Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Neal
Neumann
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Souder
Stabenow
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Sununu
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—33

Becerra
Berman
Borski
Boucher
Castle
Cooksey
Deutsch
Ehlers
Gephardt
Graham
Hefner
Inglis
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Klug
Lampson
Largent
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McDade
Mollohan
Murtha
Nadler
Norwood
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Skaggs
Spratt
Waxman
Yates

□ 1925

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania and Mr. HULSHOF changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 521, 522 and 523 on October 12, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: on rollcall No. 521, ''yea''; on rollcall No. 522, ''nay''; and on rollcall No. 523, ''nay.''

FAREWELL ADDRESS

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I regret that my final hours in the House are not among its finest hours.

My dream of public service began in 1960, when, as a high school student, I witnessed the nomination of John F. kennedy for President of the United States. Congress is the only public office I have ever held. My record reflects many attempts to generate and embrace bipartisan solutions. My bipartisan district has applauded these efforts like last year's balanced budget agreement. But it also shares my dismay at the tenure of our floor debate last week on whether to begin an inquiry of impeachment of the President.

The floor debate had more the feeling of a rally than a sober exercise of one of Congress's most awesome responsibilities under the Constitution. Indeed, it seemed to me that many Members in the Chamber were gleeful and that the exercise was payback for some earlier slight, whether from the President or someone else.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of my constituents have contacted me in the past 2 months and by a recent count of 9 to 1 have made clear they find the President's conduct wrong, as I do, but they do not want him impeached.

Mr. Speaker, I have said in other forums that not only is the President on trial, so is Congress. Unless we show the Nation we can trust and respect each other, the Nation will not trust and respect the result of our inquiry.

I regret that my final hours in the House are not among its finest hours.

My dream of public service began in 1960 when, as a high school usher, I witnessed the nomination of John F. Kennedy for president of the United States.

Congress is the only public office I've ever held, and my record reflects many attempts to generate and embrace bipartisan solutions.

My bipartisan district has applauded those efforts, like last year's balanced budget agreement. But, it also shares my dismay at the tenor of our floor debate last week on whether to begin an inquiry of impeachment of the President.

The floor debate had more of the feeling of a rally than the sober exercise of one of Congress' most awesome responsibilities under the Constitution. Indeed, it seemed to me that many members in the chamber were gleeful, and that the exercise was pay-back for some earlier slight, whether from the President or someone else.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of my constituents have contacted me in the past two months, and by a recent margin of nine to one have made clear that they find the President's conduct wrong, as do I, but they do not want him impeached.

Many favor alternative remedies: censure, rebuke or criminal or civil prosecution. All feel that a prolonged inquiry risks distracting the nation at a time of serious economic and international instability.

But, as so often happens in the House, we were confronted with imperfect legislative choices. With reservations, I cast my vote for an inquiry of impeachment limited in time and scope so that Congress can fulfill its obligations under the Independent Counsel law and the Constitution, consider alternative sanctions, and conclude its review by year's end. This, I believe, was the more appropriate course for the House to take than an open-ended, wide-ranging inquiry as proposed by the Judiciary Committee majority.

Regrettably, the vote was essentially partisan, and the atmosphere dramatically different from Congress' 1974 impeachment inquiry concerning President Nixon. At the time, I served as chief counsel of a Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, and vividly recall a process which, at an early stage, generated widespread acceptance and an orderly transition of power.

It saddens me greatly that I end my service in Congress as a participant in a process that hurts this institution, the office of the presidency and, most important, the American people.

I've said in other forums that not only is the President on trial—so is Congress. Unless we show the nation we can trust and respect each other, the nation will not trust and respect the result of our inquiry.

Mr. Speaker, nearly six years ago, I stood in this well with other members of the newly-elected 103rd Congress to take the oath of office from Speaker Tom Foley. As all who have shared that exhilarating experience, it opened an important and wonderful chapter in my life—a chapter which I will soon bring to a close.

January 1993, opened auspiciously for the nation. A new Congress and new President had been elected and a new approach to governing—to addressing important economic and fiscal issues—was blossoming. History, of course, will evaluate whether we have acquitted ourselves well in the six years since. To be sure, Congress and the President made significant gains in some policy areas, particularly in working to achieve the first balanced budget in a generation. In other critical policy areas, nothing was done. And, regrettably, in some areas, efforts to roll back significant gains, particularly for women, have gathered momentum.

Having campaigned on a platform of ''pro-choice, pro change,'' I came to the nation's capital with strong views, experience in both the public and private sectors, and a determination to ''represent'' the needs of my newly-created defense-dependent district. During my campaign I said I would seek a seat on the House Armed Services Committee, a request for which I received the strong support of my dear friend Les Aspin, the Committee's then-chairman and soon-to-be Secretary of Defense. Later, with the help of Democratic Leader RICHARD GEPHARDT, I was able to realize another goal: to serve on the Permanent

Select Committee on Intelligence, a committee, again, with relevance to my district's interests.

I call California's 36th District the ''aerospace capital of the world.'' In 1993, it was suffering from deep cuts in defense spending as a result of the end of the cold war. Unemployment was in double digits, particularly among skilled professionals, as defense firms cut back jobs and programs. The patriots who won the cold war were themselves out in the cold.

Helping to rebuild the local and regional economy was the greatest challenge I faced as the new representative. Given the staggering size of the federal deficit and urgent calls for spending on education, technology, health care and the environment, it was clear that we would not restore defense spending to the levels experienced during the height of the cold war.

Instead, we needed a two-prong strategy: first, to support core research and development and procurement priorities that would win the next war, and second, to help aerospace companies diversify into growing commercial sectors like advanced transportation, communications, green technologies, and medical research.

Many of the cutting-edge technologies were then, as now, developed in the 36th District. And, key to retaining this activity was our successful effort to keep the Los Angeles Air Force Base and its Space and Missile Systems Center headquartered in the South Bay. SMC spends over $5 billion a year to play and procure space systems for the Air Force and coordinates much of the defense R&D done by local firms.

In addition, I am proud to have been an advocate of weapons programs that meet our nation's future defense requirements—programs like the C–17 heavy airlift cargo plane, the B–2 stealth bomber, the FA–18 E/F, the MILSTAR satellite, and others which enhanced our armed forces' warfighting capability.

We also recognized that diversification of the industrial base was essential to coping with the vicissitudes of the budget cycles, and assuring that human and plant resources would be there should we need to convert to defense use again.

The recent economic turnabout suggests we made the right decisions.

We helped commercialize defense technologies through programs like the Technology Reinvestment Program—TRP. In fact, the first TRP grant was awarded to a Torrance firm named Hi-Shear Technology, which used rocket technology to power a miniaturized ''jaws of life.'' That product would later be used to rescue individuals trapped in the debris of the Oklahoma City federal building bombing.

Developing such ''dual use'' technologies not only revolutionized the local economy, but also brought to the marketplace advances that have benefitted the nation as a whole. Direct satellite television, for example, was spawned by defense contractors like Hughes, one of my corporate constituents in El Segundo. Another constituent, Allied Signal, has utilized defense technologies to develop and manufacture ultra-low emission, low-cost electrical generators.

Northrop Grumman has developed the lightweight, fuel efficient Advanced Technology Transit Bus (ATTB). And, of course, the Western Regional Law Enforcement and Technology Center, sited at my request in El Segundo, identifies technologies that can be, and have been, applied by law enforcement agencies nationwide to solving crimes.

Technological advances associated with defense satellites have also found commercial applications. TRW has designed and launched a number of NASA satellites that have helped map our globe, discover valuable resources, anticipate climatic changes, identify weather patterns, and improve our communication capabilities worldwide.

Commercialization was augmented by policies that capitalized on the South Bay's position as a gateway to the economies of the Pacific Rim and Southern Hemisphere. Trade is responsible for an estimated 6.3% of the LA basin's economy, compared to half that level in 1980. And, according to a recent study by the US Department of Commerce, the region experienced a 22.1% growth in exports between 1993 and 1996. In 1996 alone, the LA-Long Beach metropolitan region exported $24.4 billion in merchandise. Exports to Canada grew by 39% and to Mexico by 36%.

In the 36th Congressional District, the percentage of annual trade-related growth is high and many thousands of jobs—including thousands of union jobs—are associated with both the manufacturing of goods for export and the movement of goods through the Port of LA, Los Angeles International Airport and the nearby Port of Long Beach.

The prospect for increased growth with our Asian trading partners remain positive and South and Central America are expected to become an increasingly important part of the burgeoning world trade picture. Los Angeles is making significant capital investments in its port infrastructure, including the Alameda Corridor, in order to meet future demand growth—investments I helped secure in partnership with local, state and the federal governments.

Given the importance of trade to the local South Bay and LA economies, it was only natural for my constituents to expect a strong advocate in Washington. I have tried to be that advocate. I voted for GATT, voted twice to continue most-favored-nation trade status for the People's Republic of China, and voted for innumerable trade and tax law changes and other policies that enhance our competitive position in the world. More recently, over the understandable concerns of some of my constituents, I voted for the measure granting the President fast track consideration of trade agreements he negotiates with our foreign trading partners.

Unemployment in the South Bay is now 5.3 percent and declining. The number of jobs is expected to continue to grow, showing a 17% increase between 1993, when the worst of the aerospace industry's downsizing hit the area, and 2005.

Thus, I am most proud of my role in helping diversify and commercialize defense technologies, which has offset the loss of jobs in the defense sector.

My memberships on the House National Security Committee and the Select Permanent Committee on Intelligence also afforded me opportunities to shape defense policies in anticipation of our nation's security requirements for the 21st century. My focus on defense reform initiatives and the revolution in military affairs has been both interesting intellectually and challenging to implement. I believe more focus is needed on the long-term consequences of some of the policy and budget proposals considered by Congress. The two-year election cycle in the House and the annual appropriations cycle discourage forward thinking, with serious downside consequences.

I believe the urge among some of my House colleagues to re-segregate by gender basic training in the military is particularly short-sighted, as it is unwarranted. Not only do such proposals victimize women and us an opportunity to use our full potential to serve our country in the Armed Forces, they also jeopardize military readiness by micromanaging decision about training which should properly be made by the military services. In my view, what is driving the debate in Congress is not an appreciation for future readiness needs, but an outdated paternalism.

In fact, one of the disappointments during my tenure in Congress has been the increasingly successful efforts to roll back Constitutionally-protected rights, particularly reproductive rights.

Nineteen-ninety-three has been dubbed the ''year of the woman'' following the 1992 elections, and the 103rd Congress passed a number of significant measures affecting women and families. The first bill signed into law by President Clinton was the Family and Medical Leave Act. I cosponsored it, voted for it, and was thrilled to be part of that landmark event.

We also reversed a number of bans on funding for abortions, particularly for indigent women who previously had been denied their Constitutional right to choose because of their inability to pay.

The 104th and 105th Congresses have, in contrast, been the most anti-choice Congresses since the Supreme Court's 1972 Roe versus Wade decision. In the last four years, Congress has taken 98 votes on choice-related issues. Abortion opponents have won 82 of them—84 percent. Hopefully, the trend will soon be reversed.

The other major disappointment during my tenure has been the deteriorating tone of debate in the House and the increased partisanship that characterizes consideration of nearly every issue. Last year's balanced budget bill was an exception—but an increasingly rare exception.

Our last major debate on one of the House's few enumerated responsibilities under the Constitution—initiating an impeachment inquiry of the president—was particularly saddening. Sitting on the House floor for the entire proceeding, the sense of gleefulness I sensed from some of my colleagues was particuarly misplaced.

I fear that Congress' ability to address the major issues of the nation is in serious decline. Rather than seeking accommodation between legitimate yet differing views and ideologies, some in this institution—still a minority—have sought to drive even greater wedges between people—wedges to the detriment of the nation and this institution. Partisanship has replaced policy as the focus of attention.

In combination with this Congress' failure to fix a broken campaign finance system, good and decent people will be discouraged from running for office, especially if future Congress' are believed to be as unproductive as this one.

Lack of program also wastes the dedication and hard work of so many Members and staff

who currently serve. Indeed, the House is an institution that works best because of the personal relationship it is built on. And, I have been blessed because of the many friends I have made here—friends from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, my favorite rhetorical question is to ask why a middle-aged mother of four would run for Congress. My answer: to add something.

During my six years, I believe I have added something. To be sure, I would have liked to accomplish more and to have generated more bipartisanship. I often say that life has many chapters and, as one closes, another opens—sometimes unexpectedly, even serendipitously.

I want to thank all my colleagues who have made my tenure here exciting and rewarding. From the two speakers under whom I've served, Tom Foley and NEWT GINGRICH, to my many colleagues past and present on the committees on which I've served, to those I have met through the variety of ad hoc caucuses and coalitions that arise during the course of governing—thank you all. To my superb staff, you demonstrate everyday what public service is all about. To my family and especially my husband, Sidney, you are, in every way, the wind beneath my wings.

Serving here has been a labor of love. And I thank the citizens of California's 36th Congressional District for the extraordinary opportunity to represent you.

SAUDI GOVERNMENT ATTEMPTING TO CHEAT AMERICAN COMPANY FOR JOB WELL DONE

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 14 years after the successful completion of the Yanuba Power and Desalination plant in Saudi Arabia, New Jersey-based Hill International is still fighting for payment for the work done by its former subsidiary Gibbs and Hill.

As many of my colleagues know, historically, U.S. firms have had difficulty collecting payment from the Saudi government for work done in Saudi Arabia.

It got so bad that, in 1993, Congress ordered the Department of Defense to investigate the claims and report on all outstanding billings. Of all the claims identified by former Secretary of Defense Les Aspin, only one, the Gibbs and Hill claim, remains unpaid.

Mr. Speaker, nobody in Saudi Arabia claims that the work done by Gibbs and Hill was inadequate nor was it incomplete. In fact, the Saudi government points with pride to the plant. They just do not want to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, both the House and the Senate have passed my legislation requiring the Department of State, Commerce, and Defense to aggressively pursue a resolution with the Saudi government and report back to Congress. Recently, Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Ambassador Martin Indyk, assured me and the full Committee on International Relations he will aggressively press this. The time has long come to pay this bill.

In 1993 the Saudis promised Secretary Aspen that they would "spare no efforts in resolving these additional claims in a fair and expeditious manner." Many here in Congress have worked hard to get the Saudis to make good on their promise. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, I have raised the issue of unpaid bills to every appropriate member of the Clinton Administration at the State Department and DOD. I've spoken with our Ambassador in Saudi Arabia, Wyche Fowler. And my colleagues and I have pushed this issue directly with Saudi officials, including Saudi Ambassador Prince Bandar.

Yet, the bill still goes unpaid.

I hope that will be enough. It is time the Saudis get the message, not just from Congress, but from the Clinton Administration as well, We will not sit idle as the Saudi government tries to cheat an American company for a job well done.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2204. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2364. An act to reauthorize and make reforms to programs authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.''

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

□ 1930

URGING CONGRESS TO COMPLETE LEGISLATION ON DISASTER RELIEF, TRADE POLICIES, AND TAX ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS BEFORE CONCLUDING SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight as we are hopefully concluding this legislative congressional session in hopes that before we return to our respective districts at home, that we make certain that certain business before this Congress is concluded.

We have all been made aware over the last several months, really over the last year, about how serious of a problem American agriculture faces as our farmers, because of significant reductions in commodity prices, but also because of weather and disease, have fared so poorly in 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in these final days of this session, as we try to find the solutions to our problems and reach the compromises that we desire and that are reasonably acceptable to a majority of Members of Congress, we do not lose sight of the crisis that American farmers and ranchers face.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that before we return home and the final gavel of this session reaches the desktop, that we make certain that the disaster relief bill, at least a version of what we have previously passed by this House and the Senate, although vetoed by the President, I hope that we get disaster relief passed and included in that final appropriation bill.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we have passed legislation which helps open markets around the world. The Agricultural Trade Embargo Act, offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), has passed this House. As I talked to the farmers across my district, it is clear they understand the importance of exports, exports, exports, and trade, trade, trade.

When my farmers and ranchers hear that 52 percent of the people in this world live in countries that we cannot sell to, that they cannot sell to, they know that Congress and the President have failed in their responsibilities.

Under the current farm bill, we have told American agriculture to farm the markets. We have told American agriculture to go out and find the countries to sell to, and to sell the commodities that the world demands. Yet, this Congress and this administration have failed to open those markets and make them available to the farmers and ranchers across this country.

So I encourage the inclusion of significant changes in the law that prohibit future embargoes and sanctions, and also that repeal the embargoes and sanctions that are currently on the books, where appropriate.

I hope that we take care of disaster relief, I hope we do something for trade sanctions and embargoes, and in addition, I hope that we do not leave the issue of taxes and the farmer and rancher and small businessman and woman and oil producer unattended before we conclude this session. Clearly we need help when it comes to the tax burdens faced by our farmers and ranchers.

So again, disaster assistance, trade embargoes, and tax relief are important. Finally, I would encourage, once again, the administration to use the export enhancement program. For almost 2 years now, I have begged, pleaded, encouraged, demanded, insisted, requested, without any success, that this administration utilize the Export Enhancement Program that, at least in