College
Virginia State University
Virginia Union University

WEST VIRGINIA

Bluefield State College
West Virginia State University

U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

University of the Virgin Islands

FEDERAL AGENCIES SUPPORTING HBCUS UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 12876

U.S. Departments of:
- Agriculture
- Commerce
- Defense
- Education
- Energy
- Health and Human Services
- Housing and Urban Development
- The Interior
- Justice
- Labor
- State
- Transportation
- Treasury
- Veterans Affairs

Agency for International Development
Appalachian Regional Commission
Central Intelligence Agency
Environmental Protection Agency
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
National Aeronautics and Space Administration
National Credit Union Administration
National Endowment for the Arts
National Endowment for the Humanities
National Science Foundation
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Small Business Administration
United States Information Agency

TABLE 10.—FALL ENROLLMENT IN HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, BY INSTITUTION, CONTROL, AND SEX: 1976 TO 1990

Institution	State	Year established	Control	1976		1978		1980	
				Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Total	.....	.....	.....	222,613	117,944	227,797	123,581	233,557	127,170
**Alabama A&M University	AL	1875	Public 4-year	4,564	2,246	4,425	2,056	4,380	2,104
Alabama State University [2]	AL	1874	Public 4-year	4,153	2,455	4,794	2,844	4,066	2,416
Bishop State Community College [3]	AL	1927	Public 2-year	1,649	920	1,500	956	1,425	955
C.A. Fredd State Technical College	AL	1965	Public 2-year	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Carver State Technical College	AL	1962	Public 2-year	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Concordia College [4]	AL	1922	Private 2-year	137	70	228	170	243	182
Daniel Payne College, Birmingham [5]	AL	1889	Private 4-year	346	165	.....	.....	.....	.....
J.F. Drake Technical College	AL	1961	Public 2-year	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Lawson State Community College [6]	AL	1965	Public 2-year	1,345	870	1,271	913	1,056	728
Lomax-Hannon Junior College [7]	AL	1893	Private 2-year	126	76	160	89	96	42
Miles College	AL	1905	Private 4-year	1,469	739	1,283	704	1,014	528
Oakwood College [8]	AL	1896	Private 4-year	1,171	652	1,266	654	1,303	751
Selma University	AL	1878	Private 4-year	650	324	632	371	501	276
Stillman College [9]	AL	1876	Private 4-year	857	497	607	360	558	317
Talladega College [10]	AL	1867	Private 4-year	625	406	705	481	797	576
Trenholm State Technical College	AL	1966	Public 2-year	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
**Tuskegee University [11]	AL	1881	Private 4-year	3,571	1,797	3,298	1,708	3,736	1,930
Arkansas Baptist College	AR	1901	Private 4-year	583	173	445	182	296	146
Philander Smith College	AR	1877	Private 4-year	592	249	550	248	590	282
Shorter College	AR	1886	Private 2-year	199	98	172	92	164	72
**University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff [12]	AR	1873	Public 4-year	3,062	1,653	2,998	1,730	3,064	1,750
**Delaware State College	DE	1891	Public 4-year	1,844	885	2,153	1,031	2,084	1,096
Howard University [13]	DC	1867	Private 4-year	9,815	4,708	10,339	5,066	11,321	5,845
**University of the District of Columbia [14]	DC	1851	Public 4-year	1,322	966	13,661	7,634	13,900	7,698

TABLE 10.—FALL ENROLLMENT IN HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, BY INSTITUTION, CONTROL, AND SEX: 1976 TO 1990—Continued

Institution	State	Year established	Control	1976		1978		1980	
				Total	Women	Total	Women	Total	Women
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Bethune-Cookman College [15]	FL	1904	Private 4-year	1,517	855	1,791	1,045	1,738	1,045
Edward Waters College [16]	FL	1866	Private 4-year	743	417	660	406	836	548
**Florida A&M University [17]	FL	1877	Public 4-year	5,779	2,913	5,882	2,987	5,371	2,726
Florida Memorial College [18]	FL	1879	Private 4-year	412	177	797	428	950	502
Albany State College	GA	1903	Public 4-year	2,222	1,289	1,750	1,066	1,555	897
Clark Atlanta University [19]	GA	1989	Private 4-year	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Atlanta University [20]	GA	1865	Private 4-year	1,177	656	1,227	658	1,371	706
Clark College [21]	GA	1869	Private 4-year	1,792	1,135	1,849	1,216	2,107	1,397
**Fort Valley State College [22]	GA	1895	Public 4-year	1,869	910	1,872	973	1,814	983
Interdenominational Theological Center	GA	1958	Private 4-year	227	31	288	41	273	36
Morehouse College	GA	1867	Private 4-year	1,402	0	1,659	0	2,006	28
Morehouse School of Medicine [23]	GA	1978	Private 4-year	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Morris Brown College [24]	GA	1881	Private 4-year	1,579	806	1,684	950	1,611	983
Paine College	GA	1882	Private 4-year	775	472	817	563	748	473
Savannah State College [25]	GA	1890	Public 4-year	2,847	1,713	2,229	1,291	2,110	1,090
Spelman College [26]	GA	1881	Private 4-year	1,289	1,289	1,262	1,262	1,366	1,366
**Kentucky State University	KY	1886	Public 4-year	2,389	1,167	2,196	1,045	2,336	1,236
Dillard University [27]	LA	1869	Private 4-year	1,186	875	1,217	891	1,208	902
Grambling State University [28]	LA	1901	Public 4-year	4,048	2,144	3,623	1,968	3,549	1,797
**Southern University and A&M College, Baton Rouge	LA	1880	Public 4-year	8,995	4,970	8,061	4,424	8,372	4,409
Southern University, New Orleans	LA	1959	Public 4-year	3,311	1,928	2,710	1,748	2,574	1,733
Southern University, Shreveport-Bossier City Campus	LA	1964	Public 2-year	974	580	692	481	723	507
Xavier University of Louisiana [29]	LA	1915	Private 4-year	1,846	1,086	1,895	1,166	2,004	1,277
Bowie State University [30]	MD	1865	Public 4-year	2,845	1,598	2,722	1,545	2,757	1,619
Coppin State College [31]	MD	1900	Public 4-year	2,949	2,122	2,874	2,114	2,541	1,838
Morgan State University	MD	1867	Public 4-year	6,254	3,333	5,209	2,891	5,050	2,851
**University of Maryland, Eastern Shore	MD	1886	Public 4-year	994	451	1,057	462	1,073	543
Lewis College of Business [32]	MI	1874	Private 2-year	225	180	560	431	487	392
**Alcorn State University	MS	1871	Public 4-year	2,603	1,476	2,296	1,365	2,341	1,346
Coahoma Community College [33]	MS	1949	Public 2-year	1,446	696	1,425	837	1,394	984
Hinds Community College, Utica Campus [34]	MS	1954	Public 2-year	994	544	834	492	1,005	575
Jackson State University	MS	1877	Public 4-year	7,928	4,283	7,646	4,274	7,099	4,078
Mary Holmes College	MS	1892	Private 2-year	624	279	655	333	422	218
Mississippi Industrial College [35]	MS	1905	Private 4-year	314	162	270	150	239	139
Mississippi Valley State University	MS	1946	Public 4-year	3,228	1,718	2,899	1,629	2,564	1,461
Natchez Junior College [36]	MS	1884	Private 2-year	19	16	62	56	.....	.....
Prentiss Institute [37]	MS	1907	Private 2-year	139	80	81	50	146	83
Rust College	MS	1866	Private 4-year	883	555	725	503	715	434
Tougaloo College [38]	MS	1869	Private 4-year	810	541	960	634	886	598
Harris-Stowe State College [39]	MO	1857	Public 4-year	1,248	862	1,102	827	1,175	832
**Lincoln University [40]	MO	1866	Public 4-year	2,341	1,037	2,332	1,047	2,651	1,202
Barber-Scotia College [41]	NC	1867	Private 4-year	526	289	401	247	317	191
Bennett College [42]	NC	1873	Private 4-year	618	618	614	614	620	620
Elizabeth City State University [43]	NC	1891	Public 4-year	1,651	929	1,584	908	1,488	836
Fayetteville State University [44]	NC	1877	Public 4-year	1,940	1,114	2,125	1,268	2,465	1,440
Johnson College Smith University	NC	1867	Private 4-year	1,599	805	1,473	766	1,379	740
Livingstone College	NC	1879	Private 4-year	909	400	921	448	879	366
**North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University	NC	1891	Public 4-year	5,515	2,675	5,385	2,580	5,510	2,473
North Carolina Central University [45]	NC	1910	Public 4-year	4,782	2,849	4,810	2,919	4,910	3,013
St. Augustine's College	NC	1867	Private 4-year	1,641	997	1,762	1,003	1,861	1,063
Shaw University	NC	1865	Private 4-year	1,453	648	1,263	549	1,523	749
Winston-Salem State University [46]	NC	1892	Public 4-year	2,094	1,277	2,204	1,329	2,220	1,313
Central State University [47]	OH	1887	Public 4-year	2,182	1,084	2,414	1,171	3,031	1,554
Wilberforce University [48]	OH	1856	Private 4-year	1,109	493	1,026	473	1,082	558
**Langston University [49]	OK	1897	Public 4-year	1,128	503	942	391	1,179	497
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania [50]	PA	1837	Public 4-year	2,848	1,289	2,637	1,345	2,426	1,249
Lincoln University [51]	PA	1854	Public 4-year	1,104	537	1,132	513	1,294	665
Allen University [52]	SC	1870	Private 4-year	543	275	419	213	410	210
Benedict College	SC	1870	Private 4-year	1,982	1,267	1,761	1,152	1,426	914
Claflin College [53]	SC	1869	Private 4-year	1,005	640	852	560	739	481
Clinton Junior College [54]	SC	1894	Private 2-year	208	81	122	34	116	54
Denmark Technical College [55]	SC	1948	Public 2-year	.....	.....	565	239	669	317
Friendship College [56]	SC	1891	Private 2-year	193	56	166	46	343	141
Morris College	SC	1908	Private 4-year	638	368	637	386	626	372
**South Carolina State College	SC	1896	Public 4-year	3,678	2,127	3,437	1,999	3,929	2,192
Voorhees College [57]	SC	1897	Private 4-year	1,050	617	794	487	613	390
Fisk University [58]	TN	1867	Private 4-year	1,279	761	1,150	721	1,009	682
Knoxville College [59]	TN	1875	Private 4-year	837	435	713	343	557	205
Lane College [60]	TN	1882	Private 4-year	701	341	673	345	757	378
LeMoyne-Owen College [61]	TN	1862	Private 4-year	1,118	677	990	637	1,063	690
Meharry Medical College [62]	TN	1876	Private 4-year	886	362	1,038	445	817	298
Morristown College [63]	TN	1881	Private 2-year	176	79	149	68	114	45
**Tennessee State University [64]	TN	1912	Public 4-year	5,480	2,919	5,537	2,855	8,318	4,435
Bishop College [65]	TX	1881	Private 4-year	1,664	694	1,569	708	945	273
Huston-Tillotson College [66]	TX	1876	Private 4-year	717	268	616	271	692	290
Jarvis Christian College [67]	TX	1912	Private 4-year	526	257	480	237	619	307
Paul Quinn College [68]	TX	1872	Private 4-year	537	236	421	195	438	230
**Prairie View A&M University	TX	1876	Public 4-year	5,118	2,660	5,101	2,667	6,592	3,542
St. Philip's College	TX	1927	Public 2-year	6,900	2,034	6,782	2,218	6,860	2,308
Southwestern Christian College [69]	TX	1949	Private 4-year	341	154	471	138	285	146
Texas College	TX	1894	Private 4-year	725	377	468	241	476	218
Texas Southern University [70]	TX	1947	Public 4-year	9,170	4,350	8,802	4,261	8,100	3,564
Wiley College	TX	1873	Private 4-year	599	293	615	319	664	328
Hampton University [71]	VA	1868	Private 4-year	2,805	1,714	2,808	1,738	3,230	1,930
Norfolk State University [72]	VA	1935	Public 4-year	6,956	4,074	7,283	4,146	7,286	4,324
St. Paul's College	VA	1888	Private 4-year	626	331	615	313	645	322
Virginia College [73]	VA	1886	Private 2-year	242	91	251	88	.....	.....
**Virginia State University [74]	VA	1882	Public 4-year	5,229	2,963	4,475	2,518	4,668	2,645
Virginia Union University	VA	1865	Private 4-year	1,424	704	1,178	618	1,361	682
Bluefield State College	WV	1895	Public 4-year	1,735	774	2,283	1,173	2,742	1,456
West Virginia State College	WV	1891	Public 4-year	4,001	1,813	3,678	1,874	4,353	2,413
**University of the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas Campus [75]	VI	1962	Public 4-year	2,122	1,350	1,848	1,266	2,148	1,533

—Data not reported or not applicable.

**Land-grant institution.

[1] Preliminary data.

[2] Founded as the Lincoln Normal School, a private institution. In 1874, became first state-supported historically black college.

[3] Founded as the Alabama State Branch by Mrs. Fredericka Evans and Dr. H. Council Trenholm, President of Alabama State College. In 1936, the College began offering a 2-year curriculum as part of the parent institution, Alabama State University. In 1965, the College became an independent junior college and the name was changed to Mobile State Junior College. In 1971, the name of the institution was changed to honor its first President, Dr. S.D. Bishop.

[4] Formerly called Alabama Lutheran Academy and College. In 1981 changed name to Concordia College. Affiliated with the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.

[5] School closed in 1977.

[6] In October 1973, Wenonah Vocational Trade School for Negroes (founded in 1949) and Theodore Alfred Lawson State Junior College (founded in 1963 and known as the Wenonah State Technical Junior College between 1963 and 1969), merged as a result of Alabama legislation adopted June 1972.

[7] Prior to closing in 1984, the school was affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

[8] Is owned and operated by the General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists.

[9] Affiliated with the Presbyterian Church.

[10] Was the first school in Alabama to admit students regardless of race.

[11] Founded by Booker T. Washington. Formerly called Tuskegee Institute.

[12] Founded as Branch Normal College, it continued from 1927 until 1972 as Arkansas Agricultural, Mechanical, and Normal College. In 1972, it joined four other campuses to comprise the University of Arkansas System.
[13] Founded as a coeducational and multiracial private university in 1867 by an act of the U.S. Congress, the University is named after General Oliver Otis Howard, Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau.
[14] The roots of the University of the District of Columbia, the nation's only metropolitan, land-grant institution of higher education stretch back to 1851 when Myrtilla Miner opened a school to prepare black women to teach. In 1976, three public higher education institutions, D.C. Teachers College, Federal City College, and Washington Technical Institute, were merged into the University of the District of Columbia. This merger caused the apparent enrollment increase in 1978.
[15] Upon the merger in 1923 of Cookman Institute for Men, founded in 1872 by the Reverend D.S.B. Darnell, and Daytona Normal and Industrial Institute for Women, founded in 1904 by Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, the institution became the Daytona Cookman Collegiate Institute and was taken over by the Board of Education of the Methodist Church. The name was later changed to Bethune-Cookman College.
[16] Founded as Brown Theological Institute. Edward Waters College is the oldest historically black institute of higher learning in the State of Florida. Affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Church.
[17] Designated as a land-grant institution in 1891 and became a university in 1953. Founded in 1887 as the State Normal College For Colored Students.
[18] Affiliated with the Baptist Church.
[19] Atlanta University and Clark College merged July 1, 1989, and became Clark Atlanta University.
[20] In 1929, the college became an exclusively graduate and professional institution, the first with a predominantly black student body; merged with Clark College in 1989.
[21] Founded as the first Methodist-affiliated college to serve African Americans.
[22] The Fort Valley Normal and Industrial School merged with the Forsyth State Teachers and Agricultural College in 1939 to become Fort Valley State College.
[23] Morehouse School of Medicine began in 1975 as a medical program within Morehouse College. In April 1985, the school was granted full accreditation to award an M.D. degree.
[24] Affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Church and is the only surviving college founded by blacks in Georgia.
[25] Called Georgia State College until 1947, it was established as a school for the training and education of Negro youth. It served as the state land-grant institution for blacks until this function was transferred to Fort Valley State College. The Regents of the University System changed the name to Savannah State College in 1950.
[26] The nation's oldest undergraduate liberal arts college for black women.
[27] Affiliated with the United Church of Christ and the United Methodist Church.
[28] Founded by Charles P. Adams. Is a multi-purpose, state-supported, coeducational institution.
[29] The only historically black institution with Catholic affiliation.
[30] Bowie State University is part of the University of Maryland System. Formerly Bowie State College.
[31] The only public senior college in the University of Maryland System.
[32] Founded by Dr. Violet T. Lewis to provide postsecondary business education to urban dwellers unable to obtain training from other institutions. This school originated in a store front in Indianapolis, Indiana.
[33] Was established as Coahoma Junior College in 1949. In 1989, the College was renamed Coahoma Community College.
[34] Founded by Dr. William H. Holtzclaw. Formerly called Utica Junior College and then Hinds Junior College.
[35] Lost accreditation in 1983 and closed in 1986. Lane College in Tennessee maintains their records.
[36] School no longer eligible for listing.
[37] Formerly Prentiss Normal and Industrial Institute. Closed in 1990.
[38] In 1869, the American Missionary Association of New York purchased a plantation of 500 acres near Jackson, Mississippi, and established on it a school for the training of young people irrespective of their religion and race.
[39] Founded in 1857 as the first teacher education institution west of the Mississippi. Was formerly known as Harris Teachers College and Harris Stowe College.
[40] A land-grant, comprehensive, multi-purpose institution of higher education founded by members of the 62nd and 65th U.S. Colored Infantry units as Lincoln Institute in 1866.
[41] Founded as Scotia Seminary, a preparatory for young Negro women. In 1916 changed its name to Scotia Women's College. Merged with Barber Memorial College in 1930. In 1932 changed name to Barber-Scotia College and then changed to coeducational in 1954. Historically affiliated to the Presbyterian Church (USA).
[42] Founded as a coeducational institution and reorganized as a women's college in 1926. Is affiliated with the United Methodist Church.
[43] Founded as a Normal School for the specific purpose of teaching and training teachers of the black race to teach in the common schools. Since 1972, it has been part of the 16-campus University of North Carolina System. Granted its first degrees in 1939 when it was known as Elizabeth City State Teachers College.
[44] Began as Howard School in 1867. In 1877 its name was changed to the State Colored Normal School. It is the second oldest state-supported institution in North Carolina and one of the oldest teacher education institutions in the South. In 1939, the institution began a 4-year program and became Fayetteville State Teachers College marking the beginning of a 4-year curriculum. In 1972, became part of the University of North Carolina System.
[45] Founded by Dr. James E. Shepard. In 1925, became the nation's first state-supported liberal arts college for black people.
[46] Founded as Slater Industrial Academy. Became Winston-Salem Teachers College, the first black institution in the U.S. to grant degrees for teaching in the elementary grades.
[47] Originated as a separate department of Wilberforce University in 1887. Became independent in 1947.
[48] Founded as the first coeducational college for blacks. Affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Church.
[49] Was founded as the Colored Agricultural and Normal University. The present name was adopted in 1941.
[50] Founded by Richard Humphreys, a Philadelphia Quaker. It is the nation's oldest historically black institution of higher learning. Began as a high school in 1837 and offered its first baccalaureate degree in the 1930s. Formerly known as Cheyney State College.
[51] The first institution established anywhere in the world to provide higher education in the arts and sciences for male youth of African descent. It was chartered as Ashmun Institute, an all-male institution, and remained as such for almost 100 years. It graduated its first woman in 1953, but it did not become fully coeducational until 1965.
[52] Founded under the auspices of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.
[53] Founded by two Methodist laymen from Massachusetts, William and Lee Claflin.
[54] School was not eligible for listing in 1988. Affiliated with the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.
[55] Founded as an all black trade school. In 1969, became a public 2-year branch campus of the South Carolina technical education system.
[56] Closed in 1982. Formerly known as Friendship Junior College.
[57] Founded by Elizabeth Evelyn Wright, it is a coeducational, liberal arts college.
[58] Incorporated under the laws of the State of Tennessee on August 22, 1867. The purpose was the education and training of young black men and women.
[59] Knoxville College now has two campuses. In 1989, Morristown College merged with Knoxville College. Knoxville was founded in 1875 by the United Presbyterian Church of North America.
[60] Founded by the Colored (Christian) Methodist Episcopal Church as the C.M.E. High School, and became Lane College in 1895.
[61] In 1968 LeMoyne College and Owen College merged.
[62] Founded as the Medical Department of Central Tennessee College, with the mission of educating health professionals for the black population. Meharry became an independent medical college in 1915. Meharry Medical College has trained close to one-third of the black physicians and dentists practicing in the United States today.
[63] After closing in 1988, Morristown was annexed by Knoxville College in 1989.
[64] Founded in 1912 as the Tennessee Agriculture and Industrial State Normal School for Negroes. It merged with the University of Tennessee at Nashville in 1979 and now has two campuses.
[65] Closed in 1988; was affiliated with the Baptist Church.
[66] Was formed in 1952 by the merger of Tillotson College (founded in 1875) and Samuel Huston College (founded in 1876). Is supported by the United Methodist Church and the United Church of Christ.
[67] A private coeducational college founded in 1912 and affiliated with the Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).
[68] Paul Quinn College began in a one room building in Austin, Texas, by a group of African Methodist Episcopal circuit riders who saw a need for a trade school to teach newly freed slaves. The college moved to Dallas in 1990 to the campus formerly occupied by Bishop College which closed in 1988.
[69] Formerly a 2-year institution, but became a 4-year institution offering bachelor's degrees in 1984.
[70] Founded as the Houston Colored Junior College. Its successor, Houston College for Negroes was transferred to the State of Texas following passage of a bill creating Texas State University for Negroes. Established as a State University in 1947. The name was changed to Texas Southern University in 1951.
[71] Founded by General Samuel Chapman Armstrong. Hampton is Virginia's only coeducational, non-denominational 4-year private college. Formerly known as Hampton Institute and Hampton College.
[72] Formerly known as Norfolk State College.
[73] Changed name to Virginia Seminary and College. Closed in 1980.
[74] The first fully state-supported, 4-year bachelor's degree black college in America. Founded in March 1882, when the Virginia legislature passed a bill to charter the Virginia Normal and Collegiate Institute. Formerly known as Virginia State College.
[75] This is a public, coeducational, land-grant institution that was founded in 1962 by enabling legislation of the Virgin Islands Legislature. Formerly known as College of Virgin Islands.

Note.—Some schools are estimated on the previous year enrollment on this table.

Source: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS), ''Fall Enrollment in Colleges and Universities'' surveys; and Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), ''Fall Enrollment'' surveys. (This table was prepared January 1992.)

COMBATING THE NATION'S DRUG PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk tonight a little bit about the growing debate about the drug war and talk about some of the things that this Congress has done to combat the drug problem in America and the youth.

I think there are two things that we need to keep in mind. One is the statistics, and the other is the recent salvo of the Clinton administration about tobacco. I, like you, have young children. I am concerned about my children smoking at early ages and I am concerned about the health problems of smoking and so forth. But why did Bill Clinton come out so strong now, on the eve of an election, against tobacco when he has had the Presidency for 4 years? Why suddenly?

One of the suggestions that people have, and I think this is a legitimate, it goes back to when Bill Clinton was talking on national TV on MTV, the music television show which gets a huge audience of, say, 13 to 20-year-olds, I will watch it every now and then myself, it is good, it is not just those ages; they have some good programs; of course they have some other things that are pretty questionable.

He was asked if given another chance to smoke marijuana, would he have inhaled; because, of course, Bill Clinton would have everyone in America believing that he never inhaled, which this particular President seems to be able to get away with a lot of things but he is famous for saying he did not inhale. But when asked by an MTV audience full of 13-, 14-, 15-, 16-year-olds, if you had it to do again would you have inhaled, to which a snickering, laughing Bill Clinton said, ''Sure. Sure, if I could. I tried before. Ha-ha.''

So here we are, he is running for the President of the United States and at that time, this was on June 12, 1992, he was clearly on his way to being the Democrat nominee, standing in front of 13-, 14-, 15-year-olds, makes a joke about it. So let us kind of say, well, that is what happened. Think about that as exhibit 1.

Now play that scenario again, Mr. Candidate for President Clinton, if you had to do it again, would you have inhaled?

''You know, if I had to do it again, I never would have smoked marijuana. I never would have tried. It hurts your ambition, it hurts your grades, it hurts your abilities to do sports. It can be a

steppingstone drug to other drugs. It could have psychological addiction. It is a bad thing. I tried it, it was rampant in the 1960's. Do not fall for it in the 1990's. We know so much more about it.''

Just think, Mr. Speaker, if you are a 14-year-old kid and you are sitting on the fence with half your friends smoking marijuana and the other half not smoking and you were sitting on the fence, in that audience, and you had the soon-to-be President of the United States tell you, sure, if I had another chance I would try it, versus, no way, hell no, it is bad for you, do not make my mistake, think which way you would go if you were that 14-year-old.

Instead, what happens is we have a passive, I would say endorsement on drug use and drug culture.

So what is the Clinton drug record? Here are some great statistics that have just come out. They are not great in the sense that they are optimistic by any stretch, but they have just come out. They are from a 1996, August, 1 month ago, report by the Household Survey on Drug Abuse, the Department of Human Services, which of course is controlled by the Clinton liberal Democrats. But it says that drug use among teenagers has exploded. From 1992 to 1995, overall drug use from 12- to 17-year-olds has gone up 78 percent. Marijuana use during the 1992 to 1995 period is up 105 percent. LSD, 103 percent increase. Cocaine, from 1994 to 1995, 166 percent increase.

Think about that, Mr. Speaker. That is all during the Clinton administration, during the period of time when he was slashing interdiction, cutting funding for drug enforcement agents and sending these cynical messages to our children about what drug use means.

I had a conversation with my 13-year-old the other day. We have a constant dialogue about this because already in her class, even though she goes to a very good school, I know most of the parents, most of the kids have gone to that same school all their life, they do not have a lot of transplants coming in and out of the system, it is a very stable environment, they already have one kid who was smoking marijuana in their class.

If you want some more statistics, and this is something that as a parent of four kids I am very concerned about—this is from the Luntz Research Co.—by the time the average teenager reaches 17, 79 percent of the teenagers have friends who are regular drinkers, 60 percent of the teenagers can buy marijuana within 1 day, 62 percent of our teenagers under 17 have friends who use marijuana, 58 percent have been solicited to buy marijuana, 58 percent know someone who personally uses acid, cocaine or heroin, 43 percent know someone who has a personal drug problem, and 42 percent find marijuana easier to buy than either beer or cigarettes. I think that is very interesting. These statistics, Mr. Speaker, as you know, are of major concern.

This past weekend, the Speaker was outraged when the President had the audacity to write a letter that blamed Congress for not fully funding his anti-drug program. We know what has happened. His sideshow with tobacco has not brought in the poll numbers that he expected, so he is going to come at the drug problem now head-on by blaming it on Congress. So here are some statistics on that that we want to talk about.

Is Congress to blame? One of President Clinton's first acts as President was to slash the staff of the drug czar by 83 percent. He cut drug interdiction spending 25 percent below the Bush administration. And from 1992 to 1995, 227 agent positions were eliminated from the Drug Enforcement Agency.

Let us talk about the Drug Enforcement Agency, Mr. Speaker. I believe the total number of employees at the Drug Enforcement Agency, the DEA as it is called often, I believe it is around 6,800 people. How many people do we have working for the IRS? One hundred eleven thousand employees.

So we have got 111,000 employees who are going to breathe down the necks of middle-class tax-paying Americans to make sure that they fill out their taxes right. But in terms of cracking down on drug thugs, we only have about 6,800 people and 227 of them have had their jobs eliminated under President Clinton.

Drug prosecution. What is going on over at the Attorney General's office? They are in on that, too. Drug prosecution has dropped 12 percent during Clinton's first 2 years as President. And we remember one of his key top advisers and Cabinet members had a son who was involved and arrested for drug usage and maybe drug sales, I am not sure; I know drug usage, and at the time she said, as a good mother should say, she thought he had done no wrong; I guess a good mother should say, I am still behind my son, I love him, even though he has done wrong; but I would say in true Clinton administration fashion; blamed it on society. That is the kind of people that we seem to have surrounding the President.

The recent book that came out by Gary Aldrich who was a top FBI adviser over at the White House, the name of the book is ''Unlimited Access,'' it is an FBI agent who is no longer with the administration but who was there during the key periods of time in the administration, he talks about the big difference between, say, Bush applicants and Clinton applicants. And I am not going to say that this book is gospel, I am not going to say that all of this has been verified. Frankly, some of it has, some of it has not. I will say this; that if Anita Hill said anything that was truth, then this book is gospel compared to Anita Hill, but I am not going to get into opinions too much, just read a little bit of it here.

That a minority of Bush applicants, and this is on page 112 of the book, experimented and admitted to inhaling illegal drugs. They were very sorry. They said, yes, I smoked marijuana once or twice, I was in college, everybody was doing it, so I stopped, I stopped using marijuana after I left college. I am ashamed that I ever did it, but it was stupid and I am sorry agents like you were risking your lives fighting drug traffickers and I did not have the guts to stand up to peer pressure.

What Mr. Aldrich does in his book, he contrasts this to Clinton staffers. Remember, this guy was there at the time. He said, by contrast, Clinton staffers, older or younger, make no apology for their illegal drug use, which was much more extensive, with heavy drugs like cocaine, crack, LSD. Many were actually in your face about it, using the FBI interview to try to debate me, me being Gary Aldrich, on the merits of making drugs legal.

That sets a tone of this White House having certainly, I am not going to say a drug culture, but certainly a different view of drugs entirely than society; because I think society as a whole recognizes the danger of drugs, recognizes that it is not a positive thing, that society as a whole does not want to legalize marijuana, which again was one of the Clinton Cabinet and adviser things that they brought up.

Here is another quote, again Mr. Aldrich says incidents like these, and it is talking about an incident of somebody who had had some marijuana and polygraph problems, but the word had trickled down that the Clinton staff system was rigged and there were some paperwork problems, that they would blur over people's drug use or whatever like that.

□ 1930

This book goes into great detail about it. It also talks about the drug czar and some of the Cabinet members. Originally the drug czar was not the gentleman who is drug czar now, who is a fine gentleman and doing a very good job over there. I am glad to see that Clinton has recognized that, and I am sorry to see it is in the 11th hour of his administration.

But, you know, getting back to what the Gingrich-Clinton discussion was about over the weekend, I think it is good to hear what the Speaker said in his letter back to Clinton. Clinton wrote that Congress has not come up with $640 million in appropriations or his request to spend more money on drugs in the safe and drug free school program.

I am a member of appropriations, as you are, Mr. Speaker. I have never been lobbied by anybody except for the new drug czar about increasing spending for drug interdiction, enforcement, or convictions. I have not had anybody from the administration contact me as an appropriations member and say this is what we need. I have had some other agencies do that, but they were not acting from the administration.

The Speaker wrote back: It is an outrage to watch you, to the President, to watch you, the President, joke about your own drug use. You have eliminated 83 percent of the drug czar's office after being sworn in, and you stood by while your Surgeon General called for drug legalization and your Attorney General testified against mandatory minimum sentences for drug dealers.

He also contended that Clinton tried to cut antidrug efforts by law enforcement agencies, appointed Federal judges who are easy on drug dealers.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about that. Typical Clinton-appointed judge: This was a case where a woman pulled up into a high crime district in New York City. She hops out of her car. Four men come out of the dark alleyway and put two duffel bags into the trunk of the car. When that happened, law enforcement personnel closed in on her. The people ran. The police caught them. They arrested them, took them to court.

In court, the liberal Clinton-appointed judge threw out the bags of cocaine, which was in the duffel bags, full of, I think, 80 pounds of cocaine in each duffel bag, threw that out as evidence. He said in that neighborhood running from the police is logical and rational behavior because police in that neighborhood are oppressive. That was the Clinton-appointed judge who was supposed to be protecting our children on our streets from drug thugs and traffickers and pushers.

That is the kind of mentality we have here. It is just two different perceptions of the problem.

The letter from Mr. GINGRICH goes on, and I think it is a good one, but he points to a lot of facts. This year, Republicans in Congress will provide $173 million for the Drug Enforcement Agency. That is $20 million more than the President had requested.

The Republican Congress is increasing funding for INS, $542 million, including 400 more Border Patrol agents. That, Mr. Speaker, is the Immigration Service. As we know, one of the big problems we have with drug trafficking is people coming over the borders from out of the country bringing in drugs. If we can crack down on illegal immigration, we are also cracking down on drug trafficking.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that 22 percent of the prison population in our Federal penal system are illegal aliens, and 80 percent of them are in jail for violent offenses, and many, many related to drugs.

Republicans are also providing $914 million in the defense budget for drug interdiction and counter drug activities. I met with a gentleman today who represents a group who is trying to support new funding for an airplane for Customs. This airplane has a special kind of radar that can be used to detect drug dealers. As you probably know, Mr. Speaker, most drugs right now are the ones south of the border and are coming from Peru or Bolivia. They are manufactured there, and then they are brought to Colombia, where the lab is. Then from Colombia they are flown to a ship or flown to another country and dropped off, either with a quick landing, or sometimes they have to just drop the stuff and keep going.

This drug interdiction plan would track drug planes and tell the people on the ground where they are going to, and so forth, because right now, of course, the drug planes are flying without flight plans, without running lights and so forth, and they are very hard to detect. Drug interdiction planes would be a great help in fighting that.

We are spending $13 million more than President Clinton requested for intelligence efforts against drug cartels, and $9.5 more for interdictions on the southwest border. We have increased funding to fight drugs in high crime neighborhoods by $10 million.

Now, we have a philosophical disagreement on some of the spending for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program, because some of that was frankly getting wasted. But there is a lot of good that came from it, because this was a Reagan program. It was part of the Nancy Reagan just say no program.

One of the things that is interesting about Nancy Reagan's program, Mr. Speaker, is that as the liberal Washington elite snickered at it because it was just too simple, it is interesting that up until 1992, drug usage for every drug except for heroin fell up until 1992. Then you get a new President, you get a new tone, a new drug philosophy, and what happens? Drug usage is right back up.

So this is something that we have got to keep fighting on. It is something where marijuana is more deadly now than it was when we were teenagers. There are chemicals and so forth that are mixed into it. It is not the same plant that parents say, ''Well, I smoked a little marijuana. It will not hurt my 15 year old.'' It might, because it is a different drug, and it is a different age in terms of drugs.

So I think that when you look at the statistics that the Luntz Corp. put out, we have got to be very, very concerned.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move on to a couple of the other things that are of great concern in terms of this Congress, some of the reforms that we have done.

This Congress has made a lot of changes. The reforms we have put in are all commonsense based. We have given the President the line-item veto. That will be effective in January. We have applied the same laws to Congress that the private sector has to live under. That goes for OSHA, EPA, regulatory departments of all natures that have to govern us. This was a Republican initiative.

We have cut the budget of Congress by $67 million. We have eliminated 28 committees and subcommittees, and reduced our own staff by approximately one-third.

We have banned most gifts to Members of Congress. There was a time, as you know, when the Congressmen could do anything, travel anywhere, and collect honorariums. That is not the case anymore.

We have reduced the franking privileges, that is the free mail we get. In my office, and I know in yours, Mr. Speaker, we keep it down, because it is running for reelection on the taxpayers' expense.

We have put term limits on committee chairs and top congressional leaders. We have done that because we think that that will put new blood and new energy into the committee system, instead of some old bull who has been sitting there for 25 years, and maybe he is contributing, maybe he is not. Somebody else comes along who has more energy and perhaps more intellect, he has only been there 6 years. Let him have a shot at it. That is something we think is very important.

We have moved in terms of reducing the amount of Government. We have tried our best to dismantle some of the bureaucracy, not all of it, but some of the duplications and so forth. We have reduced the paperwork in the Federal agencies.

One of the things that I have always been amazed at as I go down in the basement of the Rayburn Building across the hall is there are rolls and rolls of paper, some of them as tall as I am, and it is just paper we will use in our Government Printing Office for all our documents and so forth. I would venture to say, many of them get processed, printed, and thrown away, still unread.

Just kind of skipping around a little bit, we have eliminated over 270 unnecessary Federal programs. The number of bureaucrats was reduced in 29 of the 39 major government offices. Defense spending was reduced as a result of congressional initiatives.

We have to be very careful on defense spending because it costs so much to train somebody to drive a tank or fly an airplane, and that is someone's son or daughter in that expensive equipment, and we want them to have the best equipment that is available. Also, you never know how many fronts there may be a problem on, the Middle East, Bosnia, Korea. We have to be ready in America.

We cut spending last year by $45 billion. We reformed welfare and changed welfare to a program that is work-based, and we have put the caseworkers back home closer to the decisionmaking process, rather than having a cookie-cutter, one-size-fits-all.

But, you know the thing that worries me the most, Mr. Speaker, is you are working harder and harder and getting nowhere for it. Are you worried that your children are not going to be able to have the lifestyle that you enjoy? Are you worried that your children are not going to be able to enjoy the American dream? Has big government, high taxes, and excess of regulations and

deficit spending, has it stolen or diminished the American dream?

I think that it has. What this Congress has tried to do is work for commonsense reforms. We have tried to balance the budget in a fair way. We have tried to put sanity back into our tax system, with such things as eliminating the marriage tax penalty. We have tried to make government more responsive and operate like a household budget, rather than like some kind of Santa Claus fantasy that we can just tap into some instant money machine somewhere, and the money just keeps flowing and flowing and flowing. We have tried to do this, because balancing the budget is about people.

You know, an individual today owes about $18,000 on the national debt. That means a couple working to pay their mortgage is having to pay a higher mortgage rate because the interest rates are higher because the budget is not balanced. That means a professional woman pursuing a career, leasing a car, has to pay higher payments, on buying that car, has to pay higher interest rates on that, or the small business person.

It also means that a small baby, like my nephew, Walker Watson, will have to pay over $200,000 in interest over his lifetime just on the national debt above and beyond State, local, and Federal taxes.

Balancing the budget is not about numbers, it is about people. It is not just about people, it is about a future of children in the American dream. I think we can change the system. I think we can restore sanity to Washington, Mr. Speaker. We have got to do it in a bipartisan way, we have got to do it in a fair way, and we have got to do it outside of Washington. We have got to go home, every weekend, and constantly talk to the American people about this process, because it is something that affects all of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PORTMAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. RIGGS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. GANSKE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and September 12, on account of illness.

Mr. HEINEMAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and September 12, on account of illness.

Mr. TORKILDSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of business in the district.

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of personal business.

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. CHAMBLIS to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LUCAS, for 5 minutes, today,

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. GIBBONS, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $3,061.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MONTGOMERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. SANDERS.
Mr. LEVIN.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. DOYLE.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mrs. MALONEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHAMBLISS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas.
Mr. BAKER of California.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. THORNBERRY.
Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. STOCKMAN.
Mr. SCHAEFER.
Mr. SOLOMON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CLINGER.
Mr. HAYES.
Mr. CRAPO.
Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. KILDEE.
Mr. OBEY.
Mr. MATSUI.
Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. RAMSTAD.
Mr. MOLLOHAN.
Mr. DORNAN.
Ms. DELAURO.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mrs. LOWEY.
Mr. GIBBONS.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Mr. BENTSEN.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. FORBES in three instances.
Mr. PORTMAN.
Mr. MCINTOSH.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1662. An act to establish areas of wilderness and recreation in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture 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.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2428. An act to encourage the donation of food and grocery products to nonprofit organizations for distribution to needy individuals by giving the Model Good Samaritan Food Donation Act the full force and effect of law.

H.R. 4018. An act to make technical corrections in the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1992.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 12, 1996, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by various committees, U.S. House of Representatives, during the 2d quarter of 1996 in connection with official foreign travel, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, as well as reports by various miscellaneous groups and individuals concerning expenditures in connection with official foreign travel authorized by the Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
James McCormick	5/21	5/25	Abidjan		950.00		3,986.05				4,936.05
Sean Peterson	5/20	5/25	Abidjan		1,140.00		3,293.05				4,433.05
Committee total					2,090.00		7,279.10				9,369.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES LEACH, Chairman, July 29, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Paul Berkowitz	4/9	4/13	Switzerland		1,240.00						1,240.00
Commercial airfare							3,131.95				3,131.95
	5/17	5/21	Taiwan		798.00						798.00
Commercial airfare							2,758.95				2,758.95
Debi Bodlander	4/5	4/13	Israel		[3] 2,714.00						2,714.00
Commercial airfare							4,622.95				4,622.95
Elana Broitman	4/19	4/20	Austria		253.00						253.00
	4/20	4/22	Hungary		636.00						636.00
Commercial airfare							3,119.75				3,119.75
	6/7	6/11	Nicaragua		980.00						980.00
Commercial airfare							1,382.95				1,382.95
Hon. Dan Burton	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)		7,961.53		8,509.53
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00		(4)				597.00
Phil Christenson	4/1	4/11	South Africa		1,922.00						1,922.00
	4/11	4/12	Botswana		80.00						80.00
	4/12	4/15	South Africa		218.00						218.00
Commercial airfare							7,805.15				7,805.15
Karen Donfried	4/7	4/9	Turkey		[3] 216.00						216.00
	4/9	4/13	Germany		[3] 811.00						811.00
	4/13	4/16	Belgium		[3] 569.00						569.00
Commercial airfare							4,381.55				4,381.55
Scott Feeney	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)				548.00
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00		(4)				597.00
Hon. Victor Frazer	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)				548.00
	4/11	4/14	Chile		597.00		(4)				597.00
Richard Garon	4/10	4/11	Croatia		[3] 1,300.00						1,300.00
	4/11	4/14	Bosnia								
	4/14	4/15	Croatia								
Commercial airfare							$2,300.95				$2,300.95
Kristen Gilley	4/4	4/11	South Africa		[3] 1,216.00						1,216.00
	4/11	4/12	Botswana		80.00						80.00
	4/12	4/14	South Africa		[3] 572.00						572.00
Commercial airfare							6,245.65				6,245.65
Christopher Hankin	6/21	6/25	Germany		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare							3,284.25				3,284.25
Hon. Nancy Johnson	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)				548.00
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00		(4)				597.00
David Jung	4/7	4/9	Turkey		376.00						376.00
	4/9	4/13	Germany		999.00						999.00
	4/13	4/16	Belgium		1,016.00						1,016.00
Commercial airfare							4,381.55				4,381.55
Gilead Kapen	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)				548.00
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00		(4)				597.00
Hon. Jay Kim	4/3	4/4	Singapore		355.97						355.97
	4/4	4/8	Malaysia		812.00						812.00
	4/8	4/11	Philippines		744.00						744.00
Commercial airfare							1,761.00				1,761.00
Mark Kirk	3/30	3/31	England		[3] 48.00						48.00
	3/31	4/4	Egypt		[3] 762.00						762.00
	4/4	4/9	South Africa		[3] 1,040.00						1,040.00
	4/9	4/15	Bosnia		[3] 1,455.00						1,455.00
Commercial airfare							6,071.25				6,071.25
	6/7	6/12	Nicaragua		1,225.00						1,225.00
Commercial airfare							1,382.95				1,382.95
Christopher Kojm	3/31	4/1	Hungary		212.00						212.00
	4/1	4/3	Poland		520.00						520.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		[3] 383.00						383.00
	4/4	4/5	Slovakia								
Commercial airfare							3,834.85				3,834.85
Cliff Kupchan	3/31	4/7	Morocco		822.00						822.00
	4/7	4/11	South Africa		[3] 840.00						840.00
	4/11	4/12	Bostswana		80.00						80.00
Commercial airfare							7,091.85				7,091.85
John Mackey	4/19	4/20	Austria		253.00						253.00
	4/20	4/22	Hungary		636.00						636.00
Commercial airfare							3,119.75				3,119.75
	4/8	4/9	Mexico		222.00		(4)				222.00
	4/9	4/11	Panama		278.00		(4)				278.00
	4/11	4/13	Bolivia		282.00		(4)				282.00
	4/13	4/15	Peru		504.00		(4)				504.00
Les Munson	3/31	4/6	Morocco		822.00						822.00
	4/6	4/11	South Africa		[3] 855.00						855.00
	4/11	4/12	Botswana		80.00						80.00
	4/12	4/13	South Africa		[3] 571.00						571.00
Commercial airfare							3,834.85				3,834.85
Cliff Kupchan	3/31	4/7	Morocco		[3] 822.00						822.00
	4/7	4/11	South Africa		[3] 840.00						840.00
	4/11	4/12	Botswana		80.00						80.00
Commercial airfare							7,091.85				7,091.85
John Mackey	4/19	4/20	Austria		253.00						253.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1996—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	4/20	4/22	Hungary		636.00						636.00
Commercial airfare							3,119.75				3,119.75
	4/8	4/9	Mexico		222.00		(4)				222.00
	4/9	4/11	Panama		278.00		(4)				278.00
	4/11	4/13	Bolivia		282.00		(4)				282.00
	4/13	4/15	Peru		504.00		(4)				504.00
Les Munson	3/31	4/6	Morocco		822.00						822.00
	4/6	4/11	South Africa		[3] 855.00						855.00
	4/11	4/12	Botswana		80.00						80.00
	4/12	4/13	South Africa		[3] 571.00						571.00
Commercial airfare							7,055.85				7,055.85
Ken Nelson	4/25	4/27	Canada		310.00						310.00
Commercial airfare							388.00				388.00
Roger Noriega	3/31	4/3	Haiti		[3] 260.00						260.00
Commercial airfare							642.95				642.95
	4/25	4/27	Canada		349.00						349.00
Commercial airfare							388.00				388.00
	5/31	6/3	Nicaragua		150.00						150.00
Commercial airfare							1,382.95				1,382.95
Steve Rademaker	3/30	4/1	Hungary		212.00						212.00
	4/1	4/3	Poland		520.00						520.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		[3] 269.00						269.00
	4/4	4/6	Slovakia		388.00						388.00
	4/6	4/9	Russia		[3] 477.14						477.14
Commercial airfare							4,271.35				4,271.35
Grover Joseph Rees	6/7	6/9	Mexico		371.66						371.66
Commercial airfare							502.95				502.95
Dan Restrepo	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)				548.00
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00		(4)				597.00
Frank Record	4/1	4/6	Morocco		822.00						822.00
Commercial airfare							3,354.25				3,354.25
	4/25	4/27	Canada		[3] 300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							388.00				388.00
Walker Roberts	3/30	4/1	Hungary		212.00						212.00
	4/1	4/3	Poland		520.00						520.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		[3] 463.00						463.00
	4/4	4/5	Slovakia								
Commercial airfare							3,834.85				3,834.85
Hon. Charlie Rose	5/23	5/25	Taiwan								
Commercial airfare							2,523.95				2,523.95
Hon. Toby Roth	6/21	6/25	Germany		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare							3,284.25				3,284.25
Mara Rudman	3/31	4/4	Egypt		[3] 550.24						550.24
	4/4	4/9	Israel		[3] 1,320.00						1,320.00
Commercial airfare							4,756.25				4,756.25
Marty Sletzinger	4/7	4/9	Turkey		564.00						564.00
	4/10	4/11	Croatia		300.00						300.00
	4/11	4/14	Bosnia		0.00						0.00
	4/14	4/15	Croatia		0.00						0.00
Commercial airfare							4,551.65				4,551.65
Hillel Weinberg	4/7	4/9	Turkey		276.00				46.20		322.20
	4/9	4/13	Germany		999.00						999.00
	4/13	4/16	Belgium		[3] 351.00						351.00
Commercial airfare							4,381.55				4,381.55
David Weiner	4/25	4/27	Canada		[3] 314.58						314.58
Commercial airfare							388.00				388.00
Hon. Al Wynn	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00		(4)				581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00		(4)				548.00
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00		(4)				597.00
Committee total					54,078.59		108,772.10		8,007.73		170.858.42

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Represents refund of unused per diem.
[4] Military air transportation.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Aug. 9, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, BOSNIA, CROATIA AND HUNGARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 29 AND MAR. 4, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Sonny Callahan	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Charles Wilson	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Bob Stump	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Bob Dornan	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Esteban Torres	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Charles Taylor	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Richard Hastings	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Victor Frazer	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. W. Livingood	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Charles Flickner	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Bill Inglee	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Brett O'Brien	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Mark Murray	3/1	3/2	Italy		200.00		(3)				200.00
Hon. Sonny Callahan	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Charles Wilson	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Bob Stump	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon Bob Dornan	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Esteban Torres	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Charles Taylor	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Richard Hastings	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Victor Frazer	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. W. Livingood	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY, BOSNIA, CROATIA AND HUNGARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 29 AND MAR. 4, 1996—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Charles Flickner	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Bill Inglee	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Brett O'Brien	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Mark Murray	3/2	3/3	Croatia		280.00		(3)				280.00
Hon. Sonny Callahan	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Charles Wilson	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Bob Stump	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Bob Dornan	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Esteban Torres	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Charles Taylor	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Richard Hastings	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Mac Thornberry	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Victor Frazer	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. W. Livingood	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Charles Flickner	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Bill Inglee	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Brett O'Brien	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Hon. Mark Murray	3/3	3/4	Hungary		212.00		(3)				212.00
Committee total					9,688.00						9,688.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

SONNY CALLAHAN, Apr. 1, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 16 AND MAY 21, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Doug Bereuter	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Gerald Solomon	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Jan Meyers	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Marge Roukema	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Floyd Spence	5/17	5/20	Greece		823.50		(3)				823.50
Hon. Michael Bilirakis	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Porter Goss	5/17	5/21	Greece		841.68		(3)				841.68
Hon. Toby Roth	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Bobby Rush	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Hon. Pat Schroeder	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
John Herzberg	5/16	5/21	Greece		1,441.13		1,271.00				2,712.13
Jo Weber	5/16	5/21	Greece		1,441.13		2,577.12				4,018.25
Michael Ennis	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Chris Kojm	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
William Cox	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Ronald W. Lasch	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Linda Pedigo	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Jim Doran	5/17	5/21	Greece		1,098.00		(3)				1,098.00
Committee total					21,017.44		3,848.12				24,865.56

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, June 14, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO U.S.-RUSSIA JOINT COMMISSION ON POW–MIA AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 25 AND JUNE 1, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Pete Peterson	5/26	5/27	Germany		240.00		(3)				240.00
	5/27	5/29	Azerbaijan		394.00		(3)				394.00
	5/29	5/31	Georgia		426.00		(3)				426.00
	5/31	6/1	Germany		240.00		(3)				240.00
Suzanne Farmer	5/26	5/27	Germany		240.00		(3)				240.00
	5/27	5/29	Azerbaijan		394.00		(3)				394.00
	5/29	5/31	Georgia		426.00		(3)				426.00
	5/31	6/1	Germany		240.00		(3)				240.00
Committee total					2,600.00						2,600.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PETE PETERSON, June 7, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HUNGARY, BOSNIA, AND CROATIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 21 AND JUNE 24, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. David L. Hobson	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO HUNGARY, BOSNIA, AND CROATIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 21 AND JUNE 24, 1996—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. Bill Barrett	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. Dan Miller	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. Robert W. Ney	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. Tom Bevill	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Hon. John S. Tanner	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230		(3)				230
Hon. Wilson Livingood	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Kenneth Kraft	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		3				230.00
Brian Gunderson	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
John Plashal	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
R. Scott Lilly	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Dudley L. Tademy	6/21	6/23	Hungary		324.00		(3)				324.00
	6/22	6/22	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/23	Bosnia				(3)				
	6/23	6/24	Croatia		230.00		(3)				230.00
Committee total					7,202,000						7,202,000

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

DAVID L. HOBSON, July 17, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO A TRI-LATERAL FORUM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 28 AND JULY 2, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Amo Houghton	6/28	7/2	United Kingdom								
Hon. Clifford Stearns	6/29	7/2	United Kingdom		93.00		3,082.45				3,175.45
Hon. Charles Taylor	6/29	7/2	United Kingdom		93.00		3,082.45				3,175.45
Hon. Kika de la Garza	6/29	7/2	United Kingdom		93.00		3,082.45				3,175.45
Hon. James McDermott	6/29	7/2	United Kingdom		93.00		3,271.45				3,364.45
Robert Van Wicklin	6/29	7/2	United Kingdom		93.00		3,215.45				3,308.45
Julie Paradis	6/29	7/2	United Kingdom		93.00		3,082.45				3,175.45
Committee total					558.00		18,816.70				19,374.70

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AMO HOUGHTON, Aug. 2, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 5 AND JULY 9, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Henry Hyde	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Patricia Schroeder	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Steny Hoyer	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Benjamin Cardin	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Louise McIntosh Slaughter	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Bob Clement	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Greg Laughlin	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Bill Brewster	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00
Hon. Pat Danner	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00	(3)					1,216.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO OSCE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 5 AND JULY 9, 1996—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Karen Thurman	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,216.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,216.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,216.00
Hon. Jesse L. Jackson	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,216.00
Hon. Samuel Wise	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,056.00
Hon. Ronald McNamara	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,216.00
Hon. Erika Schlager	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				1,171.89
Marlene Kaufmann	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				826.85
Michael Amitay	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				762.00
Mark Gage	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				984.00
Caroline Cooper	7/5	7/9	Sweden		1,216.00		(3)				973.47
Committee total					23,866.00						22,798.21

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HENRY HYDE, Aug. 2, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. GARDNER PECKHAM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 12 AND FEB. 24, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Gardner Peckham	2/12	2/14	Germany		301.00						301.00
	2/14	2/21	Bosnia		1,288.00						1,288.00
	2/21	2/22	Croatia		228.00						228.00
	2/22	2/24	Italy		337.00		1,515.75				1,852.75
Committee total					2,154.00		1,515.75				3,669.75

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GARDNER G. PECKHAM, Mar. 18, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. DAVID JOERGENSON, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 31 AND APR. 14, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
David Joergenson	3/31	4/2	Ecuador		326.00		(3)				326.00
	4/2	4/5	Chile		848.00		(3)				848.00
	4/5	4/8	Argentina		822.00		(3)				822.00
	4/8	4/14	Brazil		1,383.00		(3)				1,383.00
Committee total					3,379.00						3,379.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

JOHN D. JOERGENSON, May 14, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. JASON LOVELL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 7 AND APR. 14, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Jason Lovell	4/7	4/9	Chile		581.00						581.00
	4/9	4/11	Argentina		548.00						548.00
	4/11	4/14	Brazil		597.00						597.00
Committee total					1,726.00						1,726.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JASON LOVELL, Apr. 30, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. ANDREA P. CAMP, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 31 AND APR. 14, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Andrea P. Camp	3/31	3/31	Panama				(3)				
	3/31	4/2	Ecuador		326.00		(3)				326.00
	4/2	4/5	Chile		848.00		(3)				848.00
	4/5	4/8	Argentina		822.00		(3)				822.00
	4/8	4/14	Brazil		1,383.00		(3)				1,383.00
Committee total					3,379.00						3,379.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

ANDREA P. CAMP, May 14, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. SAMUEL LANCASTER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 8 AND APR. 15, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Samuel G. Lancaster	4/8	4/9	Mexico		221.75		(3)				221.75
	4/9	4/11	Panama		278.00		(3)				278.00
	4/11	4/11	Colombia				(3)				
	4/11	4/13	Bolivia		282.00		(3)				282.00
	4/13	4/15	Peoria		504.00		(3)				504.00
Committee total					1,285.75						1,285.75

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

SAMUEL LANCASTER, May 29, 1996.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HONORABLE GREG LAUGHLIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 8 AND MAY 14, 1996

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Greg Laughlin	5/8	5/14	Russia		100.00		3,280.95		306.00		3,686.95
Committee total					100.00		3,280.95		306.00		3,686.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GREG LAUGHLIN, May 30, 1996.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of September 10, 1996]

4939. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's 34th quarterly report to Congress on the status of Exxon and stripper well oil overcharge funds as of March 31, 1996; to the Committee on Commerce.

4940. A letter from the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (94–1558—Engine Manufacturers Association, on Behalf of Certain of Its Members versus Environmental Protection Agency); to the Committee on Commerce.

4964. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Employment Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's rule—Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals with Disabilities, Disabled Veterans and Veterans of the Vietnam Era; Approval of Information Collection Requirements and OMB Control Numbers (RIN: 1215–AA62, 1215–AA76) received August 27, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4972. A letter from the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (95–5057—Scott Armstrong, et al. versus Executive Office of the President); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

4974. A letter from the Director, Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting the activities of the Capitol preservation fund for the first 9 months of fiscal year 1996, which ended on June 30, 1996, and comparable data for the same period of the previous fiscal year; to the Committee on House Oversight.

5000. A letter from the U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia Circuit, transmitting an opinion of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit (92–3133—United States of America versus Rochell Ardall Crowder); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

[Submitted September 11, 1996]

5065. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's ''Major'' final rule—Control of Air Pollution; Final Rule for New Gasoline Spark-Ignition Marine Engines; Exemptions for New Nonroad Compression-Ignition Engines At or Above 37 Kilowatts and New Nonroad Spark-Ignition Engines At or Below 19 Kilowatts [FRL–5548–8] received September 10, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5066. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Las Vegas, New Mexico) [MM Docket No. 95–161] received September 11, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

5067. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Brunei for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–63), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5068. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 96–64), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

5069. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of major military equipment with Sweden (Transmittal No. DTC–41–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5070. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed manufacturing license agreement for production of a major military equipment with Sweden (Transmittal No. DTC–40–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

5071. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–31–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5072. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–38–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5073. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–54–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5074. A letter form the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of export license agreement for the temporary export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Kazakhstan (Transmittal No. DTC–49–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5075. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to Norway (Transmittal No. DTC–55–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2076. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed issuance of export license agreement for the temporary export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the Department of National Defense, Government

of Malaysia (Transmittal No. DTC–45–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 23776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5077. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially to the United Kingdom (Transmittal No. DTC–43–96), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

5078. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

5079. A letter from the FOIA Officer and General Counsel, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5080. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a correction to the Commission's annual report submitted June 12, 1996; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

5081. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Fisheries Off the West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Trip Limit Reductions [Docket No. 951227306–5306–01; I.D. 082996C] received September 11, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

5082. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Editorial Amendments for Classification and Program Review; Inmate Discipline; Education, Training, and Leisure Time Program Standards; and Release Gratuities [BOP–1057–F] (RIN: 1120–AA56) received September 11, 1996, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5083. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the existing authorization for flood damage reduction at Cape Girardeau—Jackson Metropolitan Area, MO, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct the project at a total cost of $42,776,000; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5084. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), Department of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to modify the project for deep-draft navigation at San Juan Harbor, PR, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct the project at a total cost of $45,085,000; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5085. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the results of a determination of the Railroad Retirement Account's ability to pay benefits in each of the next 5 years, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1); jointly, to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

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 Mrs. CLAYTON (for herself, Mr. ROSE, Mr. JONES, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BURR, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. WOLF, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WISE, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 4046. A bill to make emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to provide relief from the damages caused by Hurricane Fran and other natural disasters of 1996; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. STARK, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. HILLIARD):

H.R. 4047. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide additional consumer protections for Medicare supplemental insurance; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER of California (for himself, Mr. RIGGS, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HORN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. KIM, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4048. A bill to enhance California's habitat, water quality, and water supply; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. GILLMOR:

H.R. 4049. A bill to permit States to prohibit the disposal of solid waste imported from other nations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4050. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to replace the current individual and corporate income taxes, and the Social Security and Medicare taxes, with a value-added tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. KLUG):

H.R. 4051. A bill to waive temporarily the Medicaid enrollment composition rule for Managed Health Services of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KLECZKA (for himself and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 4052. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to assure continued health insurance coverage of retired workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, 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. LAHOOD:

H.R. 4053. A bill to impose temporarily a 25-percent duty on imports of wheat gluten and to require the administering authority to initiate an investigation under title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to wheat gluten; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT:

H.R. 4054. A bill to provide relief to agricultural producers who granted easements to, or owned or operated land condemned by, the Secretary of the Army for flooding losses caused by water retention at the dam site at Lake Redrock, IA, to the extent that the actual losses exceed the estimates of the Secretary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4055. A bill to require initial intake screenings and the use of youth development specialists in Federal juvenile proceedings, and to encourage States and local governments to use similar procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, 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 Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 4056. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for less restrictive standards for naturalization as a citizen of the United States for certain categories of persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 4057. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on the chemical DEMT; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WISE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. KASICH, AND Mr. HUTCHINSON):

H.R. 4058. A bill to provide for parity for mental health benefits under group health plans; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Government Reform and Oversight, 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 Mrs. SEASTRAND:

H.R. 4059. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain property on Santa Cruz Island; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself, Mr. STUMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. LONGLEY):

H.R. 4060. A bill to establish the Commission on the Future for America's Veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and National Security, 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. TALENT:

H.R. 4061. A bill to provide for the establishment of uniform accounting systems, standards, and reporting systems in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. SOLOMON (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Con. Res. 212. Concurrent resolution endorsing the adoption by the European Parliament of a resolution supporting the Republic of China on Taiwan's efforts at joining the community of nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H. Res. 518. Resolution to establish a select committee to investigate CIA involvement in the financing, distribution, and promulgation of crack cocaine and the use of any proceeds to support the Contras; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H. Res. 519. Resolution to amend House Rules to require the random drug testing of Members, officers, and employees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. WATERS:

H. Res. 520. Resolution to establish a select committee to investigate CIA involvement in crack cocaine sales to fund Contras; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

242. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 50, postratifying the 27th article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America deferring any variations in the compensation of Members of the U.S. Congress until an election of U.S. Representatives shall have intervened; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 72: Mrs. FOWLER and Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 103: Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 210: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1023: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1090: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1363: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 1386: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1402: Mr. STOKES and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1998: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. NEY, and Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 2084: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2085: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2089: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 2247: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2508: Mr. HAYWORTH and Ms. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 2531: Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas and Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 2535: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2900: Mr. MICA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. REED, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 3002: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 3077: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 3142: Ms. PRYCE and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 3178: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 3207: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 3221: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 3226: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. STARK, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 3307: Mr. PARKER, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 3337: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3348: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3401: Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3430: Mr. CANADY, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 3511: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 3584: Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 3590: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 3646: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3654: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 3678: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 3714: Mr. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3727: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 3745: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 3752: Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3905: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 3923: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CLINGER, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FROST, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MCDADE, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 3927: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 3928: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3963: Mr. BLUTE, Mr. HORN, Mr. BARR, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 4000: Mr. MANTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4011: Mr. CAMP and Mr. MANZULLO.

H.J. Res. 191: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. BALDACCI and Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 135: Mr. WILLIAMS, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DAVIS.

H. Con. Res. 176: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. MANTON, Mr. FOX, and Mr. HOBSON.

H. Con. Res. 199: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 478: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H. Res. 486: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, and Mr. BAKER of California.

H. Res. 510: Mr. STOCKMAN, Ms. GREENE of Utah, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.