

Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams

Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

Yates
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOES—133

Allard
Archer
Army
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dorman
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Everett
Fowler
Galegaly
GeKas
Goodiatte
Goodling

Grams
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Laughlin
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Lloyd
Lucas
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica

Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Ramstad
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stearns
Stenholm
Stamp
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Zeliff

NOT VOTING—13

Blackwell
Frost
Gallo
Gilman
Gingrich

Rangel
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Slattery

□ 1638

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 2866, HEAD-WATERS FOREST ACT

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 2866, the Clerk be authorized to correct the table of contents, section numbers, punctuation, citations, and cross references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill.
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STUPAK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?
There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2866, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?
There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT TO H.R. 3171, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1994

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be permitted to file a supplemental report to the bill (H.R. 3171) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?
There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4539, TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-736) on the resolution (H.Res. 537) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 4539) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VACATING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the 5-minute special order for today granted to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?
There was no objection.

□ 1010

MINORITY WHIP BLACKMAILING PRESIDENT

(Mr. DEFRAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)
Mr. DEFRAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today, page A21, Washington Post, "Clinton Warned on Trade Measure." "House Minority Whip Gingrich said he told Clinton, you have a chance to get

GATT, you have no chance to get health care, you need to choose what you want to get done."

So now we have lowered ourselves, or the minority, to blackmailing the President of the United States and saying if you go forward with health care, we will kill GATT.

Now, either you think GATT is good, or you do not. I do not. I think it is a big loser for the American economy, for working people in America, and for American sovereignty, and I am against it. And I think we need to improve the system of health care in this country. But it is pretty hard for me to see how the minority whip can say, "I am going to kill GATT if you try and do something on health care."

Now, either he believes in GATT, or he does not. One or the other. Or is he using it to blackmail the President of the United States for his own gain?

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post article is included for the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 21, 1994]
CLINTON WARNED ON TRADE MEASURE
(By Dana Priest)

Republican House and Senate leaders told President Clinton yesterday that trying to pass a last-minute health care bill would create what one called "a partisan reaction" in Congress and kill Republican support for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) legislation.

"I suggested strongly they could not pass a health bill in the House, but [they] have the opportunity to pass GATT. If they pursued health care much longer, they would kill both," House Minority Whip Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) said he told Clinton at a White House meeting with congressional leaders.

The Gingrich remarks came as 45 groups and other prominent supporters of comprehensive health care reform asked Senate Majority Leader George J. Mitchell (D-Maine) to abandon efforts to pass a modest reform bill this year because it "represents a step backwards for our members."

Mitchell said he would begin polling members to "evaluate the impact" of the Republican statements and the letter on any bill's prospects. "They make an already difficult task even more difficult," Mitchell said.

But even the authors of the modest bill being written by a "mainstream" bipartisan Senate group says it has virtually no chance of passing the Senate and House before this session's scheduled mid-October adjournment.

Rep. John D. Dingell (D-Mich.), chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, wrote to Clinton urging him to "give health care a decent burial. . . . It is time for us to accept the fact that the health insurance industry, an assortment of small and large freeloaders, ideologues and their allies in the Congress have succeeded in their goal: preserving a status quo in which they prosper while millions of Americans suffer."

The 45 groups that signed the letter to Mitchell said "it would be a grave mistake to bow to last minute pressure to pass any 'mainstream' health care legislation that is both unworkable and destined to cause real harm to millions of Americans."

The letter was signed by several unions, consumer groups, medical associations, senior citizen and church organizations including Citizen Action, Consumer Unions, the American Association of Retired Persons and the Unitarian Universalist Association.

At the White House meeting with leaders of both parties, Gingrich said, he told Clin-

ton, "You have a chance to get GATT, you have no chance to get health care, you need to choose what you want to get done." Trying to pass health care "would create a partisan reaction" in the House that would spill over to GATT, he said.

Asked whether his party would consider supporting even a modest health bill, Gingrich responded: "They are not going to get [Republican] cooperation. We don't want to participate in writing a 1,100-page bill at the last minute."

House Majority Whip David E. Bonior (D-Mich.), who has supported the administration's push for comprehensive health care reform and also attended the White House meeting, said Gingrich and Senate Minority Leader Robert J. Dole (R-Kan.) told Clinton, "That's the choice you have, health care or this GATT agreement. . . . I was taken aback by the fact they were so blatant about it."

Bonior said Vice President Gore then "expressed the need to do GATT, why it was so important." Gore, he added, "spoke in defense of GATT, as opposed to health care."

Mitchell, who took himself out of contention for the Supreme Court to help Clinton pass an insurance-for-all health care bill, has been trying to reach agreement with the mainstream group on a package of insurance market reforms and insurance subsidies for low-income people.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DAY THREE OF THE UNITED STATES OCCUPATION OF HAITI

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, September 21, 1994, day three of the United States occupation of Haiti. With each day that passes it is becoming clearer that the administration does not know quite what to do with the country they have occupied and none of the parties involved know what to do with the agreement that was signed on their behalf by Emile Jonassaint and Jimmy Carter on Sunday. Aristide will not publicly support the agreement because the military leadership does not have to physically leave Haiti. The Haitian military leaders will not leave their country period and have said they won't step down unless the Parliament passes an amnesty law. The Parliament hopes to pass an amnesty law but fears that they cannot get it past the Aristide supporters in the Haitian Senate. Haitians are beginning to wonder if the agreement meant anything at all because the United States has not acted to lift the embargo and sanctions, ostensibly because of the United Nations position. While all of the involved parties go about the business of trying to figure out what it all means to them, American soldiers are still on the ground in Haiti with no orders to

intervene in Haitian-to-Haitian unrest, no mission objective and no idea of when they will be allowed to go home.

Someone down at the White House better start thinking about the question so many of us asked over the last few months before events move too far to capitalize on the agreement made this past Sunday:

How do you move from intervention in Haiti to democracy in Haiti?

This noon I had a phone conversation with several members of the Haitian Chamber of Deputies in Haiti that I believe offers some hope for the future of Haiti. There is a group of 48 members in the Chamber of Deputies who months ago issued an invitation to both the House and the Senate to exchange delegations for discussion about a peaceful resolution to the situation in Haiti. They are still there and are still hard at work trying to right what's wrong with their country. If I were to offer any advice for the White House, I would say: Start talking to these people now. The parliamentarians are on the right track and have begun drawing together different segments of Haitians society—members of the Haitian Parliament, the churches and the business sector to build what they call the "the grand national consensus." Their aim is to balance the factions in Haiti concentrating on the center rather than on the two extremes of the military junta and the Aristide camp. Their efforts are based on the assumption that if there is to be any lasting change in Haiti, no one faction can have it all their own way. As Lawrence Pezzullo, former special adviser on Haiti, wrote today in a column in the New York Times:

The Haitian constitution of 1987, which balances executive power with parliament's—essential in a country with a long history of abusive strongmen—requires that the President build a working majority in the legislature. It was precisely father Aristide's estrangement from the elected Parliament, coupled with his chilly relationship with business leaders and the military that led to his overthrow in 1991 without a broader governing coalition and an operating majority in the Parliament. Father Aristide could face a repetition of the conflict that turned violent in 1991.

Only this time, American soldiers will be right in the thick of it. While American policy has tended to deal purely with the good guy-bad guy, Aristide-Cedras comparison, the time has come to examine what lies between these two extremes—a group of Haitians who simply want to bring longterm peace and prosperity to their beleaguered nation and are asking for our help in doing so.

As we have long said, there is a better way than the Clinton administration's policy in Haiti, and it is long overdue, but it is not too late to pursue it. We need to stop the embargo, as we have now promised we will do. We need to bring home the troops that are down there in an extra-hazardous situation for no apparent gain, or certainly for no justification, of the national secu-

city of our country. And we need to follow up on the gains that former President Carter, General Powell, and Senator NUNN meant by opening the door with negotiations.

When the President of the United States told the people of the United States last Thursday night that all efforts, all options, all possibilities, had been exhausted, that the only chance was invasion, he was clearly wrong. It is now time to admit it and get on with the negotiating with the people in an atmosphere that has been fighting us to do that. It is the right way. It is not too late yet, but we need to do it now.

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

[Mr. BACHUS of Alabama 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 Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□ 1650

ASK CONGRESSMAN LONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I report to this body the death of my predecessor in the Maryland's 2nd Congressional District seat, former Congressman Clarence Long. For 22 years, he served the people of Maryland's second district with respect and with dignity. When I ran for Doc Long's seat, my first promise was to continue the remarkable record of constituent service he had established.

This was not an easy task. After all, this was the man with the slogan, "If anything goes wrong, call Congressman Long."

This was the man who promised to "See anybody who is sober and not carrying a gun twice a day, at 11:45 a.m. or 4:45 p.m." And Congressman Long's office on wheels was a familiar sight in the district on Saturdays.

Even though I have held this seat for 10 years, my Towson office to this day receives an occasional call from constituents who remind us that Congressman Long helped them with a Social Security problem, or fixed a pothole on their street.

One of my more colorful encounters with a Doc Long constituent occurred during a phone call from a gentleman who insisted that my office track down the name of a company in Wyoming that sold buffalo jerky—beef jerky just