necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of Iraq.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 20, 1993.*

REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1991—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress (15 U.S.C. 714k), I transmit herewith the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1991.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 20, 1993.*

REPORT OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1990—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 13, Public Law 806, 80th Congress (15 U.S.C. 714k), I transmit herewith the report of the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1990.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 20, 1993.*

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. 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. 2519.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1994

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1305

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2519, with Mr. BROWN of California in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, July 1, 1993, the bill had been read through page 59, line 8.

Pending is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, as part of our continuing effort to cut Government waste, I am offering an amendment today to delete the funding for the Economic Development Administration. Just 3 weeks ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] made a point of order to strike $223 million for new EDA grants and loans. In other words, 3 weeks ago we got rid of the program of EDA. It seems only natural and appropriate we now get rid of the staff of the EDA.

The amendment that I am proposing would complete the job by cutting the additional $26 million in the bill for EDA's salaries and expenses. They have no program now. They do not need the salaries and expenses.

Mr. Chairman, during the campaign the President promised to increase investment through new public-private partnership. Good idea, in many cases, but I would caution the President to move carefully, because the EDA was such a public-private partnership. Its record is less than successful. Every group that has looked at this program, the inspector general, the Grace Commission, anybody that looks at Government waste, comes up with the EDA and tells us this is an absolutely awful program.

Over the past decade the EDA spent $2 billion in unauthorized appropriations. The inspector general found the EDA invested $27.5 million to create 86 jobs. That is $320,000 per job.

Another IG investigation found $82.5 million invested in 80 projects, almost half of which actually eliminated jobs. It has invested $800,000 on a golf course that washed away, $450,000 on a water tank that cannot be used, and $670,000 on a marina that is too large for the town to maintain, and on it goes.

The EDA was created in 1965 to help economically distressed rural areas. Originally enacted, 12 percent of the country qualified for EDA assistance. Today EDA's mission has been expanded to 90 percent of the country. We all know 90 percent of this country is not economically distressed; at least, not yet.

How did the EDA lose its focus? Unlike the popular community development block grants, the EDA picks and chooses its own projects. This makes it highly susceptible to pressure from Capitol Hill. This makes it extremely valuable to Members of Congress. The result has been an administration with a 28-year history of bad projects and ineffective assistance.

It is not all Member-directed pork. Sometimes it is just bad management. Let me give the Members an example from my own district. Manitou Springs is a small resort community known for its natural sparkling waters. It is the home of the Manitou Springs Bottling Plant. In the early 1980's an investor bought the property with an EDA loan. Then he defaulted on the loan. In 1989, after dragging their feet over an ownership dispute, the EDA formally took possession of the property. Then nothing happened. The EDA did not market the property. No property managers or real estate professionals were hired. The sign outside the property did not say "for sale," it said "keep out."

The EDA did not maintain the property. At one time the city had provided the EDA with a list of code violations. In fact, the fire department would not use the bridge going to the property because they did not want to lose their truck. As a result, the EDA did not sell the property. For most of the decade, the bottling plant sat unused and deteriorating. While Manitou went through a deep recession, one of the best properties in town was tied up, vacant, deteriorating.

This is not just a Colorado phenomenon. At one point over 40 percent of the businesses receiving loans from the EDA were in default; 40 percent, almost half, in default.

□ 1310

This is an agency that is supposed to promote economic growth, not deflate it.

Let us protect jobs. Let us save communities. Let us save money for the Federal Government at a time of a money crunch and tight times. Let us eliminate the EDA.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

At one time EDA had an appropriation of I believe $750 million. It was reduced very substantially perhaps several years ago down to where the Agency is primarily involved in getting projects up to the point where they can be financed locally.

Many local governments, for example, cannot float bonds until they have certain kinds of studies and certain kinds of other material on the record. I think EDA has done a good job of that. The ones available for public works grants projects have been greatly reduced.

The Agency also administers the repayment of loans that come back into the EDA. We would not have any

money at all even to administer the collection and repayment of those loans were it not for the salaries and expenses account that the gentleman proposes to strike. I think even if we were to completely eliminate the EDA programs, we could not strike the money that they need to administer the collection and the repayment of these old loan accounts.

I am opposed to striking this funding.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose any amendment by my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY]. He is a very close friend of mine, but I must oppose this amendment, because I think the gentleman is very much misguided on this point.

I represent one of those economically distressed areas of the country. I do not know what we would have done had it not been for the Economic Development Administration over the years. There just simply was no other place that a region like that can turn except to the Federal Government. The State of Kentucky, and I daresay most of the other States, do not have the kind of resources it takes to help a whole region lift itself up out of poverty and the lack of employment opportunities. The EDA has been the principal place, I daresay, for regions and communities to turn to for sewer projects, or water projects, or any number of other types of projects that would allow that community to lift itself up out of poverty, and I have seen it, time and time again, with hundreds of new jobs in our communities.

It is awfully easy if you represent an affluent area of the country, or a region of the country that does not need any external assistance, encouragement, or enticement to attract new industry, or to help an existing one expand, or to help a community that is otherwise helpless, with a sewer project or other enticements that produce jobs. But for many parts of this country, there is simply no other place to turn, Mr. Chairman, but to the EDA. I am sure that we can find here and there projects that were failures, projects that at first blush could be nitpicked. But there are dozens of good success stories for every single failure that one can point to. And I have to say that many of the projects that we are trying to help with EDA grants, are projects that cannot be financed in the private marketplace. You cannot get a loan, or you cannot get a grant from a private source to do these types of projects, because many of them are risky.

So I say we should not destroy the possibilities and the hope that these EDA grants bring to poverty-stricken areas, or even areas that need economic development that could not be called poverty stricken, Mr. Chairman. So I hope that we can reject the amendment, even though my friend is a great Member of Congress. I have to oppose him on this one because I do think, on this particular amendment, he is very much misguided.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, just one quick comment, and that is, I think it is just the other way around, maybe from the way the gentleman said it, in that I think you will find dozens of failures for every success. I am not saying that there are not successes—and there have been some successes with this. But I think if we look at the GAO report, the Grace Commission, any other study we want to look at that has studied this in an objective way, I think they will point out that there have been far more failures. And if we look over the years, for instance, at where the projects are, and it may just be an absolute coincidence that so many of them are in key Appropriations Committee Members' districts, and that a large number of them are in West Virginia. That may just be an accident, but I do not much think so.

Mr. ROGERS. Reclaiming my time, I cannot speak for all of the other Members on these projects, where they are, or what they have done, but I can tell Members a couple of mine in my own district. Our young people are moving away to other places seeking employment. There is no other choice for them. We educate them well, and then we ship off that tremendous talent to somewhere else that gains the benefits of it.

But we have seen, through EDA projects and grants, like in my home county of Wayne County, helping a company come in there called Avian Farms, providing 182 new jobs for people whose families now can live at home, rather than be shipped off to Ohio, Michigan, or perhaps Colorado or somewhere else. We have seen dozens of those projects.

So I hope we will not cut off this opportunity and this hope in a program that helps our people.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get agreement on a time limit on this amendment. Is 20 minutes enough, or do we need 30?

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think 20 minutes would be fine.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 20 minutes, with half of the time allocated to myself and half of the time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE].

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, my friend from Colorado thinks the program is moving backward, this country is backward. But in fact, what I think this amendment reminds me of, is the guy who got up one morning, put his shoes on backward and walked forward into the past. I think what we are doing, in fact, is going to move backward.

EDA is a forward program to help people and communities. Yes, there is some pork. But we are going to find pork in just about everything we do. There is nothing perfect in life. God knows that I am not perfect, but my wife is not ready to divorce me yet, at least I hope she is not.

But to dismantle this program only denigrates Government's responsibility to help people and communities in an insurmountable time of need. This is American tax dollars going back to those who have paid the taxes 100 percent.

It is always amazing to me those Members who will cut programs that go back to help people, to reduce the debt, will then support programs that will send our jobs out of the country to other nations of the world by supporting NAFTA, and supporting liberal trade agreements with Communist China.

EDA has helped millions who have been hit by natural disasters, by economic disasters because of jobs that have gone out of the country. They have helped so many in so many different instances, and right now, with the defense base closures, EDA has helped in my area by saving a steel mill, and it has helped in my area by saving an aluminum company.

I can remember when the Reagan-Bush administration tried as hard as they could to dismantle this program, and they put in a guy who fell flat on his face and failed. Then he went on to manage Ross Perot's Presidential campaign. So you know what that says.

But the people support this, and they want their money to stay at home. Defeat this amendment. It is a misguided amendment. We should support a Government that is for, of, and by the people. Keep our money at home, help our local communities, help our local industries, and get back the jobs that are going overseas. Again I think that is the way we are going to be able to balance the budget.

□ 1320

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hefley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that EDA has not been reauthorized since 1981, the fact is that sufficient support has resided in Congress to keep the program alive.

For fiscal year 1993, EDA received $244 million in appropriations, plus $27 million for salaries and expenses.

State-Justice-Commerce bill appropriates $223 million for fiscal year 1994.

EDA is the Federal Government's principal agency to handle base closure-defense conversion programs. Members who have military facilities in their districts that are subject to downsizing or closure ought to be aware that EDA can play a very constructive role to assist local communities and local businesses. Don't forget there will be a second round of the Base Closure Commission in 1995.

DOD has transferred $130 million to EDA for base closure-defense conversion programs. Money to be used for planning and project grants to minimize disruptions in affected communities.

EDA is also relied upon to provide assistance to areas devastated by natural disasters. Most recently, EDA provided $75 million in disaster relief assistance for Florida, Hurricane Andrew; Hawaii, Hurricane Inikea; Guam; and Kansas.

Critics of EDA are quick to point out projects funded by EDA that sprang from admittedly make-work jobs initiatives funded by Congress in the late 1970's and early 1980's. EDA projects today are funded on a cost-shared basis, the amount of cost-sharing is related to the degree of distress suffered by the local community. Projects are supported by local governments; EDA is no longer in the business of fully funding make-work projects.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the Hefley amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. RAMSTAD].

Mr. RAMSTAD. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Hefley amendment to kill the pork-riddled Economic Development Administration.

I strongly applaud my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY] for his point of order which struck over $200 million from the EDA.

But now we have to finish the job.

President Clinton, in his State of the Union Address, challenged us to come forward with specific spending cuts to reduce the deficit.

Here's one that should be on every Member's list.

The EDA is a program that simply will not die. Even though there has been a strong effort for 12 years to cut this wasteful program, Congress has continued to fund the EDA with unauthorized appropriations.

Today is our chance to finally terminate it once and for all.

This program embodies the law of bureaucratic behavior. It started with a noble intent—to provide assistance to economically distressed rural areas.

Then its programs were expanded dramatically—even though it had not demonstrated proficiency in its existing programs—to include development in 90 percent of the country. Clearly, 90 percent of the country is not impoverished, yet the EDA's turf continues to expand.

Mr. Chairman, we all believe in economic development.

But to continue draining funds from the jobs-creating private sector by running massive budget deficits hurts the economy and ultimately costs jobs.

Here's our chance to eliminate a very specific program, one that has long since outlived its usefulness and is only a drain on our economy.

Please join Citizens Against Government Waste and other taxpayers' groups in supporting the Hefley amendment and say "no" to the pork-barrel, deficit spending of the Economic Development Administration.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARLOW].

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

Mr. BARLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of EDA, and the area development districts.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hefley amendment to obliterate funding for the Economic Development Administration and the area development [AD] districts. In western and south-central Kentucky, the area development districts do an absolutely outstanding job of reaching into every county to help lift people up, to care for those in need, and to create infrastructure for jobs. The area development districts help small towns with water and sewer needs; they help fire and rescue organizations keep abreast of community needs; they help senior citizens with programs to serve their health and well being; they assist communities in developing industrial sites and businesses needing people with upgraded skills. These are just a few of the areas in which the AD districts work every day in my First Congressional District, and I strongly oppose this minority party attempt to set back the standard of living of the families of west and south-central Kentucky and to dash future hope for economic and community betterment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the logic of those who wish to abolish the Economic Development Administration. The EDA has a historic role in the pursuit of economic development and job creation in this country. Despite numerous attempts to undermine the program during the 1980's, the EDA has survived. It has survived because it works. It works for small businesses, entrepreneurs and local governments trying to foster real economic growth.

The EDA is a cost-effective means to spur the economy—local economies in particular.

The EDA is a small program. Yet, most of us in Congress understand its importance to be much greater than mere dollars. EDA programs often leverage additional economic development, in both the public and private sectors, in regions where the programs operate.

However, as we move into the 21st century, and as this country begins to deal with the structural changes of our economy, the EDA's purpose has broadened.

In California, a State which has an unemployment rate hovering at 10 percent despite a national economic recovery, the EDA has become the focal point—the organizer, if you will—of the Federal Government's efforts to turn the California economy around. President Clinton has begun an ambitious program of economic conversion. This program is essential in California, where a disproportionate portion of the military downsizing has occurred.

This program is bureaucratically complex with funding sources in the Department of Defense, Labor, HUD, as well as Commerce. Representatives of the EDA have visited California several times this year and are developing a program to simplify and quicken the administration's efforts in defense conversion.

In other areas dealing with economic development as well, EDA has taken a coordinator's role.

It is foolish to think about the relatively small savings that can be derived in the short run by eliminating the EDA. In the long run, the negative economic impact in community after community would vastly outweigh the small budget savings.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this attempt to delete $26 million in salaries and expenses from the Economic Development Administration. To me, this action would define the saying "Penny wise and pound foolish." Vote "no" on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI].

(Ms. MOLINARI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not one of the Members that you might expect to be here today defending the Economic Development Administration. I represent residents of Staten Island and Brooklyn, NY, hardly a rural area that the EDA caters to. My district is not part of an economic development district and since its creation, the EDA has done little work, if any, in my district.

Yet, today I am here to oppose the gentleman's amendment because the communities I represent and hundreds like them across the country now need the help of the EDA more than ever. When the Base Realignment and Closure Commission finished its work last month, communities from Charleston to Alameda started the road to economic conversion. The one agency that can truly help these communities is the EDA.

Mr. Chairman, the EDA is at the forefront of helping communities adjust to the economic

dislocations caused by defense cutbacks and the base closure process. The EDA has wide-ranging authority under title IX to provide comprehensive assistance to affected communities. Under grants already awarded, the EDA has funded proposals to: Establish loan funds to help small businesses reduce defense dependency, invest in physical infrastructure to enhance economic development opportunities, develop business incubator and training programs, and establish community strategy to deal with the cutbacks.

In fact, a recent report done by the Department of Defense suggested that EDA was the best qualified Government agency to oversee the planning and implementation of conversion efforts.

In my district, the closing of Naval Station, New York will mean the loss of 3,225 jobs. We will need help creating new jobs for these displaced workers and replacing their income in the community. We will need the help of the EDA.

On behalf of the hundreds of communities that will be affected by this most recent round of base closings and future rounds, I ask my colleagues to vote against the amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, the age-old dilemma has descended upon us; we know some of the good program intents of the EDA. Many of us have helped make them work back in our districts. But now comes the time, the other side of the dilemma, when the budget deficit is rearing its head to bite us all and to hurt our economy in the long run and to hurt our society as well while doing its worst on the economic situation in our country.

Which shall we do? We must in the final judgment come down on the side of reducing the budget deficit. Since the House has already spoken on the subject, I reluctantly, although I can speak eloquently about some of the work of the EDA in the past, I must come down on the side of fiscal sanity and vote consistently with the House to make sure no extra dollars are spent for these programs.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

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

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Chairman. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hefley amendment which will have the effect of closing down the Economic Development Agency.

The Economic Development Agency will channel a substantial amount of money into areas affected by base closings and will assist communities facing the economic dislocation as a result of these closings. In my congressional district, as a result of the closure of the Charleston Naval Base and Shipyard and other naval facilities, we will lose over 29,000 military and civilian jobs. We are facing the harsh reality of reshaping an economy long molded by the military presence there.

I do not think it wise or prudent at this time to shut down an agency which will play a major role in defense conversion.

We need the title IX "Special Economic Development and Adjustment Assistance," administered by the EDA, and I would urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing the Hefley amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA].

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, in this time of economic difficulty, how can we come to the floor to discuss yet another way to eliminate investment? The Economic Development Administration provides investment capital for community development and economic diversification, strategic planning and technical grants, and infrastructure projects, all with a tremendous record of success; in short helping the needy communities of this Nation to help themselves.

If we are to confront the economic distress being faced by too many American citizens, we must act in a timely fashion. The EDA is a perfect mechanism with which to do this. It offers its programs to urban and rural communities alike, in all regions of the country. We cannot continue to ignore such communities.

Let me illustrate EDA's potential with just one example from my district. Many communities are facing tremendous hardship due to the pending closure of a military base in their area. The Air Force has predicted that last month's closure of Wurtsmith Air Force Base will result in a loss of 50 percent of the population of Oscoda, MI. The Air Force economic analysis estimates an unemployment rate of approximately 27 percent after the closure of Wurtsmith. Now 27 percent unemployment may be acceptable to some Members of this body, but it is not to me.

The Michigan Department of Social Services has predicted that by 1995, one-third of all households in Iosco County will be receiving social program assistance due to this loss of jobs. In the case of Iosco County, a grant to improve water delivery to the area will generate jobs by attracting eight companies which have committed to the abandoned base if the infrastructure can support them.

The people of Iosco County cannot pay for such improvements themselves. They have come together in a regional effort, donating their time and energy to plan the base reuse project and recruit companies. But without help from EDA, they are lost.

Mr. Chairman, as a freshman Member of this body, I share the commitment of some of our colleagues to cut unnecessary spending. But there are those among us who promote a cutting frenzy for political gain, with no thought to the effect of their actions. We must have a responsible, and I emphasize here a responsible, budget policy.

All of us learn as children the old adage "pennywise and pound foolish." What we have here is an opportunity not to act this adage out. The return on such investments is immeasurable, not just in tax revenue and lower social program payments, but in pride, self-esteem and self-sufficiency.

In the case of the EDA, either we choose to help our people to help themsleves—to rebuild their communities and restore their children's future—or we will be forced to support them in their poverty through unemployment insurance and welfare, perhaps for generations.

I choose to afford dignity to economically struggling communities through agencies like EDA. Our colleagues must decide for themselves, Mr. Chairman, which they believe is the better alternative.

□ 1330

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment, which would have the effect of killing the Economic Development Administration.

Now, more than ever, we need the EDA, the one government agency whose resources are committed to what all of us should acknowledge is a matter of the highest priority—revitalizing our economy. How quickly we forget. Just last fall the phrase "it's the economy, stupid" was on all of our minds. And rightly so, for millions of Americans were unemployed not by choice, but by circumstance. Then—and now—there was and is a pressing need to get our economy moving in the right direction. Then—and now—it requires more than good will and best intentions.

The EDA gets a bum rap and I have to admit that most of it comes from well-intentioned if not well-informed Republicans.

For the past dozen years there has been a conscious effort by two administrations to eliminate all funding for EDA. The professionals in that agency, who day in and day out labor hard to make it work, have been handicapped in their efforts because of no support at the top. Despite that lack of support, EDA has managed, with a very limited budget, to finance worthy projects, projects that preserve existing jobs and promote new jobs, all over the country including in the district I represent.

This isn't just my pet theory, it is a fact. I serve now and have for a number of years on the Economic Development Subcommittee and have heard testimony from literally hundreds of expert witnesses about the good works of the EDA.

Has everything been perfect? By no means. There is always room for improvement in every agency and every phase of Government activity.

This amendment goes about our work in the wrong way. Rather than seek to improve that portion of the agency's work and approach which might need improving, it seeks to de-

stroy everything. Talk about throwing the baby out with the bathwater. At a time when vast areas of the Nation are hurting because of natural disasters and at a time when vast areas of the Nation are facing economic hardship because of significant cuts in defense and the military installations which support our national security, we should be focusing our efforts on how to strengthen and make more productive an agency whose mission all Americans applaud. Let's give EDA something it has not had in more than a decade, strong support and adequate resources and we will all be the better for it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, for several years I served as chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development and chaired the Investigations and Oversight Subcommittee that looked into—not just looked into, but rigorously investigated the way in which the EDA conducted its programs.

This is just one of several volumes of hearings we conducted in depth on the good things that the EDA accomplished in some of the problems that the program had that the Congress created by grandfathering in counties. The Congress so loved the EDA that it did not ever want to let go; Members did not ever want to let go of its eligible counties.

We devised a totally new program, indeed with the support and insight of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] who was so helpful on this and on the ARC, and with the former ranking member of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Hammerschmidt, and my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

We reshaped and rewrote this program, and three times it passed the House by votes of four to one, but it would never get through the Senate because the White House was always able to get a Senator to block the legislation from moving ahead.

We will deal with it this year. We will have a bill out that will mirror the legislation of the past, that will correct the problems in law, although the gentleman from Iowa in his appropriations legislation has done a great deal of reining in and limiting the way in which the EDA operates. I will not go into the details of how that program functions.

I just want to comment, though, and I am sorry the gentleman has left the floor, my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, who said of the EDA that it is a wasteful program.

It is easy to say when you represent an area like the silk stocking district around Minneapolis-St. Paul, where the per capita income per individual is about twice that of a household in my congressional district and that which the gentleman from Kentucky represents, where the EDA investments in infrastructure, in industrial parks, new businesses, created jobs, permanent jobs that are returning every year to the national economy $6 billion in taxes to Federal and State governments, three times what the Federal Government has invested in the EDA.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sound and solid investment in jobs for the future of America. Defeat the amendment.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, let me just close, if I might, with a few comments.

One of the speakers on the other side said that they do not understand the reasoning why we would want to cut the EDA. If you had listened to what I said at the outset, when you go down through it, it is not that the EDA or most of the other programs that we have talked about in here so much this year is an entirely evil program. It is just that it is a program that is unnecessary and that has a great deal of evil in it over the years.

Is it not interesting that the only study done of the EDA that anyone can find that says, yes, it is a pretty good thing, it needs to be revised, but it is a pretty good thing, is a study done by Congress. Congress does not want to give this up. This is a wonderful source of "take home the bacon" for the folks back home.

Let me just end by saying this. I gave the example of EDA jobs created. Now, in many of the programs they do not create jobs. They lose jobs, but in jobs they have created, it costs about $320,000 per job to create, $320,000 as opposed to if those jobs had been created in the private sector, if you took the money that is going to the EDA and you left it in the private sector and you let the private sector create the jobs, it averages about a $35,000 to $40,000 investment to create a job. That is not good fiscal sense.

Mr. Chairman, let us kill this thing once and for all.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment to strike funding for the Economic Development Administration [EDA] contained in H.R. 2520, the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill.

Since 1982, the last time the EDA was authorized, the House and Senate budget and Appropriations Committees have seen fit to keep EDA functioning by funding it in the absence of an authorization.

This body voted for those bills to continue EDA—for the past 12 years.

Since 1982, the House of Representatives has passed reauthorizing legislation for the EDA.

For 12 years—Members of this body have voted to reauthorize EDA.

With so much support over 12 years to continue the vital work of the EDA—why are we here today trying to delete funds for those public works—developmental opportunity—job-creating programs?

This Government has failed to invest in its infrastructure here at home for 12 years—while spending more than $300 billion a year on defense buildups. That is why we are here today, trying in this modest way, to continue funding the EDA.

In case you have not heard, we are downsizing the military. We are closing military bases. The cold war is over.

We are trying to plan for and to pay for defense conversion.

Our President has chosen EDA as one of the means, for use in moving defense conversion programs forward.

Let us help him.

What good are EDA programs; let me just cite a few in my district:

Just recently the Greenbrier Public Service District No. 1 was awarded an EDA grant of $686,000 to extend a public sewer to two vital businesses that, without this investment, would have moved their businesses out of our State. A significant number of jobs would have been lost had this occurred, and West Virginia cannot afford to lost jobs.

This past May, the Cowan Public Service District in Webster County was awarded an $890,000 EDA grant to make improvements to their public sewer system. Again, these improvements mean hope for an economically depressed county—making the area attractive to new business and creating jobs in the process.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. EDA funds help in West Virginia, but they help in other States as well. Let me just cite a few EDA successes elsewhere in the country:

In the past year in Philadelphia, EDA funds were used to rehab an older building, and then to create a revolving loan fund, which generated thousands of new jobs through business expansion;

In Chicago, EDA funds improved an obsolete infrastructure in Crawford Industrial District allowing them to retain 85 industrial firms, generate $40 million in new investments, and to retain 3,780 jobs.

In North Carolina, EDA funds were used last year to build a water system and industrial access roads creating 3,300 jobs—a new job for every $500 invested.

So you see, EDA funds are not just vital to West Virginia, but to the entire Nation, and these are just a very few examples of what EDA grants can do, if we leave them in this bill.

We are no longer under the Reagan administration who tried to repeal EDA for 8 long years.

We are no longer under the Bush administration, who tried to repeal EDA for 4 short years.

This is the Clinton administration, and he wants and needs to help displaced military personnel by using EDA as one of the Federal entities necessary to bring about defense conversion efforts.

EDA helps expand business and create jobs. We must create jobs for the hundreds of thousands of displaced military and civilian technicians who will be out of work as a result of base closings.

We need to expand business and create jobs for all other unemployed Americans who have been out of the job loop for too long.

Fund the Economic Development Administration now.

Defeat this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN].

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hefley amendment, which by deleting funds for the salaries and expenses would seal the fate of the EDA. I can assure you that I will fight throughout the remainder of this process to ensure that EDA funding is maintained.

How can we even consider abolishing the EDA, which serves as the central agency for technical and financial assistance to economically distressed areas. There is no other Federal agency with the flexibility to address the range of immediate to long-term economic problems, and the EDA does not promote top-down solutions. Rather it supports a grassroots network to focus on locally developed strategies and solutions. EDA offers comprehensive services—from planning grants and research activities, to technical assistance support, to public works project funding, to sudden and severe economic dislocation assistance. The EDA is in fact a one-stop shop for economic assistance.

I find it incredible that today, in this time of systemic economic transition for our Nation, we are debating an amendment to gut the funds for a program that offers successful solutions.

West Virginia felt the effects of economic dislocation over a decade ago. And the EDA has been a critical resource in our fight to turn the economy around. For example, in Barbour County, the EDA helped renovate a building that was headed for demolition. Today, 60 people are employed in that building—that is 60 jobs in an area where 60 jobs makes a difference. In Ohio County, the EDA helped create the Wheeling Oglebay Park Artisan Center where today 83 people sell West Virginia-produced glass. These examples only scratch the surface of the invaluable assistance that EDA has provided to my State.

To those of my colleagues familiar with EDA's work, I need only remind you of its importance. And to those of you unfamiliar with EDA, I would offer that as our economy continues to transition—and dislocation continues to be the unfortunate side effect—you, too, will depend on the Economic Development Administration.

Help your communities help themselves by continuing our commitment to EDA oppose the Hefley amendment.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that would delete funds for salaries and expenses of the Economic Development Administration.

The Economic Development Administration is recognized by many economic development practitioners, by State and local leaders and by many others at the grassroots, as having the most effective Federal program for economic development—a program that gets funds to the communities that need them.

Critics like to point out that 80 or 90 percent of the Nation's population live in areas eligible for the agency's assistance. However, they ignore the fact that EDA generally targets program funds to areas of high economic distress based on criteria such as excessively high unemployment rates and per capita income below the national average or that are experiencing long-term or sudden and severe job loss.

In the area of defense adjustment, EDA has for years played a key role in providing special economic development and adjustment assistance. Agency programs have helped many communities facing military base closures or major defense industry cutbacks plan strategies. In addition, these programs support major infrastructure investments for reusing bases and making the transition to a civilian-based economy. In recent years, $130 million in defense appropriations has been transferred to EDA for this activity. Secretary of Commerce Ronald Brown has stated that EDA is to be on the leading edge of further conversion activity.

EDA provides essential tools to urban and rural areas to help them make better use of their resources. Diversify their economic base and attract businesses that can retain and create long-term jobs and broaden an area's tax base.

The assistance provided helps to cure some of the economic ills and imbalances that exist among our States, communities, and regions. It bolsters the capacity of local areas, and the Nation as a whole, to meet the challenges of competition in global markets.

EDA's public works grants have been crucial for rehabilitating, repairing or constructing infrastructure that is the foundation for economic development and essential for the growth of industry and commerce.

Its planning grants have enabled distressed communities evaluate their economic potential and conceive strategies for long-term solutions. The research and technical assistance have resulted in many creative initiatives at the local and regional levels.

Mr. Chairman, for close to 28 years, the Economic Development Administration has offered vital resources to support and encourage local efforts to enhance economic growth.

Testimony of witnesses has consistently revealed that many of the benefits realized would not have otherwise been possible were it not for the programs of the Economic Development Administration.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to eliminate one of the best Federal programs available to help deal with the substantial economic problems facing our Nation.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment to strike funds for the Economic Development Administration.

Mr. HAMBURG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hefley amendment, which will strike funding for salaries and expenses at the Economic Development Administration.

The EDA is particularly important today as we struggle to adjust to profound changes in two major sectors of our economy: Our rural, resource-based economy, and our military economy. As such, EDA is particularly important to my largely rural district, where unemployment is currently as high as 14.5 percent.

Rather than talking about abstractions like agencies and dollar amounts, I want to focus for a moment on communities and people—the focus of the Economic Development Administration.

Point Arena is a town of roughly 400 people on the northern coast of California in my district. It is a community which depends on fishing and tourism and symbolizes the pioneer spirit in America. I would like to read from a letter sent to me earlier this year by Bill Pettigrew, harbormaster of Point Arena. He wrote:

> In January of 1983, an "El Nino"-generated storm sent waves into Arena Cove of such height that the pier at Arena Cove was totally destroyed. The result was the loss of a vibrant Salmon fishing port that had received up to 100,000 pounds of product a day. Stores in town failed and were boarded up. The timber industry was starting to downsize at the same time and Point Arena became a severely depressed economic area.
>
> The City of Point Arena joined forces with five different federal and state agencies in 1985 to rebuild the pier. With a two and a half million dollar investment, the pier re-opened in April 1987. The Economic Development Administration (EDA) was the single largest grantor with a commitment of $875,000.
>
> Following the "Grand Opening" in 1987, the once seasonal port has operated 'year-round,' creating many new jobs both in the Cove proper and downtown. Support facilities, stores, restaurants and private development have flourished. The fiscal year 1989-1990 saw Arena Cove become the nation's second largest port for receiving sea urchings with a total poundage exceeding 8.2 million pounds across the dock, 98% of this a United States export commodity going to Japan.

Mr. Pettigrew recently confided to me that,

> Without the EDA, Point Arena would not exist today. We could never have coordinated the various agencies or achieved the level of funding necessary without the EDA's assistance. They are professionals and good public servants.

EDA is not a pork-barrel agency doling out moneys to congressional districts.The regional economic development representative of the EDA helped Point Arena navigate the murky waters of conflicting bureaucracies. They ensured that planning grants, technical assistance, and economic adjustment programs, delivered maximum benefits to the community.

The example I cited from my district represents the everyday efforts of the EDA. It was nothing out of the ordinary.

EDA is also playing an increasingly vital role in defense conversion. The probable imminent closure of Mare Island Naval Shipyard has made me keenly aware of the desperate need of affected communities for the promise represented by the EDA. Now, before base closure, EDA planning grants can help the small cities of Fairfield, Napa, and Vacaville, plan for the conversion necessary to keep shipyard employees working in new jobs as the area's economy changes.

The end of the cold war demands fundamental conversion of our defense-based economy. EDA has 30 years of experience in helping communities transform their distressed economies. We cannot afford to give up such critical expertise at this juncture.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Hefley amendment. It is shortsighted and fails to recognize the importance of this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 300, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—122

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Billirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hobson
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—300

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Byrne
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Baker (LA)
Bevill
Conyers
Dornan
Falcomavaega (AS)
Frost
Hamburg
Henry
Hinchey
Horn
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Rostenkowski
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Valentine

□ 1357

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan for, with Mr. Tucker against.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY and Messrs. INGLIS of South Carolina, DEUTSCH, and RAVENEL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HALL of Texas, MCCOLLUM, and MCHUGH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained and missed the last vote on the Hefley amendment. I would like to note that if I were present, I would have voted against it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR: Page 59, after line 8, insert the following:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration, $22,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get some agreement on time for this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I would say that no more than 20 minutes would be sufficient.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Twenty minutes, ten minutes on each side?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Yes. We probably will not use all that time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would hope that there could be some time allotted to this side of the aisle on the question as we talk about limiting time. Would the gentleman be amenable to allocating a third of the time, whatever time is agreed to, to this side of the aisle?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], 10 minutes to myself, and 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be limited to 30 minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto, the time to be divided, 10 minutes apiece, among the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking minority member, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

□ 1400

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores to the Travel and Tourism Administration funding that was eliminated in the markup of the bill Not because the chairman is not in accord with the views, with the issues, the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, but because there was so much

pressure under the limited allocation his subcommittee had and the subcommittee was under extreme pressure to find reductions in all of its programs.

But since the bill has been on the floor, there have been a number of reductions in the overall programs under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, and there is certainly room to restore the funding level for the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration. This amendment will restore the funding to $500,000 below the authorized amount, $22 million. The authorization is at $22.5 million.

The travel program, tourism, is such an important generator of business for America and income to this country. Last year we had 44-plus million visitors to the United States from other countries. They spent well over $50 billion in the United States. That generated a balance of payments surplus of $16.5 billion in our favor. We did not have to send anybody overseas. We did not have to package anything except to market the idea among people of other countries to come visit America. They came, and we benefited by a $16.5 billion trade surplus.

Mr. Chairman, there are not very many sectors where we have that kind of balance of payments benefit. Usually we are in deficit. It certainly makes good sense to make this modest investment in encouraging people of other countries to come to the United States and spend their currency, their dollars, whatever their currency happens to be in our dollar terms, in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we ought to preserve the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration's ability to market America overseas, to attract people to this country. Tourism is clean, it is efficient, and it employs people to the tune of $90 billion in national payroll in this country. It virtually affects every community, small or large. It is a vital sector of our national economy. Tourism overall is a $320 billion sector of our national GDP. Most countries spend tenfold more than we do on tourism promotion. This is a modest investment in the future of American growth.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest to my very good friend from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] and to my colleagues and friends that will speak on behalf of this amendment that their allegiance to the tourism industry is misguided in this particular amendment, and remind them of the context of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, do you know in this bill we are cutting back on Drug Enforcement Administration agents? We are cutting back on FBI agents. Virtually every important priority that is included in this bill is being cut back. And what are we trying to do? Add money to the Travel and Tourism Administration.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subsidy to the major airlines and hotel chains. There is no evidence that this kind of federal expenditure is going to generate any more tourists. The thing that generates tourists from foreign countries into this country is the exchange rate between the U.S. dollar and foreign currencies and the promotions that are put on by the major airlines and by the hotel chains.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman's argument is right, then why does the Province of Ontario spend $36 million a year every year to attract Americans into Ontario? If you stop advertising, they stop coming. It is a sector that yields the revenue needed to generate the support for the other programs the gentleman is advocating.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would not suggest to the gentleman reasons why Ontario does whatever it does. The Canadian Government I do not think is necessarily a standard setter for frugality in many ways. But why people visit Ontario I suspect is because of the natural resources that are in the Province of Ontario, rather than any particular promotional program they might have.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a very, very strict budget that has been applied to every program within this appropriations bill. Here we are subsidizing industries that clearly do not need it and cannot compete with the kinds of priorities that are included in the rest of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I represent an area that benefits a great deal from tourism. But I also know that it is not going to benefit from tourism unless they have the hotels and motels, the restaurants, all the kinds of infrastructure, if you will, that accommodate new tourists.

What we are doing with this new program, because of the authorization that requires it to go into this cooperative marketing program, is we are trying to attract people to areas that do not have the hotels, that do not have the tourist accommodations to maximize the opportunity that tourism in those areas might provide. That is one of the reasons why we did not want to put so much money into this program so fast.

Mr. Chairman, to suggest that $22 million in travel and tourism to subsidize the large airlines and the hotel chains is more important than spending that $22 million on Border Patrol officers, on FBI agents, or on drug enforcement agents, seems to me is misplaced priorities.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to argue with the judgment of my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR], and I respect it a good deal. But within the context of this bill, if the gentleman would look at the rest of this bill, I think he would recognize that the subcommittee's priorities are in order and that we cannot afford this additional amount of money to go into USTTA.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I support the work of the USTTA. I support the U.S. Travel Tourist Administration. But let me explain why this amendment should not pass today.

As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] has said, our subcommittee only has 96 percent of the current services to spread for next year's spending amongst all the agencies that we have to deal with, including USTTA.

What we did was basically go to all agencies and say, "We are going to give you 95 percent of what you got last year for next year." We treated USTTA just like most all of the others. Only two or three agencies, as I recollect, got more than 95 percent.

□ 1410

So we gave 95 percent of their current services to USTTA, because the work they do is good for all of the States of the Union, not just two or three; all of them.

The Committee on Energy and Commerce, the authorizing committee, comes along and says, Mr. Chairman, "Appropriators, you cannot appropriate any money for the USTTA at all unless you include this new program that we want called the Cooperative Tourism Marketing Program, which will help two or three States on the Canadian border."

They said, "You can't appropriate, Congress, you can't appropriate any money at all for the whole United States' effort to promote tourism unless you say we can spend this money for our two or three States."

We said, no. We are going to give USTTA the same amount of money we are giving the other people in the Government, 95 percent of current services, just like everybody else. We do not have the money for a new program. It is just not there.

We are having to say no, no, no, no all across-the-board. USTTA is no different.

This amendment should add back to the bill, Mr. Chairman, after it was stricken on a point of order a couple of weeks ago. Now they come back and say, "We not only want 95 percent of the current services for next year. We want 41 percent more than 1993.

We put in the bill originally, $17,120,000. That was stricken. Now they come back and want $22 million, Mr. Chairman, for a new program.

How many new programs is this Congress going to be able to afford this year on any kind of initiative, especially a program that benefits just three or four States of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. I urge all Members to vote against it.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has sought to legislate here in violation of House rules tends to show the unwisdom of that practice on the part of that great committee. They say this is a new program. It is not a new program. It is 25 years old.

The hard fact is that what the Committee on Energy and Commerce and the House of Representatives did last year was to say to it that 25 percent of the money was going to go to the States for purposes of funding tourism promotions by the States and through the States. That is why.

What the issue here is, is the Committee on Appropriations going to change the program on which the Congress voted overwhelmingly to change an unworkable program into one which now works?

The Committee on Appropriations intends and tries here to continue the old unworkable ways where we have a bunch of bureaucrats sitting around in offices around the world doing nothing. What we need to do is, if we are going to have tourism in this country, is to have an aggressive program of promoting and bringing forward tourists to come to the United States.

What my good friend from Iowa would do is to legislate. What we are seeking to do is simply have the law as it now is applied, without changes by our dear friends on the Committee on Appropriations.

The hard fact is, there are no fiscal issues raised by the amendment. It is well within the authorization level. It is also within the budget allocation levels.

It is supported by the agency itself, by OMB and by Members on both sides of the aisle.

I have here a letter signed by Leon Panetta which says,

> The administration supports the provision enacted in the Tourism Policy and Export Promotion Act of 1992 requiring that no less than 25 percent of funds appropriated to USTTA be allocated to Cooperative Tourism Marketing Program grants and believes the Oberstar amendment is necessary to carry out that provision. Accordingly, the administration has no objection to the Oberstar amendment.

I urge my colleagues to reject this attempt by the Committee on Appropriations to legislate and get on with the program which was overwhelmingly supported by the House and by the Senate.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on this particular amendment. I must say, I am persuaded by the proponents of the amendment.

I listened very carefully to the author of the amendment, our friend from Minnesota, and I agree that this is a wise investment.

When we read the amendment and we see what it does, we see that it is really going to provide jobs in the area of tourism.

Now, tourism is the second largest job producer in just about every State in the Union. What this bill will do will be to match funds with State and local tourism agencies.

I have looked at what goes on in this area, and I find that foreign visitors last year spent $16 billion in this country, $16 billion. So we really have a trade surplus in this area.

Why is that? Because if we have tourists coming here and buying something, it is like shipping it overseas. That is why we have this huge surplus.

Every single State is going to benefit economically by this amendment. America is a big country, and people overseas want to come and visit America. But they do not know much about various sectors of America, because they are always zeroed in on two or three areas.

What this bill is going to do, it is going to explain what America is like, all of America, not just one or two or three areas.

We had 44 million visitors here in America last year from overseas, spending some $71 billion. And some $16 billion, as I mentioned before, more in this country than we spent overseas. That is why we have a $16 billion surplus in this area.

This money will go to create jobs in a sector where jobs really are needed, the service sector.

As far as who is going to benefit, we know no States will benefit more than the State of Iowa and Kentucky. I mean, people are going to be reading about Kentucky.

People overseas want to know about the Kentucky Derby and what goes in Kentucky. People overseas want to know what goes on in rural America. That is where Iowa is at the head of the list. Look what is going on along the Mississippi now.

I think we want foreign visitors to come to that area. This is precisely what this amendment is going to do.

It is hard to persuade me to vote on some of these amendments, but this particular amendment is really a good investment. This is a jobs amendment. That is why I think this is a good amendment and one that I hope that the Congress and the Members here will give real consideration to and vote for.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Procurement, Taxation and Tourism of the Committee on Small Business, we had a hearing yesterday in Alexandria, LA. Let me tell the gentleman from Alexandria, VA, that that little town has hotels and has tourist accommodations, but they need help in rural America.

I come from a large urban center in Las Vegas, NV. We get our message out very loud and clear. But little rural America needs help. They need people to help them to promote their message in their areas.

The program that has been expounded by the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce is very, very important, because it gives help from USTTA, funds to match their funds to promote rural America.

When a foreign tourist comes to this country, he spends 6 times what an American tourist does in going to those communities. It is not rechanneling American dollars. It is rechanneling money from Europe into our economy. We have a great balance of surplus on tourism.

We have got to promote that. I am standing, telling the Members now, if we spend $3 million more we will bring in tens of millions of dollars to our economy from this tourism being spent here.

I will tell the Members, people out there are asking for help from rural America. They want this program. They need this program. They need the Members' help. Believe me, this Congress should not be penny-wise and pound-foolish, because let me tell the Members, we need this program. I commend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] for proposing it. We need it for USTTA, we need it for rural America, we need it for America as a whole to create jobs and get this country moving again.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, this is new money. We gave USTTA 95 percent of current services in our bill. Then it was stricken on a point of order. Now they come back wanting $22 million, which is a 41 percent increase over what we gave them. We simply do not have the money.

Bear this in mind, if we vote for this amendment we are giving money to the Tourist and Travel Administration that we are taking away from the FBI, the DEA, modernization of the Weather Service, that we could not afford; the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Border Patrol and the protection of our borders. That is where the money is coming from, if the Members approve this increase, this new money for a new program for the U.S. Travel and Tourist Administration. Bear in mind, the money has to come from someplace in the bill. It is coming from the places where it should not come, and that is the law enforcement agencies of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask how much time remains.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, let us bring a sense of reality back here. We are not going to have just a cutback in some of these other agencies. We are having cutbacks all over in education and health care. If we want to attack those issues, let us attack those issues. However, if we want to generate the taxes that help us pay for all of these in the first place, whether it is FBI agents, drug . ents, or travel agents, then we have to have the jobs generated to generate the taxes that give us the revenue to enable us to do this.

One of the whole ideas of job stimulation has been to make an investment. If we cannot do that with Federal dollars, what are we here for? The State of Hawaii alone spends more than $22 million on its travel and promotion program, in addition to everything that we do with hotels and with airlines and with other travel agencies and instrumentalities, we spend more, alone.

What we are asking for from the entire country is a mere $22 million to invest in all the rest. Hawaii is not hurting in that respect in terms of promotion. Las Vegas is not hurting in respect of promotion. On the contrary, we stand here telling the Members, the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] and the gentleman from Hawaii, saying, "We know how to promote tourism. That promotes jobs, that promotes tax revenues." What we want to do is help share this with the rest of the Nation, so all of the other States, rural and urban areas alike, benefit from it.

We want to go to the context of this in terms of promotion because that is what is going to help generate it in every State, in all the 50 States, everyone benefits. Tourism is the No. 1 industry in 13 States. It is one, two, or three in 37 States out of the 50 States in America.

I urge all of us to pass favorably on this amendment so all Americans can benefit. This is an investment in America. Vote "aye."

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers, but before yielding back our time, I just want to clarify an inadvertent mistaken impression that may have been created. This program is indeed authorized. The Office of Management and Budget indicates clearly, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] said, that the administration believes the Oberstar amendment is necessary to carry out the Cooperative Tourism Marketing Program, and has no objection to the amendment.

That is rare, to get that kind of support from the Office of Management and Budget, and it indicates this program is important. I think the President clearly understands the significance of tourism. He supported tourism as the Governor of Arkansas, and he supports it very strongly as President of the United States.

The evidence is replete that until we had a really aggressive USTTA program, we did not break the sound barrier on balance of payments. We have done so, and the Cooperative Marketing Program will carry us further. Every other country in the world markets its values abroad. This is not like "Field of Dreams," "Build it and they will come." We have built America. We have to tell people about America and what they need to see here, so we can generate that positive balance of payments, $16-plus million last year.

Vote for this amendment. Vote to sustain America's momentum in travel and tourism.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

The gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] has made the argument better than I could. Hawaii alone spends $22 million or more per year on tourism. Yet, the Energy and Commerce Committee, when they reauthorized this program last year, added $5 million for competitive grants to the States. Why do we need $5 million for 50 States if one State spends more than $22 million? That shows how insignificant this whole program is.

Some years ago the Secretary of Commerce was a fellow by the name of C.R. Smith who had been President of American Airlines. We asked him at the time he left office, we said to him, "What do you want to tell us about the Travel Service?" He said, "I will tell you this," and we were spending only a few million at that time, he said, "either spend $100 million or stop the program. You are not doing any good with a trivial amount of a few million." That was more than 15 years ago. Now we are talking about $17 million or $15 million or $22 million for the USTTA.

This committee visited Denmark a few years ago. They had a great travel promotion program over there, they said. We found out what happened. Almost all of the airline tickets to the United States had been sold in a 30-day period when the hotels and airlines had a special.

What we have here is this. Last year when the Energy and Commerce Committee authorized this program again, a new provision was added. Instead of just being a legislative provisions, they in affect included an appropriation in their authorizing bill. They said, "You have to spend 25 percent of this money for this new program." This had the effect of appropriating on a legislative bill, 25 percent of the money.

To get the 25 percent, what do we have to do? We increase the amount of money they got from $15.6 million last year up to $22 million, to pay for this new program, so more Governors can get on nationwide TV through their favorite advertising agency, advertising themselves, and the mountains in the background, or whatever it may be. This is a new program that they have added to this agency. They in effect appropriated the money right up front in the authorizing legislation to take care of it.

The gentleman's amendment would provide a 41 percent increase over last year's level. We do not have any 41 percent increase in this bill for other programs. It does not come out of thin air. We have to get the money someplace. Where do we get the money? Here are some of the things Members wrote to us that they wanted, that were not in the budget. We tried to squeeze a little here and there and put these funds in. Here are some of these programs:

The non-point pollution program, we had a whole raft of letters on that;

Aquaculture;

Marine sanctuaries. Do the Members want to take some more money out of marine sanctuaries? We will have to take it out of somewhere if we add 41 percent for this agency.

Fisheries research? I will tell the Members, there are five salmon commissions. I did not know before I came to Congress that there was more than one kind of salmon. There are several kinds of salmon.

We have salmon commissions and other kinds of commissions. Everybody wants some of this money.

Zebra mussels? We do not have enough money in here for zebra mussel research, I will say that up front, even though we increased the amount of money requested by the administration. Zebra mussels are a serious problem.

Do we want to take the money out of the Sea Grants Program? The Sea Grant Program is a great favorite among many Members. We have a list this long of Members and States wanting a Sea Grant Program increase.

□ 1430

We could take these funds out of the Sea Grant Program if you want to. This funding does not come out of thin air.

So what we have here is a 41-percent increase being requested for one program that is dubious as to whether it works or not. But even if it does, we would not want a 41-percent increase in this program.

I say vote "no" on the Oberstar amendment.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, Mr. OBERSTAR, to fund the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration at $22 million next year. I also comment Mr. ROTH for his commitment to this issue.

Visitors love the United States and they show it by coming in ever greater numbers. Moreover Mr. Chairman, visitors show it in the dollars they spend, the sales tax they pay, and the jobs their visits provide.

Tourism is an important industry in this country. Last year it brought in $16 billion more in revenue to the United States than U.S. citizens spend abroad. In 1990, 1.3 billion

tourists spend $295 billion in cities and towns across this country.

The Federal agency primarily responsible for assisting the American tourism industry is the Travel and Tourism Administration. This agency works with the Secretary of Commerce in formulating policies to assist the tourism industry in this country be the winner it is today.

And more importantly, that success translates into 5 million American jobs which are directly tied to the tourism industry.

Some might say that this $22 million is wasteful spending. On the contrary, we cannot afford not to spend this money. Tourism has a substantial, measurable, and sustainable impact on our economy. If this amendment does not pass, we will be pulling the rug from under the feet of an industry that depends greatly on the resources and assistance provided by the Travel and Tourism Administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 263, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—158

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Bateman
Becerra
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
Deal
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Faleomavaega (AS)
Farr
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilman
Green
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings
Hayes
Hilliard
Hochbrueckner
Houghton
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kennedy
Kildee
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
LaRocco
Lehman
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Meyers
Mineta
Mink
Moorhead
Murphy
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reynolds
Richardson
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Roth
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shepherd
Shuster
Skelton
Slaughter
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Vucanovich
Washington
Waters
Wheat
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Zeliff

NOES—263

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilirakis
Billey
Boehner
Bonilla
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Darden
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Emerson
English (AZ)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lantos
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Manzullo
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Menendez
Miume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Royce
Santorum
Sarpalius
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thornton
Thurman
Torricelli
Unsoeld
Valentine
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walker
Walsh
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Bonior
Brown (FL)
Conyers
de Lugo (VI)
Dornan
Edwards (CA)
Frost
Gutierrez
Hamburg
Henry
Hinchey
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tauzin
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Yates

□ 1450

Messrs. ORTIZ, CLAY, LEVY, and ROWLAND changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. STEARNS, BARCIA of Michigan, and TORKILDSEN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, including expenses authorized by the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended; representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties, ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, or specific Acts of Congress; acquisition by exchange or purchase of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343, 40 U.S.C. 481(c) and 22 U.S.C. 2674; $1,612,206,000, and in addition not to exceed $665,000 in registration fees collected pursuant to section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, may be used in accordance with section 45 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, 22 U.S.C. 2717, and in addition not to exceed $1,185,000 shall be derived from fees from other executive agencies for lease or use of facilities located at the International Center in accordance with section 4 of the International Center Act (Public Law 90-553, as amended by section 120 of Public Law 101-246), and in addition not to exceed $15,000 shall be derived from reimbursements, surcharges, and fees for use of Blair House facilities in accordance with section 46 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2718(a)).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGLISH OF OKLAHOMA

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma: Page 59, line 23, strike "$1,612,206,000" and insert "$1,512,206,000".

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, in a hearing held by the Government Operations Subcommittee on Legislation and National Security on Tuesday it was revealed by the General Accounting Office and the State Department's inspector general that the State Department was losing hundreds of millions of dollars due to inadequate and sloppy financial and management systems, as well as the lack of administrative controls in its overseas operations.

The GAO has been reporting on these same management problems at the State Department for over 30 years. For these past 30 years the State Department has continually said they

would get this situation under control. However, the Government Operations Committee, year in and year out, finds itself in the position of looking into continuing waste, fraud, and abuse in this area.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress is often accused of micromanaging the affairs of various agencies. I, for one, do not condone this practice except when serious circumstances dictate. This is certainly one such circumstance.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to give you examples of a few of the problems we have run into.

As I mentioned, the General Accounting Office has been reporting on the State Department and the same mismanagement problems for over 30 years.

We recently sent out a management questionnaire to 104 embassies and received an 80-percent return. Now, these questionnaires, as well as other investigations carried out by the inspector general, showed that 80 percent of the embassies surveyed showed staffing gaps that impacted on the daily operations and budgeting, contracting, procurement, and other such items.

We also found in the area of training that 53 percent of the information systems security officers have not received the formal training in managing an automated, unclassified information security system.

In addition, in the financial management area we found that on-third of the responding embassies reported dissatisfaction with the ability of financial management systems to provide timely information necessary for making operational and management decisions.

In fact, State first reported that its financial systems had a material weakness under the Financial Integrity Act process. They said corrective action may come—may come, Mr. Chairman—in 1999, 16 years after this problem was first reported.

Mr. Chairman, in the procurement and contracting area, 39 percent of the embassies responding to the GAO survey reported that they did not have the competition advocacy program, 30 percent did not have State's worldwide procurement database installed and in operation, and 39 percent had not developed an acquisition plan for the fiscal year 1992.

In the real-property management area, an estimated worth of overseas real estate and construction is somewhere in the neighborhood of between $8 billion and $10 billion. Of that property, 30 percent of the embassies acknowledged that they have not conducted the recommended annual condition surveys of all Government-owned and long-term-leased facilities. Ten percent indicated that they did not have a preventive maintenance program.

Most of the 80 embassies answering the survey said that they had not prepared an annual inspection summary report, which is a recommended tool for developing long-range maintenance objectives and budget requirements.

In the housing area, Mr. Chairman, 88 percent of the embassies responding to the surveys reported that some housing units at their embassies exceeded—exceeded, Mr. Chairman—State's 1991 residential housing space standards. Sixty-one percent reported that 10 or more of the units exceeded the standard. Sixty-two percent estimated it would take 2 years or more to be in full compliance with the 1991 housing space standards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, as far as personal property is concerned, 19 percent of the Embassies responding to the survey reported that the personal property shortages that they had exceeded 1 percent or more of the total value of the inventory in fiscal years 1991 and 1992 or both.

In the fiscal year 1992 the value of the inventory shortages at 10 responding Embassies totaled $425,000 and 14 percent of the respondent Embassies reported that their Embassy did not use the automated property system developed by State in the 1980's to improve the internal controls for all nonexpendable property.

□ 1500

Mr. Chairman, these kinds of items raise some very serious questions about the willingness of the State Department to deal with what as I mentioned is the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars each year.

With regard to that situation of missing property, we also even have items such as office furniture, office equipment, computers, typewriters, and even lawn furniture, Mr. Chairman, was simply found to be missing with no accounting. No one knows where it went. It simply was not at the particular Embassy anymore.

In one egregious case, the Office of Inspector General reported the unauthorized construction of two buildings at the Embassy in the Philippines to house squash and racketball courts. These courts were built without the approval of funding by the Department, and, in fact, the employees responsible for this theft, that is what this is, Mr. Chairman, out-and-out theft, if you will, Mr. Chairman, they were given a simple slap on the wrist, 7 days without pay.

Mr. Chairman, these individuals should be in jail. Obviously, no one is going to take these matters seriously if there is no intention to prosecute this kind of fraud.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the only way the State Department, and let me say possibly other Departments, will get the message that this type of practice is simply unacceptable is to cut their funding, and that is exactly what I intended to do today.

In the last few days, both in the Government Operations Committee and in conversations I had with State Department officials, I was personally assured that the individuals in the State Department, including the Secretary, would sit down with officials from the General Accounting Office, the Inspector General's Office, the committee staff, and myself, in order to finely hone a program where this sort of waste will be stopped.

Let me also say, Mr. Chairman, I think without question it must be stopped.

In light of the fact that we have new officials in the State Department and with their willingness, strongly expressed willingness to cooperate, I am willing to withdraw this amendment; however, Mr. Chairman, let me stress that if the corrections to these practices are not made in the coming months, I believe the only way in which these programs can be dealt with is to return here to the floor of the House of Representatives and either instructing in funding legislation how this money will be spent to deal with these problems in a micromanagement way, if you will, or to simply cut the appropriation bills altogether.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma. I was on the Government Operations Committee for 4 years. It does some wonderful work. It is set up for the very purpose of oversight in depth that other committees do not have an opportunity to get into. The gentleman has done a good job on this matter, and I want him to continue to do that good work.

We have 270 embassies and consulates around the world. Our subcommittee, to the extent we have time, tries to see some of these embassies and consulates, and every time we have done that, we have found someplace where money could be saved, quite often in the millions of dollars. Our subcommittee can only get to a few of those each year. Maybe if we make three trips every two years, we might see 15 or 20 embassies and consulates. So we welcome the help of the gentleman's committee.

I want to commend the gentleman for what he has done in looking into this.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I think the subcommittee chairman makes a good point.

The real issue that we have get down to and what we have to persuade the State Department to carry out is putting in place the kinds of management systems, making sure that the apparatus is there, that the people have the training, that they understand and recognize that this is in fact a very important item.

During these time, and I know the gentleman has done extremely well in bringing to the floor an appropriations bill that is trimmed down, in fact reduced, cut, and that the dollars that are available are becoming more and more scarce each and every year, and that is going to be the case on into the future.

We simply cannot tolerate at any time the waste of taxpayers' dollars, but especially during these extremely difficult times we have to make certain that every dollar that we can possibly save is saved and that we simply cannot tolerate mismanagement.

I am hopeful that we will convince the State Department to prosecute vigorously through the Justice Department any cases and instances of out and out fraud, such as using taxpayer dollars in an unauthorized fashion to build a squash or racketball court. That simply is not acceptable.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to leave the impression that past Secretaries of State have not tried to do something about these problems. Each one who came in during the last few years really tried to do something, but the State Department is a worldwide operation. As must as the Secretaries have tried, and they have made some improvements, there are still a lot of improvements to be made.

I am thankful the gentleman will withdraw his amendment, because it is not that the Department needs less money. They need to spend the money more wisely.

So Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman for his work, and I would appreciate it if he would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Oklahoma. He, the inspector general and the GAO, have pointed out a very serious management and control problem in the State Department.

As I understand the situation, the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee made reference to it, we are hearing from the State Department that they think, that they accept and acknowledge the existence of this problem. They think they are starting to make improvements.

As I understand it, the Assistant Secretary of State for the administration testified in front of the Subcommittee on Government Operations, on which the gentleman serves, and made very clear his intent to get to the bottom of this, to try to clean this problem up.

All I wish to indicate from the point of view of the authorizing subcommittee in this area, that we intend to look very closely into what is happening and to pay more attention than we have up to this time to this whole question of property management of our overseas posts, and I thank the gentleman for his initiative.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLISH of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I appreciate his comments and the work that he does in his committee.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a warning shot across the bow. If we are required to come back from the Government Operations Committee next year and we cannot report substantial progress being made, if we cannot report an agreement being made between the State Department, the inspector general, and the GAO, as well as the relevant committees here in Congress, then we will be pushing ahead with this amendment. We will either be voting for substantial cuts along the lines we are talking about, likely exceeding the $100 million in the amendment I was offering, or we will be attempting to earmark specific dollars for specific systems to give us a full accounting and to deal with this problem.

I am hopeful that we can reach an agreement and an understanding. I am very hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that it will not be necessary to reach that degree of micromanagement, but I am prepared to do that next year.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ENGLISH] is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Department of State and the Foreign Service, provided for by law, including expenses authorized by section 9 of the Act of August 31, 1964, as amended (31 U.S.C. 3721), and the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as amended, $481,416,000.

BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE

To offset adverse fluctuations in foreign currency exchange rates and/or overseas wage and price changes, as authorized by section 24(b) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2696 (b)), $3,800,000.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 1-11 as amended by Public Law 100-504), $23,469,000.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 905 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980, as amended (22 U.S.C. 4035), $4,780,000.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS

For expenses, not otherwise provided, to enable the Secretary of State to provide for extraordinary protective services in accordance with the provisions of section 214 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 4314) and 3 U.S.C. 208, $10,551,000.

ACQUISITION AND MAINTENANCE OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For necessary expenses for carrying out the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 292-300), and the Diplomatic Security Construction program as authorized by title IV of the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4851), $381,481,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c): *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for acquisition of furniture and furnishings and generators for other departments and agencies.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service pursuant to the requirement of 31 U.S.C. 3526(e), $7,805,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c): *Provided*, That not more than $1,000,000 shall be available for representation expenses.

□ 1510

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ORTON: Page 62, line 6, strike "$7,805,000" and insert "$2,700,000".

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce spending by $5,105,000 in the emergency funds account. The purpose of the emergency funds account is to meet unforeseen emergency requirements in conducting our foreign operations. This includes emergency evacuations of American citizens in overseas areas due to political unrest or natural disaster. It also includes payments of rewards for information concerning international terrorism and narcotics terrorists' activities. It also includes investigations of passport and visa fraud.

But it also includes, Mr. Chairman, activities associated with visits by foreign dignitaries and representation activities. This is a fancy word for entertainment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have objection to having contingency or emergency funds available for foreseeable types of needs that occur with frequency. For example, emergency evacuations are required with an increasing frequency, but with no great predictability as to cost. However, so-called emergency expenditures should be just that, not merely a backdoor approach to increasing expenditures for rep-

resentation allowances or entertainment. The use of these funds for representation allowances is especially disturbing.

Now the House bill language does include a limitation that no more than $1 million shall be available for representation expenses. I do question whether any such funds should be used from emergency accounts.

The Senate has found in their Appropriations Committee report, and I quote, the department has used this account, which is paid for by the American taxpayers, to fund gifts and a standard of entertainment to which few Americans could ever aspire. For example, for the visit of one foreign leader, Mr. Chairman, the State Department hired exclusive caterers and accounted for the following expenditures:

Catering for State Department lunches: $7,532; flags: $5,733; flowers: $2,140; calligraphy: $896; limousine service: $11,453; lodging: $1,148; interpreter services: $1,300; and White House State Department dinner: $27,655.

Now, aside from the questionable use of emergency funds for entertainment, Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a question of whether or not the funds are actually needed. In researching this issue I noted that the State Department, in response to a question submitted in the appropriations hearing on page 248 of the House subcommittee hearings, which is where my colleagues can find this question, the State Department responded that they estimated there would be a $4.8 million carryover at the start of fiscal year 1994, the period for which we are appropriating. Thus, when we add this carryover of $4.8 million to the $7½ million that we would be appropriating here, the amount of emergency funds would actually be $12,605,000. Given that we have consistently, over the past several years, seen a carryover of these funds, I question whether this level of emergency contingency funding is not excessive. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, my amendment, even after cutting the $5 million, would still leave an estimated balance in the emergencies account of $7½ million.

Furthermore, if it should be necessary, or if necessary fundings should prove insufficient and it is necessary to find other funds, there are other sources available to tide us over in the next fiscal year, either through reprogramming the funds from salaries and expenses or from supplementary appropriations, both of which methodologies were used in the 1991 problem when we had to evacuate citizens from the Iraqi conflict in which $1.6 million was reprogrammed from the salary and expense account and an additional $9.3 million supplemental appropriation was approved.

Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to withdraw this amendment, and I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] is going to speak to some of my concerns.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full 5 minutes. I will let others speak. But let me just say this.

This account has three pieces to it. One is for emergency evacuations for our Government employees and American citizens who are caught abroad in some disturbance: Civil unrest, a war, natural disaster, or whatever. The second purpose, of course, is for rewards for information to help fight international terrorism and narco terrorism. The third part, as the gentleman has mentioned, is for entertainment expenses at the White House and the State Department for the entertaining of foreign dignitaries. I ask my colleagues, when President Yeltsin comes, what are you going to do? Give him crackers and send him on back home? This is for the state dinners at the White House, the entertaining of foreign dignitaries and heads of state that come to our country.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman mentioned, that portion of the bill is limited to $1 million. That is all. The gentleman's amendment would cut this whole account by over $5 million, which means, if we cut out all of that million, we are cutting $4 million out of these terribly important accounts of emergency evacuation of our people and rewards for fighting terrorism and narcotics.

So, Mr. Chairman, I cannot support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON]. This money is too important and needs to stay in the bill, and I would hope the gentleman would, in due course of time, withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. Chairman, we already cut this account and it may appear there is still more money than is needed, but I tell the gentleman that this account will have to award $4 million in the PanAm case. That was information they needed and it was a terribly important case. It involved a lot of deaths of American citizens. They do have the carryover the gentleman mentioned, but we cut the total amount in the bill.

The State Department is also expecting to have use of this account to evacuate a lot of American citizens out of Nigeria. They do not know when this may come up. It may come up when we are not in session.

This fund is needed. This is a fund that helps American citizens that happen to be caught in a bad situation in a foreign country, and I just think these are funds that the Department needs. I have not seen the evidence that they have been wasting these funds. But anyway I think they need this amount of money. It is less money than they requested. So, I feel at this time the House should oppose this amendment.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ORTON. As I looked at this particular amendment and researched the issue, I noted that we are, in fact, carrying over each year a significant amount, banking this amount for contingencies. Back in 1991 they actually needed more than they had and came with a supplemental.

□ 1520

But in 1992 the amount appropriated was $7 million. They only spent $4.5 million. In 1993 the amount appropriated was $8 million and they only spent $4.5 million. Now we are appropriating $7.5 million, and, with a $4.5 million carryover, we have got actually $12.5 million that would be available.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we are taking into consideration that they had been expecting for 2 or 3 years to pay out a lot of money in the Pan Am 103 case. There is also another award for information about terrorist activities that the fund will have to pay. That is another $1 million. So there is a need for this money that has carried over from prior years.

Mr. Chairman, in most accounts I would agree with the gentleman, that carryover money should be considered as a part of the current funds available for the current needs. But I think in this case we need some carryover funds.

They kind of anticipate more or less the amount they will need for the awards program. They cannot anticipate the amount they will need for evacuating Americans from Nigeria or some place like that. We might be out of session when they need the money.

So I would hope the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] might withdraw his amendment after pointing out the problems.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yes, I understand what the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] is driving at with this amendment, but I want to put some of the issues involved in this amendment into a certain context.

The gentleman read about expenditures from this account for representational purposes, essentially inside the United States, entertainment of foreign dignitaries. Had the Congress, and the subcommittee which I chair, not declassified that information in the 1991 State Department authorization bill, the gentleman would not have been able to bring that to the floor of Congress.

Moreover, we separated out the representational moneys from the emergency and reward moneys because we felt there were questionable activities and expenditures being made from that account, and we wanted, one, for it to

be declassified, and, second, to be limited.

Moreover, the amount that has been authorized and appropriated for representational activities has been dramatically cut. And in this appropriations bill there is a flat cap on that portion of the emergency funds which can be spent on representational activities, which is considerably less than the level back in the beginning of the 1990's.

On the broader question, and both the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] have made reference to this issue, this account is a very important account. It provides the Secretary with his discretionary ability to deal with unforeseen crises, particularly those affecting the lives and safety of American citizens abroad, threatened by war, civil unrest, or natural disaster.

When the Persian Gulf crisis erupted, the Department totally depleted the account in evacuating U.S. employees from all agencies, citizens, and dependents, out of harm's way.

Through operations made possible through this account, we removed thousands of our compatriots from danger. This helped our Armed Forces to conduct Operation Desert Storm without special measures to protect the safety of American civilians.

The State Department had to be able to rely on this account for last minute charters of civilian aircraft. This cost money.

The Persian Gulf is not the beginning and end of the story. Since 1979 emergency evacuations have become a fact of life. Repeatedly in Iran, Afghanistan, Libya, Liberia, Somalia, evacuations have saved countless American lives. The end of the cold war has increased, not diminished, unrest around the world.

As recent events in Kuwait and Iraq demonstrate, the risks to our people overseas from terrorism are something we must continue to plan to counteract.

Now, we also deal with that portion of the account that pays for rewards for information to deter, counteract, and prosecute international terrorists and drug thugs. The awards program has been a success. I would hate to see the Department stop publicizing rewards for lack of funds.

The account also pays for confidential efforts to investigate U.S. visa and passport frauds by terrorists and refugee smugglers.

The gentleman makes an interesting point on the carryover money, and we must acknowledge this carryover money is part of an effort to replenish this fund to deal with those contingencies which may be far more than anyone could now anticipate.

As I look at the spending history of this account, and moving aside the representational expenses which now have been capped and limited, the fact is that in fiscal year 1989, there was appropriated $4.5 million with obligations of just less than $100,000 left in that. In 1990, the year of Desert Storm, there was an appropriation of $4.6 million, and $7.4 million was spent. They actually reached into a deficit situation in that particular year.

By the time we passed our supplemental in fiscal year 1991, long after that money was spent, we appropriated $15 million and included a reprogramming transfer. We only expended or obligated $12,496,000.

Now we are carrying over approximately $4.5 million and appropriating $7 million more. Presumably we will have to see where we are at the end of fiscal year 1994. Next summer, as we get into the appropriations process, hopefully we will have built the fund up to the point where the State Department can feel free to respond quickly before Congress has a chance to pass a supplemental.

The gentleman makes one other point regarding programming of salaries and expenses. The fact is we have cut well over $100 million in salaries and expenses and support staff for the State Department below fiscal year 1993's level.

In addition, when you take the peacekeeping drain and the humanitarian relief drain for what is going on in Bosnia and other countries, the ability to reprogram quickly substantial amounts of salary and expense money is getting more and more limited. I think this is a prudent level of appropriation for this year. I think we want to look at it again next summer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ORTON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] for their explanation on these issues, as well as the other members of the committee. I would simply say that my concern was twofold: One, that expenditures not be appropriated out of the emergency account for nonemergency entertainment. I think that has been addressed by the committee with the $1 million limitation. I am certainly willing to look at this again next year.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his explanation of the additional needs with regard to the Pan Am bombing that may be expended this year.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $593,000, as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2671: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $183,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the Salaries and Expenses account under Administration of Foreign Affairs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ORTON

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ORTON: Page 62, line 11, strike "$593,000" and insert "$186,000".

Page 62, line 14, strike the word "In" and all that follows through line 18.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce spending by $590,000. This reduces the subsidy cost of direct loans for the repatriation loan program by $407,000 and reduces costs of $183,000 and funding for administrative expenses necessary to carry out this repatriation loan program.

Very briefly explaining what this repatriation loan program is, when we have U.S. citizens traveling abroad, occasionally they find themselves in a foreign country. They have spent all of their money, and they have no way to get home. This particular program offers loans to those U.S. citizens for the cost of getting back home to the United States.

Now, on its face that certainly seems to be a very bona fide purpose for lending taxpayer money. When we look a little closer, in face we can see in instances where this is a valid expenditure or a valid loan.

□ 1530

For instance, individuals may have a health problem in a foreign country, and there may be costs of evacuating that individual by private ambulance or et cetera or bringing them back for treatment to save the life of that individual. Certainly, no one would suggest that we eliminate those types of loans. But we also find a number of U.S. tourists and students who, knowing that this money is available to borrow from the Federal Government to get back home, go overseas to Europe and decided to stay that extra week, spend all of their money. In fact, there have even been reports of tourists cashing in their return ticket and then spending that money in Europe, going to the Embassy, saying, "I don't have any way to get home," and having these loans made.

If the loans were paid back, I would not have a problem either. But we find that there is a historic 80 percent default rate on repayment on these loans. This program simply allows Americans to be irresponsible, to spend all their money and ask Uncle Sam to bring them home.

My amendment, in fact, does two things. One, cutting the loan subsidy, the $400,000 reduction in the subsidy cost would allow the State Department to continue to finance the same amount of loans as proposed in the bill, if they got their repayment rate or

their default rate down to 25 percent instead of 80 percent. So if they simply were able to collect from 75 percent of those loans rather than only 20 percent of the loans, they could still function with the programs at the same level.

I do not think a 25-percent default rate is unrealistic. I do not see justification for administrative expenses for this program, since, in fact, the program is not operated separately as a separate freestanding program.

All of the costs attributable to interviewing the people, as they come into the Embassy, and making the loan and so forth are paid for or are done simply by employees in the normal course of their business. There is not an additional need of administrative expenses for this program.

So my amendment would also cut the direct administrative expenses for the program. Mr. Chairman, I believe that is reasonable to ask the State Department to simply collect on the loans that are made. And if we can get the default rate down to only 25 percent default, we certainly can fund the same level of the program.

So I would urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

First, let me explain why we have a separate item here for salaries and expenses to administer this program. It is because the Credit Reform Act requires that. They require setting forth separately the amount to administer these loan programs.

Twenty percent of these loan requests are denied. And as the gentleman said, sometimes American citizens are in a foreign country who should not be in the fix that they are in. But they are in those countries. They are United States citizens. It is a very difficult thing to decide what to do.

We cannot just leave them there. The public would not permit that. So what we have done is provide a program which will loan them money if they do not have it. If they don't pay back the loan, they will never get another passport.

I do not know what more we can do than that because if we did not loan them the money, we would probably end up giving them a grant. And none of these funds would ever be paid back.

Whatever we are getting back under this loan program is more money than we would have repaid if we did not have the loan program.

Members demand that when their constituents are in a foreign country and find themselves without any funds to get back to the U.S., whether they lost their money or were robbed or whatever the situation may be, they be given some kind of emergency help to get them home. As a matter of fact, Members also demand that the State Department quit harassing their constituents to get these loans paid off.

So Members just would not permit the Department to stop this loan program. The State Department takes their passports. The Department does not give them another one until the loan is paid back.

It is one of those items we cannot win. If the Department does not give them a loan, then they will have to give them a grant. And if they give them a grant, nobody can complain about the default rate. If the Department gives these Americans a loan, then some of them will not pay them back.

I think this program is needed, and I do not see any alternative. So I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time that will come toward the end of the bill, before the motion to rise, I will seek to offer an amendment that would be similar to the amendment that I sought to offer on the previous appropriation bill. That is, to set aside 1 percent of the funding in this bill to be used for the flood disaster in the Midwest.

The amendment that I have would seek to have the Secretaries hold 1 percent of their money for payment of possible bills in 1994 for the flood disaster.

What is now apparent is that the $2.5 billion to $3 billion that we will be asked to provide in the emergency supplemental bill that will come to the floor within a couple of days will only be a down payment on the amount necessary to clean up after the floods in the Midwest. Both infrastructure needs as well as needs of individuals in that area of the country are going to exceed the $2.5 to $3 billion figure by many billions. No one is exactly certain what the figure is, but the administration and most other observers are now saying that additional needs are going to be there.

Those needs, given the fact that we are at the end of this fiscal year, will fall in fiscal 1994, and so we already know that this Congress is going to have an obligation to help people in the Midwest with flood damage clean up in fiscal 1994.

The issue is whether or not we are going to add that additional money onto the deficit or whether or not we are going to begin to prepare now to pay for that expense that we know is coming.

In my view, we ought to begin to prepare now. If we would begin now to set aside 1 percent of the money in each appropriations bill for flood damage control, if we did this on all the appropriations bills, we could find $5 billion, give or take a little bit, for flood damage control. That figure, in addition to the $2.5 to $3 billion that will be in the supplemental appropriation, comes somewhere close to the figure that observers are now saying would be necessary to deal with the flood disaster.

The reason for doing this is because it would then allow the agencies to begin to plan as well. Those agencies ought to know the percentage of their money that is going to come out to deal with flood damage, and they could begin to plan immediately for that kind of contingency.

If we refused to provide contingency monies, it seems to me that we are admitting from the outset that this is money that we want to spend of an emergency nature and we want to add it on to the deficit.

I agree that the money ought to be spent in an emergency way. The question is whether or not faced with the emergency, whether we ought to do the fiscally responsible thing. The fiscally responsible thing would be to set aside money in next year's budget now for expenses that we know we have to meet next year.

That is what my attempt will be. I will ask the membership to vote against the motion to rise, if that should precede my amendment. And if the motion to rise should fail, I would then offer an amendment designed to set aside 1 percent in this bill.

I want to assure the House that it is my intention to make that 1 percent also applicable to the other appropriation bills.

□ 1540

What my hope is, is if the House sends this kind of signal, we can go to the Senate and suggest that these moneys be added onto the Senate.

There is also entirely the possibility that we could end up with a continuing resolution at the end of this year. This kind of amendment would certainly be something that could be added to a continuing resolution, setting aside 1 percent of all the money in that resolution for flood damage relief. If we begin the process now, we will assure that we will have the ability to get that kind of action taken should we come to a continuing resolution. It gives us an opportunity to do the responsible thing.

I would urge the membership to vote against the motion to rise at the time that that comes, in order to be able to deal with the flood disaster in a fiscally responsible manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN

For necessary expenses to carry out the Taiwan Relations Act, Public Law 96-8 (93 Stat. 14), $15,165,000.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service Retirement Disability Fund, as authorized by law, $125,084,000.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of

membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, $388,599,000, of which not to exceed $88,983,000 is available to pay arrearages, the payment of which should be directed toward special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill on page 63, lines 1 through 17. The paragraph provides appropriations for a program not authorized by law, and is in violation of House rule XXI, clause 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is not authorized, so I have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The point of order is conceded, and the Chair upholds the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the entire 5 minutes. However, it is appropriate, I think, at this point in the discussion to mention a couple of points, because we have just stricken the entire section dealing with international organization contributions; that is, the United Nations and the other international organizations. The peacekeeping operations of the U.N. are not included in this account.

Let me say this, the United States contribution to the United Nations' general fund is 25 percent of the entire budget of the United Nations. That figure, of course, is an historic figure that goes back to the formation of the Security Council, but is antiquated in that Japan is not a member, Germany is not a member of the Security Council, and the contribution level that the United States is supposed to make to the United Nations and does make, at 25 percent, one-fourth of the total, is not fair. It needs to be addressed. I know efforts have been made in that respect; without avail, however.

At one point in time a few years ago we withheld a portion of our annual contribution to the U.N. to force some reforms to take place, and thank goodness, over a span of time and thanks to our withholding of those funds, those reforms did take place.

Now there is another reform that is desperately needed. We have requested it. The United Nations so far has refused to go along with it. That is simply to account to us about where our monies are going and how they are being spent.

Our representatives there have asked the United Nations for the appointment of an Inspector General of the United Nations, to be able to go through the books and to assure us that our contributions are being fairly and adequately spent, and to report to the American people and to the other contributors to the United Nations around the world. There is nothing wrong with that. There is no way they can defend refusing, in my judgment, that modest request of the appointment of an inspector general. We are entitled to know where these moneys are going.

I will not talk today about some of the rumors and allegations of misspent moneys in the United Nations. That perhaps can take place another day. I hope it does, if there is no remedy forthcoming. However, the American people are entitled to know where this very large amount of money that they contribute to the United Nations is being spent and for what purpose.

I am told that the peacekeeping account, different from the general account of the United Nations, I am told that moneys float freely between the peacekeeping and general accounts; that when the general fund runs low, the peacekeeping account is drained some, and vice versa.

I would point out to the Chair that our peacekeeping assessment is more than 25 percent. It is more than the 30 percent that they have been assessing us. Now it is up to 31.4 percent. Who sets the figure? We certainly did not. The United Nations Security Council does. They say: "United States, we are going to send a peacekeeping force to this place or that place," we are in 14 of them now, "and by the way, here is your bill, and your share is almost one-third." Mr. Chairman, I think that is terribly unfair.

I want to see us address in the United Nations some of these questions that the American people are entitled to have addressed. The peacekeeping account now is becoming a very large dollar figure. There are 14 of them going on now. I think there are another 12 or 13 requests for more peacekeeping missions that are in the works. Not only are we talking about dollars here. Of course, and more importantly, we are talking about the assignment of American military personnel, by a non-American entity.

I hope Congress and the administration addresses a very basic policy question that goes to the very roots of our existence as a country: How do we deal with these multiple requests by the United Nations for men and money for these peacekeeping operations around the world where we, the Congress, do not decide whether we assign American forces and money there. The War Power Act at best is understood, not to mention the Constitution and Congress' power to declare war.

Mr. Chairman, it needs to be addressed. For that purpose, I wanted to say these words before we go further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROGERS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman that our subcommittee is concerned, and I join him in being alarmed at the size of the peacekeeping bills. The Peacekeeping assessments are made pursuant to the UN Treaty so we are obligated to pay them. However, with the tight budget situation the bigger the peacekeeping bill, the less there is for salaries and expenses for the State Department's overseas operations. In too many cases, as our subcommittee has been pointing out for four or five years now, these peacekeeping operations are at best marginal. They are mostly an excuse to get rid of a problem in a certain area. That has been the history of most of the peacekeeping operations.

I think that the opposition now to continually placing large peacekeeping forces everywhere in the world, has become a chorus in the House now, instead of just a few Members talking about it. We have to pay considerable attention to this development because we cannot continue to pay bigger peacekeeping bills in the hundreds of millions of dollars when these funds come out of the salaries and expenses account of the State Department, and reduce programs that are very badly needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For payments, not otherwise provided for, by the United States for expenses of the United Nations peacekeeping forces, as authorized by law, $422,499,000, of which not to exceed $20,892,000 is available to pay arrearages.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES AND CONTINGENCIES

For necessary expenses authorized by section 5 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 in addition to funds otherwise available for these purposes, contributions for the United States of general expenses of international organizations and conferences and representation to such organizations and conferences as provided for by 22 U.S.C. 2556 and 2672, and personal services without regard to civil service and classification laws as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5102, $5,463,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c), of which not to exceed $200,000 may be expended for representation as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 4085.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to meet obligations of the United States arising under treaties, or specific Acts of Congress, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

For necessary expenses for the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and to comply with laws applicable to the United States Section, including not to exceed $6,000 for representation; as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, not otherwise provided for, $11,054,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of authorized projects, $14,051,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c).

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $9,000 for representation expenses incurred by the International Joint Commission, $4,290,000; for the International Joint Commission and the International Boundary Commission, as authorized by treaties between the United States and Canada or Great Britain.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses for international fisheries commissions, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law, $14,200,000: *Provided*, That the United States share of such expenses may be advanced to the respective commissions, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3324.

OTHER

UNITED STATES BILATERAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AGREEMENTS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for Bilateral Science and Technology Agreements, $4,275,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c).

PAYMENT TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

For a grant to the Asia Foundation, as authorized by section 501 of Public Law 101-246, $16,287,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2696(c).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 501. Funds appropriated under the title shall be available, except as otherwise provided, for allowances and differentials as authorized by subchapter 59 of 5 U.S.C.; for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and hire of passenger transportation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1343(b).

SEC. 502. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of State in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the United States Information Agency in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

Related Agencies

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for arms control and disarmament activities, including not to exceed $100,000 for official reception and representation expenses, authorized by the Act of September 26, 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2551 et seq.), $47,279,000.

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING

GRANTS AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Board for International Broadcasting, including grants to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Incorporated, as authorized by the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2871-2883), $214,643,000, of which not to exceed $52,000 may be made available for official reception and representation expenses.

□ 1550

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the provisions contained in lines 14 through 22 on page 67.

Mr. Chairman, lines 14 through 22 on page 67 would provide an appropriation which is unauthorized in law at this time, and thus constitutes a violation of clause 2(a) of rule XXI of the House which prohibits unauthorized appropriations in general appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will concede the point of order. It is not authorized, so I will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The gentleman concedes the point of order. The Chair upholds the point of order, and the lines will be stricken.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me make it clear what the point of order that was just raised is all about, which is an attempt to deflect the opportunity for this House to debate an amendment to cut 15 percent out of the operating budget of the Bureau of International Broadcasting, which includes Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe.

Since the Soviet Union fell in August 1991 we have spent $650 million in U.S. taxpayer dollars telling the individuals who lived under Communist rule what they have already learned from living for 69 years of occupation under Communist rule.

I understand that Mr. Mica, the new chairman, and Mr. Forbes, the former chairman of the Board of International Broadcasting, have a very intelligent, thoughtful plan to consolidate these operations with Voice of America, saving millions of dollars over the next few years. But let me suggest to this House that this is a town where everybody has a plan to save millions of dollars at some point in the future.

Is there a necessity in these days for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty? Perhaps. There certainly may be an application in Bosnia where the Government controls virtually all of the media and it is impossible to get any conflicting views. But is it really necessary in this day and age to broadcast in Prague and Czechoslovakia when you can turn on the television in any hotel room to Cable News Network. Or does it make sense to broadcast in this day and age in Afghanistan at a time when there is no longer an Afghan civil war?

I understand the suggestion that what we are going to do at some point is shift resources to Asia and reconsolidate the mission. But I think this is a perfect example of a government agency which has done its mission well and it is now time to dismantle it.

Research across the world has shown a couple of things. And one key point I would like to make in terms of international broadcasting is that given the choice, occupants anywhere in this world will watch television first. Second, they will listen to broad band radio, AM/FM as here in the United States, and the last choice will be shortwave radio. And as the media begins to proliferate across the former Soviet Union and across what was once beyond the Iron Curtain in Eastern Europe, and television stations appear and radio stations appear, it simply indicates that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are not needed in the same way or to be funded at the same kind of levels they have been for the last 25 years.

Is there still a mission? Absolutely. That is why this amendment would not strike funding altogether.

Is there a need to cut back when we have a $400 million deficit in this country? Absolutely.

And I respect the gentleman from California's position to try to save Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in order to allow the consolidation proposal to take place. But the great disappointment I have today is that if we are going to see a consolidation that the Members of the House do not have an opportunity to guarantee that it happens with a 15-percent reduction.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] for raising this point of order. Removing this appropriation for the Board for International Broadcasting is the most appropriate decision at this time and should be viewed as a positive move for the future of our international broadcasting.

I support the continuation of international broadcasting because of the significant contribution it makes to the goals of democracy and because it is an efficient means to foster free and fair press.

However, the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees are currently considering legislation to consolidate all of our international broadcasting—to include services provided through the Bureau of International Broadcasting to Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty.

Since we are revising the organizational structure of international broadcasting, I support Mr. BERMAN's effort to preserve the resource decisions for

BIB and RFE/RL pending the outcome of the consolidation legislation that will be incorporated in conference on the Department of State and USIA authorization bill.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, just to explain a little further, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] accurately characterized my position as one of seeking to save the BIB appropriation as part of allowing the consolidation envisioned in the administration's plan to take effect. And while it may be the most used argument in the world that we are spending money in order to save money, once in a while even that argument is an accurate one, and in this particular case it is.

The ability to rationalize existing services, maintain surrogate radio, and I would suggest we might well wait 3 or 4 years before we proclaim the victory of democracy in all of the countries focused on by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and recognize their critical role in helping to consolidate those democracies, but I believe this consolidation effort, this rationalization of our limited resources will be dramatically impeded if we face a major slash in the appropriation level. For that reason, I sought to protect it with my point of order.

I might point out that Radio Free Asia, a new initiative by the administration, is contained in this appropriation level, and that had an amendment been proposed and adopted it would have had a massive impact on our ability to start Radio Free Asia as well.

In addition, we have a major task to perform in the former Yugoslavia and republics of the former Yugoslavia where we want to see RFE and RL again broadcasting there. This consolidation will not occur overnight. We will have a chance to debate the consolidation as I expect it will be coming back in conference reports in both the authorization and the appropriation process. And I think it is very important at this critical time that we maintain our commitment to surrogate radios, to independent radio that I think played an important part in our public diplomacy during the cold war, and now plays a critical part in our promotion of democracy throughout the world.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I very much regret that the point of order raised by the gentleman from California was occasioned by the amendment that the gentleman from Wisconsin would have offered. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from Wisconsin, for his intelligence and perception and understanding of the issues. But I believe, very frankly, that the amendment he planned to offer would have been extremely shortsighted and counterproductive.

It would have slashed the funds for the Board for International Broadcasting, one of the very best Government-funded programs that we have in this country. A great deal of the credit for ending Soviet communism and the domination of Eastern Europe by Soviet-backed, Communist governments has to go to the Board for International Broadcasting through its two service radios, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

We like to think that after years and years of authoritarian rule that people will simply understand immediately what democracy, human rights, and the rule of law is all about. But if we believe that we are fooling ourselves and no one else. It takes time to develop the institutions of freedom. It takes a commitment to doing so by those outside like ourselves who know that it is to our best advantage that democracies exist around the world. We have an obligation to assist people living in countries where formerly they were ruled by authoritarian governments, and we must put out resources and our commitment to seeing that democratic institutions do survive in their incipient phase and become established on soil that had not been hospitable to them before.

With all due respect, I might say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, what you see on a hotel room television set is not necessarily what is being seen by the people in the countryside who do not understand what elections are all about, what an independent judiciary means, and what the rule of law means to them and their rights as opposed to their government.

□ 1600

I believe very strongly that the best money we spend, the most effective, productive, cost-effective money we spend is for our surrogate broadcasting services. We are now at the point, Mr. Chairman, of looking at the reorganization of all of our international broadcasting services, and we are working toward the establishment of a more efficient, effective means of getting our messages broadcast to listeners across the globe. In addition, we are going to expand our surrogate radios to beam a message of truth to the oppressed billions in Asia, countries such as China, Vietnam, Cambodia, Burma, North Korea, and Tibet, places where freedom is unknown, places where the institutions that we value, that our society is based upon, have no understanding. This mission to expand our surrogate services to Asia has got to be established under an institution that enjoys the same kind of independence as the Board for International Broadcasting.

It would be a travesty if the United States does not make that commitment to begin those broadcasts to Asia and penetrate those societies with the same message of freedom that we send to Eastern Europe and to the former Soviet Union.

And so I respect my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, a great deal. I do believe that the amendment he would have offered would have been harmful in the extreme. I would not like to see a message sent to the other body that this body does not fully support the Board for International Broadcasting, especially during a time when we will be consolidating all of our international broadcasting services.

I support very strongly the establishment of Radio Free Asia, or Asian Democracy Radio, as it may be called. Once established, this service will continue the fine traditions started by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty of promoting our values abroad in a most cost-effective way, and I regret that this point of order was occasioned by the cutting amendment that the gentleman would have offered.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. PORTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make two quick points.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, first of all, this is not just my wild idea. Again, what the chairman said of the Presidential Commission on International Broadcasting, focusing half the Government's transmitters on Eastern Europe and the western part of the former Soviet Union was logical once but it does not make sense now. Neither does the Government's spending 17 times on radio what it spends on television.

RFE and RL serve the country well, but with political changes, their programs increasingly resemble those of the Voice of America.

For example, the Voice of America broadcasts in 6 of 12 languages broadcast by Radio Liberty, and incredibly 100 percent, 9 of the 9 languages broadcast by Radio Free Europe.

The phaseout should not happen overnight, but it should happen. The taxpayers do not need to fund this duplication.

I share the enthusiasm of my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, for the program itself, but again, what my amendment did was not eliminate either service. It simply cut 15 percent, or $32 million, out of an operating budget next year of $214 million.

I understand that consolidation is under way, but back to my initial point that this is a town and a community where everybody has got to plan to save money 3 years from now.

Mr. PORTER. Reclaiming my time, let me say to the gentleman one thing, and I want to make this absolutely clear. The mission of the Voice of America is an entirely different mis-

sion that the mission of the surrogate radios. The purpose of the Voice of America is to broadcast to other countries what our society is all about. That is a very important mission, indeed, but it is not what surrogate radios do.

Surrogate radios provide free information, the truth, within societies where the truth is either not readily available or censored by the government. It is a truth about their own societies and the rest of the news of the world, not about what is good about America. They are very different missions, and they should be very carefully defined in the future.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the proposed Klug amendment to cut Board for International Broadcasting funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Some of our colleagues argue that these important broadcasting services are no longer necessary because the cold war is over. The cold war may be over, but the transition to democratic societies and market economies is not. Transitions are not easy and they do not happen overnight. Every day we hear new stories of ethnic conflict and unrest in the republics of the former Soviet Union.

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty provide an important independent voice promoting freedom and democracy in a tumultuous region undergoing fundamental change. They provide a voice of reason at a time and in a place where frustration and uncertainty are high. The transition has not yet been successfully made and the need for the voices of democracy continues.

We have spent over $82,000 per family in this country on defense expenses to fight the cold war. Now that it is over, we can start cutting back on expenses related to it. Let us make sure, however, that our spending reductions are in the right place at the right time. Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have been effective programs to promote democracy. Until we are sure that the transition to democracy and market economies has been successfully made, we should continue to support programs that will facilitate it. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Klug amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ISRAEL RELAY STATION

(RESCISSION)

Of the available funds under this heading, $180,000,000 are rescinded.

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE BROAD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses for the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, $200,000 as authorized by Public Law 99-83, section 1303.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $44,391,000, to remain available until expended.

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP COMMISSION

JAPAN-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP TRUST FUND

For expenses of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission as authorized by Public Law 94-118, as amended, from the interest earned on the Japan-United States Friendship Trust Fund, $1,250,000; and an amount of Japanese currency not to exceed the equivalent of $1,420,000 based on exchange rates at the time of payment of such amounts as authorized by Public Law 94-118.

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 (91 Stat. 1636), to carry out international communication, educational and cultural activities; and to carry out related activities authorized by law, including employment, without regard to civil service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $700,000 of this appropriation), as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, and entertainment, including official receptions, within the United States, not to exceed $25,000 as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1474(3); $730,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,400,000 may be used for representation abroad as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1452 and 4085: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,200,000 of the amounts allocated by the United States Information Agency to carry out section 102(a)(3) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2452(a)(3)), shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 shall remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a), for expenses and equipment necessary for maintenance and operation of data processing and administrative services as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1535—1536: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $7,615,000 to remain available until expended, may be credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from or in connection with English teaching, library, motion pictures, radio, television, and publication programs as authorized by section 810 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), and in accordance with the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 1105(a)(25), $4,247,000.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

For expenses of Fulbright, International Visitor, Humphrey Fellowship, Citizen Exchange, Congress-Bundestag Exchange, and other exchange programs, as authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), and Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1977 (91 Stat. 1636), $217,650,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2455.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses of Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated to be derived from interest and earnings from the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund as authorized by sections 4 and 5 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (20 U.S.C. 5204-05), $300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary or other compensation, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376; or for purposes which are not in accordance with OMB Circulars A-110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements) and A—122 (Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations), including the restrictions on compensation for personal services.

ISRAELI ARAB SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the Israeli Arab Scholarship Program as authorized by section 214 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2452), all interest and earnings accruing to the Israeli Arab Scholarship Fund on or before September 30, 1994, to remain available until expended.

RADIO CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, $75,164,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a).

EAST-WEST CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960 (22U.S.C. 2054-2057), by grant to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in the State of Hawaii, $23,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376.

NORTH/SOUTH CENTER

To enable the Director of the United States Information Agency to provide for carrying out the provisions of the North/South Center Act of 1991, (22 U.S.C. 2075), by grant to an educational institution in Florida known as the North/South Center, $8,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 72, line 26, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request by the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

For grants made by the United States Information Agency to the National Endowment for Democracy as authorized by the National Endowment for Democracy Act, $17,500,000, to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

I rise to make a point of order against the provision contained in lines 1 through 5 on page 73.

Lines 1 through 5 on page 73, Mr. Chairman, would provide an appropriation which is unauthorized in law at

this time, and thus constitutes a violation of clause 2(a) of rule XXI of the House which prohibits unauthorized appropriations in general appropriation bills.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I agree it is not authorized, and I will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The point of ordered is conceded, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise because I did not have the opportunity to make the motion to strike these funds although it is appropriate.

What is involved in lines 1 through 5 on page 73 is the remaining funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

I rise today to oppose the pressure that is being exerted in this town, within the beltway, to be certain that National Endowment for Democracy does not die.

Mr. Chairman, following the vote on the amendment offered by myself and our colleague from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, which eliminated the Federal earmark for [NED] the National Endowment for Democracy has gone to the well, if you will; to the patriarchs of the Republican Party, the patriarchs of the Democratic Party, the leaders of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the AFL–CIO. Everyone has joined together to be certain that National Endowment for Democracy is funded in the conference report on this bill when it comes back from the Senate so that the Endowment will not die.

Since the June 22 vote, the extremes of our newspaper columnists in America have written on this, from extreme liberal to extreme conservative. They have joined together and have found common ground in their support of the National Endowment for Democracy.

Of course, I understand that people of diverse views and philosophies can join together and support something, but I would suspect that our effort to terminate the National Endowment for Democracy has struck a real chord. The chord is the same message that my friends on the other side of the aisle have been talking about during earlier debate on this bill: nothing ever dies in this town. Regardless of whether a program is a $1 million expenditure or a $500 million expenditure, someone always has reasons to prove it should go on and live forever.

The truth of the matter is all of these programs may in some measure do some good, but we must ask ourselves "can we afford them?"

In addition to my philosophical and fiscal accountability concerns about National Endowment for Democracy, which were discussed in depth during the June 22 debate, I must answer my constituents when they ask "How can America today, with $300 billion in deficits, continue to finance the economic, social, and political benefits of all the people of the world and not provide for the economic, social, and political benefits of the American people here at home."

Just today Mr. Chairman, the last shoe manufacturing plant in my hometown of 10,000 people, Nanticoke, announced that it is closing. One hundred and seventy-five people in the shoemaking industry are losing their jobs because of foreign competition; competition from Asia and primarily China.

Yet here we are spending hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars so that the Chinese can hear the great American message from the United States. We are using my shoemakers' dollars to let the Chinese know that democracy is a great institution, and that we want them to join us. Not only will we pay for them to hear how great we are, as well as the benefits of freedom and individual rights, but they can enjoy this message while they produce shoes with prison labor. These shoes are the same shoes that are going to cause the unemployment of 175 workers in Nanticoke, and across America.

These same America workers who on April 15 were asked to pay their taxes so that this Congress can go back and continue to spend money on programs such as the National Endowment for Democracy, Radio Free Europe, and countless others.

Mr. Chairman, I just hope that when the authorizing subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], and the Appropriations subcommittee chairman, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, go off to conference and make a hell-bent effort to fund the National Endowment for Democracy against the wishes of the majority of the Members of this House, that they will remember there ought to be a domestic Endowment for Democracy here in the United States. There ought to be some program to take care of the 175 workers in my hometown that just lost their jobs after 25 years to foreign competition.

I cannot go home and explain to them how this Congress can spend $50 million for the National Endowment for Democracy but not $1 for domestic economic development at home. We have a deficit, and we cannot afford it.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had the opportunity during this debate to address the other concerns I have about the National Endowment for Democracy. For this reason, I would like to submit a written statement I had prepared earlier on the subject of National Endowment for Democracy with our colleague from Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS.

WHEN SPECIAL INTERESTS GROUPS CONDUCT AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

How many Americans are aware that arms of the national Democratic party, the national Republican party, the AFL–CIO, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce receive millions of taxpayers' dollars annually to develop and carry out their own version of American foreign policy? Not many, we would guess, as these private groups are not usually considered to be the choice of the American taxpayer to carry out American foreign policy.

Yet through the National Endowment for Democracy, [NED], that is exactly what happens. National Endowment for Democracy is a private organization whose sole job is to take taxpayers' funds and dole the majority of them out to these four major interests groups so that they can promote democracy—(and their own agendas)—abroad. Since 1984 National Endowment for Democracy has received several hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal coffers.

We object to the premise that these four groups have a better understanding of how the American taxpayer wants to spend their hard-earned money than either the Congress or the administration, both of which are accountable to the people.

For this reason, we recently offered an amendment on the House floor to eliminate National Endowment for Democracy's annual earmark, not the organization itself. Our amendment passed by a margin of 243 to 181.

Since then much has been written about the vote; people have speculated as to the motives for the amendment, why it passed by such an overwhelming margin, and why anyone would be "against" global democracy.

To set the record straight, we support a progressive foreign policy as well as American assistance abroad to ensure that democracy and human rights are upheld, protected, and promoted. In fact, we would probably support many of the projects funded by National Endowment for Democracy if they were developed and overseen by an established government agency charged with conducting American foreign policy. However we reject the current practice of giving taxpayers' money to four of the biggest, most powerful special interest groups in Washington. We do not believe that the framers of the Constitution intended for our Nation's foreign policy to operate this way.

We do not dispute that some of the projects funded by National Endowment for Democracy have been beneficial in the world-wide struggle for democracy. But with an annual budget of just over $30 million this year, we reject the notion that National Endowment for Democracy was responsible for the fall of the Berlin Wall or the breakup of the Soviet bloc.

In addition, National Endowment for Democracy has also funded a number of questionable projects. Through National Endowment for Democracy American taxpayers' dollars have gone to labor unions in France and to the opposition party to then-President Oscar Arias in Costa Rica. Both France and Costa Rica have been democracies for more than 100 years.

Furthermore, because National Endowment for Democracy is not accountable to Congress or the President there have been instances in which National Endowment for Democracy-funded projects appear to be contradictory to American foreign policy. An example occurred in Korea in 1989, where National Endowment for Democracy moneys assisted the Federation of Korean Trade Unions [FKTU] in increasing its ability to influence government policies. This occurred 1 year after the State Department commended the Korean government for breaking the FKTU's monopoly by allowing other unions to register.

In another instance, National Endowment for Democracy money was used in Panama in the mid-1980's to support political events on behalf of Nicolas Ardito Barletta, a candidate for president. Mr. Ardito, the military-backed candidate, won by 1,713 votes in a fraud-ridden election over Arnulfo Arias, who was twice elected president only to be deposed by the military. When the U.S. ambassador discovered this expenditure of American funds he wired the State Department and, noting the existing United States policy of not meddling in Panama's politics, speculated about the likely embarrassment should this interference come to light. The Ambassador's cable concluded "Embassy requests this harebrained project be abandoned before it hits the fan."

It is the concept of federally funded projects "hitting the fan" that may have led many of the freshman Members of the House, as well as the majority of our House colleagues who have heard this debate before, to support the amendment. Members of Congress are right to hesitate to support an organization which has a history of funding dubious projects as well as fiscal mismanagement and abuse, a critical 1991 General Accounting Office report found an instance in which Federal money was used to help obtain a car for use in a drug crime.

National Endowment for Democracy is an American foreign policy loose cannon which needs to be reined in. We agree there is a need to bolster fragile democracies abroad, but National Endowment for Democracy is not the proper vehicle. American taxpayers' dollars should be spent by the structures sanctioned by the Constitution, not private organizations with private agendas.

□ 1610

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I will try to be brief. But I think the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] deserve a response.

One can assume that Members of this body from the Democratic side of the aisle and from the Republican side of the aisle and the columnists from the liberal persuasion, and columnists from the conservative persuasion are involved in some conspiracy to feather the nests of party leaders and the bureaucracies of the chambers of commerce and organized labor in order to promote their own narrow special interests and to reward their friends; or one can assume that the issue underlying the National Endowment for Democracy is the belief that it is in the American workers' interests for pluralism, democracy and regard for human rights and peaceful resolution of disputes to take hold in the rest of the world because to the extent that, whether it is communism or totalitarianism under any other name, or terrorism or ethnic rivalries that blow over, pretty soon history tells us American interests are directly affected.

It was a cornerstone of this President's campaign that the promotion of democracy and of democratic values would be a cornerstone of our foreign policy. The National Endowment for Democracy is the major institution that exists; it has done that throughout its life, it has done excellent work in a variety of different areas, and I suggest to my friend from Pennsylvania that the testimony of support that is coming now from different columnists and from different people, from many different philosophical backgrounds, is a recognition of what they have done not just in Lithuania, Poland, or Czechoslovakia, but in Chile, Namibia, and the Philippines, and I can assure the gentleman that this particular Member will be hellbent to try and secure the funding, undo the decision the House made earlier in the year with respect to that funding.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone disputes that the National Endowment for Democracy has done a lot of good things; that is not the question. The question is: Can we afford it? Is there no other vehicle by which these good works can be tried out? The private sector, the State Department?

The gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] will remember our former colleague here, the gentleman from the Ozarks, Mr. Taylor. He had a little test he put to every piece of legislation that came before us. That test was: Do we need it, and can we afford it? And if the answer to both those questions is "yes," we must then ask ourselves how was it we got along without it for so long?

I think that test is applicable here where we know we are in a time of great budgetary constraints. It seems this is nonessential spending.

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time, I think the question is: Can we afford not to do it?

I think all one has to do is to study the history of the 20th century when America decided that its engagements abroad were either too expensive or too difficult or too complicated or too controversial, and sought to withdraw within its own borders and tried to divide the world up into the United States and this domestic affairs, versus what is going on in the rest of the world, and thought that we could somehow escape.

The clear history leading up to World War II indicates the follies of isolationism as a general policy.

I do not support the National Endowment for Democracy because it is a nice thing and I wish it on the rest of the world. I support it because I believe its development, its promotion is vitally in America's interest from an economic and from a national security point of view.

We have spent trillions of dollars in the cold war. We are talking about an infinitesimal percentage of those expenditures to try to deal with the controversies around the world, whether they were Communist in nature or other kinds of antidemocratic forces, because inexorably history tells us if we do not deal with them and try to get ahead of the curve in this area, we will be facing far more difficult and larger expenditures from our own taxpayers, our own people, their fortunes and their lives by ignoring all of this.

So it is a question of how you feel about what our role in the world should be at this very exciting but difficult time of transition. I think there is a role for it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to respectfully disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] in attempting to eliminate NED. The National Endowment for Democracy has been providing an invaluable means to promote democracy throughout the world, and it is extremely shortsighted to zero out funding for such a worthy organization.

I submit we need to support the capability for a rapid response to the unforeseen needs that arise in the emerging democracies. Government agencies alone cannot provide the kind of quick responses that NED and its grantees have exhibited in a number of important programs around the world. Our national interests are best served by building democratic institutions, and NED has been a vital tool in implementing this key foreign policy objective.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly, prayerfully urge that we do not dissolve the National Endowment for Democracy. And I suggest to my good friend from Pennsylvania that he has provided us with some false alternatives. It is called in logic the fallacy of the false alternative; we cannot take care of our problems at home if we are spending money overseas.

That may or may not be a sound, general proposition, but there are some expenditures that are in our national interest. We have troops over in Somalia, we have troops over in Macedonia, and there are many areas where trouble spots exist. It is imperative that the world calm down.

The cold war has been supplanted by a hundred smaller hot wars, whether they are in Azerbaijan, Armenia, whether in former Yugoslavia, whether in still-explosive Afghanistan; all over the globe you see slaughter and killing.

This world needs democracy.

There is an agency that privatizes the selling of democracy. This agency is not a part of Government. There are places in the world where the Government cannot get in, where suspicions

exist if you are an official member of the Government.

But when you can get the essential elements of the American economy—management, labor—working together in a common cause, where you can get the Democratic Party and the Republican Party working with management and labor in a common cause and that cause is democracy, it is an incredible self-defeating notion that we would turn our backs on this most useful agency selling the most important product, world peace through democracy, in the world today.

And so I urge that we continue this grand idea that has worked so well in Poland, in Central Europe, in so many places. Now, if indeed they have made mistakes, if some expenditures have been unwise, then, fine, let us exercise oversight over them. We have the staff, we have the Members of Congress willing to do so.

But do not, do not extirpate this agency that does so much good in the cause of peace, in the cause of showing countries practically from the private sector how democracy works and what it can mean for their country, what the free enterprise system can do to lift their standards of living, to prevent the conflicts and the wars that are bleeding the world to death.

□ 1620

So please, I ask that you look at this expenditure as a wise one, as a beneficent one, as one that moves the world toward peace and democracy.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois suggest when he is having his town meetings and talking to his constituents that the only way we can privatize and sell democracy in America is by giving the Republican Party and the Democratic Party and the AFL–CIO and the United States Chamber of Commerce millions and millions of taxpayer dollars every year, going up to $50 million this year, that this is the only way democracy can be spent, or are there institutions within the Government and is not the National Endowment for Democracy capable of doing this?

Mr. HYDE. The gentleman has made his point. I just do not agree with it.

It is not the only way, but it is an excellent way.

Republicans and Democrats, what is anathema about them? These are the people of America. If you want to put some independence in there, do it, but management and labor are the heart and soul of the best economy, the most productive economy, the one that has provided this country with the highest standard of living in history, and we want to show people in the world how it can work, how we can work together.

To me there is nothing more imperative. It is not us against them.

What happens in Central Europe, in Africa, in Asia, can touch this country increasingly day by day; and I suggest to the gentleman that it is a false dichotomy that says whatever we spend in trying to democratize the world is money we cannot spend at home. It may well be the best investment that we can make if it forestalls a war, if it provides a growing standard of living for the people over there crying out for technological assistance, for help, for example, from management, from labor, from Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am here because I was listening to this debate, and seeing my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] respond to comments on the floor, and I just did not want to see him be by himself on this issue.

There have been many issues I have been involved in where I received a lot of accolades and public support, and people have said, "What a great thing you are doing."

On this one, I have noticed there are people I respect who want to continue to support NED. It may not be a popular position to oppose NED, because the name has such meaning, and as my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois points out, we do want to export democracy and we do want countries from overseas to emulate what we do here. We think the world would be a better place.

The question is, is it proper? Is it right? In fact, is it even moral to fund NED through the Republican and Democratic political structure, to fund NED through the head of the AFL–CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce? I think it is wrong. I think it is an inherently corrupt system.

I have personal experience, and admittedly going back a few years, that tells me the system leads itself to things that should not happen.

An individual in my State took a particular political position that the Republicans wanted to reward him. He finds himself on a trip, admittedly a few years ago, funded by NED, going throughout the European nations.

There have been consistent reports by the GAO that point out that funds provided for NED have not gone to the places they should have. There have been organizations that have said they never received the funds.

I do not in any way oppose the concept of NED. I oppose the concept of this money being channeled through the Republican Party, admittedly through a separate institute, or the Democratic Party, admittedly through a separate entity, or the AFL–CIO, because in all four cases they are controlled, in my judgment, by the leadership of those organizations, organizations if the AFL–CIO and the National Chamber of Commerce lobby this Congress and political leaders that we have to deal with who control our parties. I just think it is wrong.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that he has a faith in bureaucrats that I admire. I stand in awe.

I personally prefer to have people from organized labor and organized management.

The fact that you are a Republican or a Democrat, as long as you are a private citizen and you are selling the product of democracy by example and showing these people how we can work together, I cannot imagine that it is a bad idea.

Mr. SHAYS. No, it is not a bad idea, Republicans and Democrats working together, but not through the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, labor working through management, but not through their particular structures that lobby us every day of the year. That is where I have my problem. I do not have any problem with the intent of NED. I have my problem with the structure of NED.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RADIO BROADCASTING TO CUBA

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency to carry out the Radio Broadcasting to Cuba Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1465 et seq.) (providing for the Radio Marti Program or Cuba Service of the Voice of America), including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio transmission and reception and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio transmission and reception as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1471, $8,750,000, to remain available until expended as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 1477b(a).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the provisions of the bill, including lines 6 through 16 on page 73, are in violation of rule XXI, clause 2, in that they appropriate funds for a program which is not otherwise authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa, the subcommittee chairman, desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I concede that the program is not authorized, and would have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BROWN of California). The gentleman from Iowa concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained, and the language will be stricken.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This title may be cited as the "Department of State and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994".

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of each provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 605. (a) None of the funds provided under this Act or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act shall be available for the agencies obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds which: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes offices, programs, or activities; or (6) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided under this Act or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $500,000 or 10 per centum, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 per centum funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 per centum as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings from a reduction in personnel which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress, unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified fifteen days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT: At the end of the bill, add the following new sections:

SEC. . SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.

(a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, to the extent feasible, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Head of the agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, we would do a lot more to export democracy around the world if we would export a few more American-made products. If Congress would take more seriously the procurement process whereby our taxpayer dollars are used many times to buy all these foreign-made goods, we might be able to do a better job of balancing our budget.

I would just like to say this for the RECORD on this amendment. I have been getting some mail relative to this issue. I had a very interesting letter asking me if in fact there was ever one instance, one instance where Germany in fact awarded a contract to an American firm?

If anybody has that, I will leave the RECORD open. They can submit it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Well, Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that essentially the same amendment was carried last year. For that reason, I am not going to make any big deal out of it.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, we have looked at the amendment and have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EMERSON

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EMERSON: Page 75, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 606. Hereafter, each public ceremony for the admission of new citizens under section 337 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1448) shall be conducted solely in the English language.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

□ 1630

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

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

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I was astounded to learn that in Tucson, AZ, on July 2, the Immigration and Naturalization Service swore in 75 immigrants in Spanish—yes, they were sworn in as United States citizens, not in English, but in Spanish. United States District Judge Alfredo Marquez, the judge who conducted the ceremony, is quoted as saying, "Even though the new citizens can speak and understand English, the ceremony is more meaningful to them in Spanish."

Mr. Chairman, when an individual leaves his or her native homeland and comes to America, that individual is taking new steps. The swearing-in ceremony is the beginning of a new life as an American. Taking the oath in English ought to be more meaningful—the language signals a new day, a new way of life, and a new bond with the other citizens of our country.

Americans are a diverse lot; nearly 150 languages are spoken in this country, and English is the common bond for us all. The citizenship ceremony should emphasize the things that unite us, not those which divide us into ethnic and linguistic subgroups.

The INS should know better. I am therefore offering an amendment which would prohibit the INS from conducting citizenship swearing-in ceremonies in languages other than English.

America's ability to unite those of differing backgrounds—"out of many, one"—is her greatest strength. I am concerned, however, that that strength is waning. We've focused so much on the many that we're forgetting about the one.

The face of America—of that "one"—is changing. Change can be good. But as we all know, change—for better or for worse—can be traumatic. It's tough on those who come here, and it's tough on those who are already here. One essential element of that process of change—an element that could well determine our ultimate success or failure—is communication. Human nature often leads us to resist and fear those who are different from ourselves. Unless we can communicate with each other, we cannot begin to understand each other. We will not be able to communicate with each other unless we share a common tongue.

The English language is our common bond. By conducting the citizenship ceremony in a language other than English, the INS is sending the wrong message. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], the ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it sounds like the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] will be ruled out of order. The Chair will rule in a few minutes, and I assume that is what will happen. But let me commend the gen-

tleman for bringing this matter to the Members' attention.

Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's views, and I want to associate myself with his remarks. I think he made a very important point. Our common language, English, is the glue that holds this great country together, and, if we have the official U.S. Government saying to new citizens of this country that it is OK never to develop the common tongue, then we are doing those people a disservice, as well as the rest of us, and I commend the gentleman.

Mr. EMERSON. Precisely, and I thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS] for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this is strictly a legislative matter. It proposes to change existing law and imposes additional duties, modifies existing powers and duties, and it is operative beyond the 1994 fiscal year. So, I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. EMERSON. No, I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri concedes the point of order, the Chair upholds the point of order, and the amendment is ruled out of order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FIELDS OF TEXAS

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS of Texas: Page 75, after line 19, insert the following new section.

SEC. 606. None of the funds made available in this Act for "THE JUDICIARY—Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services—Defender services" may be used to provide assistance for the operation of death penalty resource centers.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

(Mr. FIELDS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to prevent any funds in the defender services line item from being used for death penalty resource centers.

Death penalty resource centers are nonprofit entities that provide free, tax-payer financed legal assistance to death row prisoners seeking to overturn their convictions and their death sentences. The fiscal year 1994 request for death penalty resource centers is $30.4 million; this for the operation of existing centers and the creation of additional centers.

My constituents do not want their hard-earned tax dollars used to pay for the endless legal appeals of murderers, rapists, drug kingpins, and others who are seeking to avoid the penalties to which they have been sentenced.

In my State of Texas, there have been numerous allegations against the Texas Resource Center. Those allegations have been lodged by various sources, including several district attorneys' offices across the State. Some of the allegations include charges that the center hired a public relations expert to handle public relations campaigns; that the center recruited witnesses in death row cases; and that the center pressured witnesses to perjure themselves. There have even been allegations—and evidence to support those allegations—that the center once posted bail for a witness who had been ordered arrested by the presiding judge in a capital case.

Funding for the centers is authorized by Congress and coordinated through the administrative offices of the U.S. courts. Some centers receive additional funding from a program of State bar associations. The centers are exempt from the Freedom of Information Act; and therefore, they are not as accountable to the public as I would like.

The serious allegations that have been lodged against the Texas Resource Center disturb me profoundly. Congress should restrict funding for death penalty resource centers until these serious allegations can be investigated and until proper oversight can be ensured.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SMITH].

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my point of order is that this is a limitation to a general appropriations bill offered during the reading of a general appropriations bill, and I insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I regrettably concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS] concedes the point of order, the Chair upholds the point of order, and the amendment is ruled out of order.

The Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1994".

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise again today in opposition to the amendment previously offered by Representative WALKER. When I last addressed my colleagues on this amendment, I focused on the negative impact that it would have on the National Marine Sanctuaries Program, programs fostering our understanding of the relationship between land and sea, and our domestic fisheries fleet. Today, I wish also to discuss the severe impact that the amendment could have on our Nation's coasts.

The committee has spoken clearly on the need for a sufficient level of funding for the coastal and ocean programs under the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA]. By stripping $37.5 million from the NOAA marine, coastal and ocean, and Great Lakes programs, we would be severely undermining the National Marine Sanctuaries Program, the National Undersea Research Program, Coastal Zone Management nonpoint source pollution prevention, the National Sea Grant College Program, zebra mussel research and fisheries management.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress acted at long last in 1992 to designate the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary with the distinct intention of preserving this pristine marine environment for future generations. Other ocean areas have also been recently designated under the National Marine Sanctuary Program. This program hinges on adequate resources to help foster sound management practices.

Clearly, it is not in our interest to undermine our sanctuary areas further and open them to potential problems after the Congress has mandated their specific protection.

This amendment would also have the very negative impact of reducing already limited funding for coastal nonpoint pollution control and the management of our coastal resources. In 1972, the Congress enacted the Coastal Zone Management Act [CZMA] in an effort to protect the Nation's coastal resources and to ensure that these resources are wisely used. This monumental legislation balanced economic growth with resource protection.

While funding for CZMA has remained level over the last 12 years, the number of States participating has almost doubled. This has caused tremendous strain on the effectiveness of the act. Without sufficient funding for CZMA nonpoint pollution control, we put our coastal areas at tremendous and lasting risk.

I implore my colleagues to realize that adoption of this amendment would be to take a giant step backward for what has been done in previous years to make this country more aware of our oceans and the opportunities they provide by establishing protection and educational processes. Previous to this amendment, this bill allowed these priorities.

This amendment is not an exercise in fiscal responsibility, but an attempt to shift funding away from the modestly funded, yet desperately needed, ocean and coastal programs to the well-funded National Weather Service modernization. In fact, even without this amendment, the Weather Service modernization is getting a 28-percent increase over last year's appropriation. The nominal amount saved by this amendment will cause a tremendous increase in the future costs to protect the marine sanctuaries. Neglect of our sanctuaries and coastal areas now will result in our having to pay for cleanup costs in addition to management later.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and restore the level approved by the committee.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on funding for the Bureau of the Census for fiscal year 1994.

I chair the Subcommittee on Census, Statistics and Postal Personnel of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In that capacity, I have worked closely with Subcommittee

Chairman NEAL SMITH and ranking minority member HAROLD ROGERS to ensure adequate financial resources for the Census Bureau's work. I am grateful for their attention over the years to the Bureau's complex, specialized, and sometimes esoteric programs.

Fiscal year 1994 is an important year in the planning cycle for the 2000 decennial census. The Census Bureau will have chosen one or two designs for testing in 1995. The 1995 test will determine those methods that hold the greatest promise to improve census-taking into the next century.

The success of that test will depend, in large measure, on adequate preparations in 1994. Those preparations include site selection, procurement of office and data processing equipment, and final research on new census techniques. The Bureau also must develop technology to process census forms that are much more user-friendly than in the past.

H.R. 2519 includes $15 million less for 2000 census research and planning than the administration had requested. The report accompanying the bill clearly sets forth the reason for that significant reduction in funding. Members are understandably frustrated by the outcome of the 1990 census. It cost twice as much as the census before it. But it was less accurate. It missed more people. It missed more minorities than the overall number of people missed in 1980.

The Appropriations Committee has sent a clear message. The primary concern for Members of Congress is the accuracy of the population numbers. Rapidly escalating costs for the census must be contained. And the Census Bureau must ensure that there is an important governmental purpose for the wide range of demographic data it has traditionally collected in the census. Those of us who work closely with the Census Bureau, and the larger Federal statistical system of which it is an integral part, are grateful for the guidance and direction that the committee has provided.

There is a consensus that we must do better in 2000. I'm convinced that we can. That is why I have supported a planning process that starts much earlier in the decade. The Census Bureau needs time to develop and test new methods that will help improve the accuracy of the population numbers, at a reasonable cost. It must explore ways to redistribute the burden of meeting the Nation's vast data needs onto other vehicles throughout the decade.

Progress toward an improved census process has been slow at times. I believe that the Census Bureau is committed to reform of that process. Unfortunately, its efforts to reach that goal have, at time, been cumbersome. The Appropriations Committee has been understandably frustrated by what might appear to be a lack of direction, or even commitment, on the part of the Bureau.

But 1994 presents a key opportunity for the Bureau to clarify its progress toward census reform, as it prepares to test promising new methods in 1995. Without the test, we cannot have much confidence in a range of complex and untried, yet promising, techniques for 2000. Worse yet, we might end up with the same census in 2000 that we took in 1990.

I look forward to working with Chairman SMITH, Congressman ROGERS, and other members of the Appropriations Committee as they prepare for conference with the Senate, to ensure that the Census Bureau has the financial resources it needs to achieve the mutual goal of a more accurate and cost-effective census in 2000.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2519, Commerce, Justice, State appropriations for fiscal year 1994. I would like to express my great appreciation to Chairman SMITH for his hard work in crafting such a fine bill. In particular, I am supportive of the provisions to increase funding for the National Marine Sanctuary Program and Coastal Zone Management programs, essential programs which protect the coastline in California and across the Nation.

As the only Federal program specifically designed to protect our most outstanding marine areas, the National Marine Sanctuary Program is of crucial importance to our National's coastal regions. The enrollment of three new sanctuaries in the program in the past year is a testament to the program's importance and popularity. The sanctuaries off the coast of California make up the largest protected marine area in the world. However, the increase in number size and complexity of designated sanctuaries has strained the program's limited resources in recent years.

Next year, as a result of Chairman SMITH'S decision to increase funding from $7 to $9 million, the National Marine Sanctuary Program will be better able to ensure that Congress' mandate of environmental protection for sensitive marine areas is responsible and effectively maintained.

I am pleased that this bill also increases funds for Coastal Zone Management programs. The district I represent, Marin and Sonoma counties in California, is famous for its beautiful coast. The Coastal Zone Management programs are vital to the health of my district's coasts as well as those of the Nation. With Federal funding in real dollars decreasing over the past 10 years, the Coastal Zone Management programs have been under growing pressure to meet more demands with fewer dollars. The increased funding that the Appropriations Committee has provided will help the Coastal Zone Management programs fulfill their important mission.

In addition, this bill continues funding of the weather data buoys which provide fishermen with critical weather information. Generations of families have made their living fishing in the coastal waters off Marin and Sonoma Counties, and the weather buoys stationed in these waters are relied upon by the fishermen and their families to ensure safe and successful journeys.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Commerce, State, Justice appropriations bill.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely pleased the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill for fiscal year 1994 includes funding for the Juvenile Justice Delinquency Prevention Act and specifically for the Juvenile Mentoring Program.

As the author of this mentoring program, I soundly believe mentoring programs provide the necessary partnership between schools, public and private agencies, institutions and businesses, which can help make a difference in the lives of our Nation's at-risk youth.

It has been proven that a relationship exists between poor academic achievement, school completion, and juvenile delinquency. By using mentors to work with at-risk youth, as in the Juvenile Mentoring Program, we provide young people with the positive role models they need to lead successful lives. Mentors provide academic assistance and experience in the workplace as well as helping to develop positive interests and attitudes. The Juvenile Mentoring Program also provides better coordination between the youth's home, school, and residential facility and helps to ensure at-risk youth keep up with their classmates. This encourages them to stay in school once they return to their homes. By making this investment in young people, we help them to be assets to their communities rather than repeat offenders or gang members.

The $2 million provided in H.R. 2519 by the Appropriations Committee will most certainly go a long way in helping our Nation's communities reduce juvenile delinquency. I appreciate the attention the Appropriations Committee has given to this important program and encourage schools to apply for and use this funding to develop mentoring programs for at-risk youth. I commend the committee for providing increases for the overall Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. This investment will pay for itself many times over in reduced costs for law enforcement, job training, and other social services. With juvenile crime on the rise in our country, particularly violent crime, it is of the utmost importance that we support the activities authorized under this law.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, at an earlier point in the debate on this bill, a point of order was sustained to delete funding for one of the lifelines for Americans who live in poverty.

As a young lawyer in the late 1960's and early 1970's, I witnessed the birth of the Legal Services Corporation and participated in its struggle for adequate funding.

Contrary to the claims of its critics, the LSC was never envisioned as—nor has it functioned as—a political effort to radicalize the poor. Rather, it has been the only chance for many Americans to have a shot at the basic tenet of our Constitution and system of law—equal justice.

Despite scant resources, the LSC has helped thousands over the years in critically important matters such as:

Wrongful tenant evictions—without the LSC there would be substantially more homelessness

Wrongful denial of Social Security benefits—often the sole income for the elderly

Discrimination in housing or employment based on psychiatric disability

Wrongful termination of parental rights which deprives children of the nurturing role of one or both parents.

All these issues affect families, and the LSC is one of the few pro-family advocates for Americans in poverty.

Yet, LSC funding and coverage have declined in today's dollars since 1981.

Here are how these decreases have affected California:

From 1980 to 1990, the number of legal services attorneys in California decreased 20 percent while the number of Californians eligible to receive legal assistance increased 34 percent.

The ratio of poor persons per legal services attorney during this same decade nearly doubled, from 5,727 in 1980 to 10,074 in 1990

California Rural Legal Assistance lost one third of its field staff in the 1980's, while pov-

erty increased 50 percent in the program's client population

In Los Angeles, the Legal Aid Foundation is facing the loss this year of $1.1 million. Due to the severe funding cuts, thousands seeking legal assistance are turned down.

Mr. Chairman, these statistics are devastating. And behind the statistics are human beings: children, seniors, adults with disabilities, many of whom are striving to break out of the cycle of poverty.

As a member of the bar and a Member of the Congress of the United States, I view my obligation to help afford equal justice for all as central. Deleting LSC funding hinders that goal. I urge restoration of LSC funding in the conference report, and approval of that request by the House.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, at the request of the Chief Judge of the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in my State, I rise to support the Appropriations Committee for including in H.R. 2519, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, funds available for use for additional bankruptcy judgeships previously authorized in the 102d Congress. The committee has included in this bill $16 million in the judiciary salaries and expenses account to cover the highest priority needs of the federal judiciary. This particular appropriation could fund many of the bankruptcy judgeships authorized, but not funded, by the last Congress.

Adequate judicial resources on the Federal bankruptcy bench represent a small but important piece needed for our Nation's economic recovery. Adequate resources help both debtors get back on their feet and help creditors receive payment more quickly. Debtors and creditors, small and large businesses, labor and management, rural and urban Americans, and the economy as a whole, all depend on the swift and equitable handling of bankruptcy cases.

The judicial district of Arizona had a record year for bankruptcy filings in 1992. Last year, Arizona ranked 11th in the country in overall filings. Funding of these new bankruptcy judgeships should lead to a reduced backlog, quicker turnaround for individual cases, and ultimately a positive impact on our economy.

I thank the distinguished chairmen of the full committee and the subcommittee, as well as the members of the full committee and subcommittee, for recognizing this national need in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were ayes 9; noes 8.

So the motion to rise and report was agreed to.

□ 1640

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. BROWN of California, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2519) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Hunter amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the so-called Penny amendment, as amended, which reduced SBA by $21,870,000, and also on the so-called Walker amendment that had to do with reducing NOAA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 19, line 3, strike "$999,000,000" and insert "$1,059,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

Mr. WALKER. 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.

Pursuant to rule XV, votes on the two subsequent amendments, if ordered, will be reduced to a minimum of 5 minutes. Members are advised this is a 15-minute vote, which may be followed by two 5-minute votes, after which there may be further votes.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 298, nays 129, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

YEAS—298

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brewster
Brooks
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Cox
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLay
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards (CA)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klecska
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
LaFalce
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCollum
McCurdy
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Nadler
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Richardson
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—129

Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Bevill
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Coble
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Dicks
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (TX)
English (OK)
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)

Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Goodling
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hoagland
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Jacobs
Kanjorski
Kennelly
Klein
Klink
Kreidler
Lambert
Lloyd
Lowey
Markey
McCloskey
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
Meehan
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Parker
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Rush
Sabo
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Skaggs
Slattery
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Swift
Synar
Taylor (MS)
Thornton
Thurman
Unsoeld
Valentine
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Williams
Wise
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—7

Conyers
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tucker

□ 1705

Messrs. PORTER, ENGLISH of Oklahoma, SPRATT, and PENNY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BARLOW, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Messrs. RANGEL, STARK, ABERCROMBIE, COX, DINGELL, TAUZIN, CLAYTON, and TOWNS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: Page 33, line 21, strike "$1,650,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,640,366,000".

The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 356, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—70

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barton
Bereuter
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Coble
Combest
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Crapo
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Franks (CT)
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodlatte
Grams
Grandy
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Harman
Herger
Hunter
Hutchinson
Inhofe
Johnson, Sam
Kim
Kyl
Linder
Manzullo
McCandless
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Minge
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Pombo
Portman
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Royce
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Solomon
Stearns
Stump
Sundquist
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thurman
Walker
Young (FL)

NOES—356

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallegly
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Conyers
Frost
Henry
Istook
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tucker

□ 1715

Mr. SPRATT changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The Clerk will report the last amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment: On page 55, line 8, strike "$243,326,000" and insert "$221,456,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule XV, and the Chair's prior announcement, this is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 242, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—183

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Brown (OH)
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Clinger
Collins (GA)
Condit
Coppersmith
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeFazio
DeLay
Derrick
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
English (OK)
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)

Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—242

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Baker (CA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Cantwell
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers
Dickey
Dornan
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tucker

□ 1723

Mr. GALLO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not make the vote on the Penny amendment to H.R. 2519. Had I been present, I would have voted for that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KOLBE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2519, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 13, line 1, strike "$307,700,000" and insert "$356,884,000".

On page 16, line 13, strike "$2,024,705,000" and insert "$2,043,705,000".

On page 18, line 4, strike "$718,684,000" and insert "$731,639,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on his motion to recommit?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, This motion to recommit will restore funding to the level requested by the President in three critical law enforcement areas: Detention of U.S. Prisoners; FBI; and DEA. My motion is as simple as that.

Orginally this motion was to have included increases in funding to protect and regulate this country's borders. The INS is woefully understaffed, resulting in wave after wave of illegal border crossings, and causing endless delay for legal crossings. By a July 1 floor amendment, however, the House agreed to add $60 million to the INS budget, removing the need to include increased funding in the motion to recommit for INS.

The increases in funding for law enforcement contained in this motion do not cause the bill to exceed last year's spending level. In fact, with this spending, it is still $2.2 billion below last year's level in budget authority and close to $1.5 billion in outlays.

Let me describe the areas very quickly.

U.S. prisoners: Of the $81.2 million total, $49.2 million will go to support detention of U.S. prisoners, bringing the bill to the funding level requested by the President.

At the bill's current funding level, over 874,126 fewer jail days will be funded than would be under this motion.

Since 1987, the U.S. Marshals Service's Federal detainee population has grown by 167 percent—an annual growth rate of 15 percent and far outpacing the Bureau of Prisons inmate population.

In 1992 alone, the population grew by 20.6 percent.

Most likely, the BOP could not handle the overflow, and the Department would have to work with the courts, and Federal arresting agencies to control the population, including delays in detaining suspected criminals, or at the other end releasing convicted criminals early so the detained people can be kept in jail pending trial.

Mr. Speaker, we have to send a strong message to lawbreakers today, that if you break the law you are going to be put away, period. We have a responsibility to be able to hold those that are being arrested, to detain them until they have trial, and this amendment would allow us to do that.

For the FBI, the motion provides $19 million to bring it to the President's requested level of funding.

Mr. Speaker, when addressing the FBI, let me point out that the $10 million will go into the fund, or will go to fund nationwide implementation of the background investigation contract service known as BICS. With the BICS funding, we will be able to take 62 agents that might be reassigned to such high-priority programs as health care fraud, and the FBI has estimated that health care fraud amounts to over $80 billion annually, or close to 10 percent of our health care spending.

If we put it another way, if we could eliminate health care fraud, and this could go partway to doing that, we

could fund the various health care reforms that are floating around this House and around Washington today.

Besides providing important funding for the BICS Program, the motion to recommit would provide $9 million for the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System that is called IAFIS. IAFIS will improve turnaround for criminal fingerprint checks from as long as 6 weeks to just 2 hours. The expedited time for fingerprint checks will help the Federal and State law enforcement agencies to identify criminals before they are released from custody.

□ 1730

This motion will add $13 million to the DEA to bring it to the President's level.

The House mark would result in a reduction of approximately 105 positions in the DEA.

These reductions come on the heels of position reductions totalling 176 in 1993, including 163 agents.

The combined agent loss in 1994 of 238 agents, 163 in 1993, and 75 in 1994, will result in roughly 1,825 fewer cocaine arrests, two-thirds of which are the highest level class I and class II cases, and an untold amount of asset seizures lost.

Worst of all is the message the cuts send the drug kingpins: That we are in retreat; that our commitment is waning; that we have lost and do not care about fighting the war on drugs.

The appropriations process is the place where this body sets its spending priorities. And while there may be debate on the merits of some programs in this bill, no one can question the importance of properly funding this country's law enforcement agencies. Law enforcement must be of the highest priority until our streets are safe.

Mr. Speaker, along with many of our Members, I wish that we could do more, but this, at least, is a beginning, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, this is a novel motion to recommit. It adds money. All of the motions to recommit we have had up to now took money out of programs.

This motion to recommit would add $81 million for a purpose that is close to my heart, always has been, law enforcement. But in the bill, we gave law enforcement more than the 95 percent of current services that we held most agencies to.

Then, if you will remember, when the budget was submitted last February, the administration requested some enhancements as part of its investment proposals. We could have the enhancements if we waived the Budget Act. But I am not about to believe that Members are going to waive the Budget Act. We could not give the administration all of the enhancements they requested. So when it is said that we did not give the Justice Department all they requested, it is because we did not give them all of the requested enhancements in the investment proposal. We just do not have the money.

Now for program enhancements, we gave them maybe half of their request. But we have to reserve money for the programs that were knocked out of the bill or points of order. If we do not reserve money, then we will not have the money to restore these programs when we go to conference.

So law enforcement was already over the 95 percent of current services that most agencies received in the bill.

Also, the Hunter amendment that the House just approved added another $60 million to the Justice Department.

Now, the money does not come out of nowhere; we have to get the money from somewhere. I need to know which Members believe law enforcement is a higher priority than all the other things in the bill. That is the reason I want a rollcall vote.

We need to know which Members believe law enforcement is a higher priority than all the other things in the bill. We can get the money; I am not going to say we cannot. We could get the money by killing the NOAA projects that are in the bill. For example, we can kill the Sea Grant Program, which is funded at $40.8 million. We could pick up a chunk right there.

We could kill the Coastal Zone Management Program, which is funded at $41 million. Those two programs together will give us the money to pay for the motion to recommit, if that is what Members want to do. It is your decision.

Marine sanctuaries, if we eliminated that program, it would save another $9 million. We can kill that program. We have already, in this bill, saved $17 million because the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee knocked out funds for the Travel and Tourism Administration on a point of order. We already spent three times that amount on the Hunter amendment which added $60 million for the INS.

That is what this motion is about. We do not have the money. If you do not have the money, do you want to increase $81 million over what is contained in the bill.

I say let us have a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 315, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—112

Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bateman
Billirakis
Billey
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Clinger
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kim
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Oxley
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Ridge
Rogers
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Schiff
Schumer
Shays
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Stearns
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—315

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney

Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Conyers
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tucker

□ 1752

Mr. STUMP and Mr. PAXON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MICHEL, RAHALL, and WISE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair reminds Members that this in a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 327, noes 98, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—327

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Calvert
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Klecza
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOES—98

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Bartlett
Barton
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gingrich
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Huffington
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Manzullo
McCandless
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Murphy
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Walker
Weldon
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Pomeroy
Tucker
Washington

□ 1801

Mr. GALLO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1850

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, while meeting with my constituents from North Dakota a few minutes ago, I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 346, a vote which represented final passage of the appropriations for Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to reflect that had I voted, I would have voted in the affirmative.

REPORT ON H.R. 2667, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR RELIEF FROM MAJOR WIDESPREAD FLOODING IN THE MIDWEST, FISCAL YEAR, 1993

Mr. NATCHER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-184) on the bill (H.R. 2667) making emergency supplemental appropriations for relief from the major, widespread flooding in the Midwest for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the Hefley amendment. It is shortsighted and fails to recognize the importance of this agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 300, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—122

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bereuter
Billirakis
Bliley
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Castle
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fowler
Gallegly
Gekas
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hobson
Hoke
Huffington
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Meyers
Miller (FL)
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Paxon
Penny
Petri
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Regula
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Schaefer
Sensenbrenner
Skeen
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Solomon
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—300

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bryer
Byrne
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Holden
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inglis
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Snowe
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Baker (LA)
Bevill
Conyers
Dornan
Faleomavaega (AS)
Frost
Hamburg
Henry
Hinchey
Horn
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Rostenkowski
Tucker
Underwood (GU)
Valentine

□ 1357

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Dornan for, with Mr. Tucker against.

Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY and Messrs. INGLIS of South Carolina, DEUTSCH, and RAVENEL changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. HALL of Texas, MCCOLLUM, and MCHUGH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained and missed the last vote on the Hefley amendment. I would like to note that if I were present, I would have voted against it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBERSTAR

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBERSTAR: Page 59, after line 8, insert the following:

UNITED STATES TRAVEL AND TOURISM ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Travel and Tourism Administration, $22,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could get some agreement on time for this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I would say that no more than 20 minutes would be sufficient.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Twenty minutes, ten minutes on each side?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Yes. We probably will not use all that time.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would hope that there could be some time allotted to this side of the aisle on the question as we talk about limiting time. Would the gentleman be amenable to allocating a third of the time, whatever time is agreed to, to this side of the aisle?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROGERS], 10 minutes to myself, and 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be limited to 30 minutes on this amendment and all amendments thereto, the time to be divided, 10 minutes apiece, among the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking minority member, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

□ 1400

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment restores to the Travel and Tourism Administration funding that was eliminated in the markup of the bill Not because the chairman is not in accord with the views, with the issues, the U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration, but because there was so much

Fingerhut
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Lehman
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Linder
Livingston
Machtley
Manzullo
McCandless
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McMillan
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Minge
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Murphy
Myers
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Paxon
Penny
Petersen (MN)
Petri
Pickle
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Ravenel
Reed
Ridge
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Synar
Talent
Tanner
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—242

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Applegate
Baker (CA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Cantwell
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Mink
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers
Dickey
Dornan
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tucker

□ 1723

Mr. GALLO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not make the vote on the Penny amendment to H.R. 2519. Had I been present, I would have voted for that amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, in its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KOLBE moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 2519, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back the same forthwith with the following amendments:

On page 13, line 1, strike "$307,700,000" and insert "$356,884,000".

On page 16, line 18, strike "$2,024,705,000" and insert "$2,043,705,000".

On page 18, line 4, strike "$718,684,000" and insert "$731,639,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on his motion to recommit?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] is recognized for 5 minutes on his motion to recommit.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, This motion to recommit will restore funding to the level requested by the President in three critical law enforcement areas: Detention of U.S. Prisoners; FBI; and DEA. My motion is as simple as that.

Orginally this motion was to have included increases in funding to protect and regulate this country's borders. The INS is woefully understaffed, resulting in wave after wave of illegal border crossings, and causing endless delay for legal crossings. By a July 1 floor amendment, however, the House agreed to add $60 million to the INS budget, removing the need to include increased funding in the motion to recommit for INS.

The increases in funding for law enforcement contained in this motion do not cause the bill to exceed last year's spending level. In fact, with this spending, it is still $2.2 billion below last year's level in budget authority and close to $1.5 billion in outlays.

Let me describe the areas very quickly.

U.S. prisoners: Of the $81.2 million total, $49.2 million will go to support detention of U.S. prisoners, bringing the bill to the funding level requested by the President.

At the bill's current funding level, over 874,126 fewer jail days will be funded than would be under this motion.

Since 1987, the U.S. Marshals Service's Federal detainee population has grown by 167 percent—an annual growth rate of 15 percent and far outpacing the Bureau of Prisons inmate population.

In 1992 alone, the population grew by 20.6 percent.

Most likely, the BOP could not handle the overflow, and the Department would have to work with the courts, and Federal arresting agencies to control the population, including delays in detaining suspected criminals, or at the other end releasing convicted criminals early so the detained people can be kept in jail pending trial.

Mr. Speaker, we have to send a strong message to lawbreakers today, that if you break the law you are going to be put away, period. We have a responsibility to be able to hold those that are being arrested, to detain them until they have trial, and this amendment would allow us to do that.

For the FBI, the motion provides $19 million to bring it to the President's requested level of funding.

Mr. Speaker, when addressing the FBI, let me point out that the $10 million will go into the fund, or will go to fund nationwide implementation of the background investigation contract service known as BICS. With the BICS funding, we will be able to take 62 agents that might be reassigned to such high-priority programs as health care fraud, and the FBI has estimated that health care fraud amounts to over $80 billion annually, or close to 10 percent of our health care spending.

If we put it another way, if we could eliminate health care fraud, and this could go partway to doing that, we

could fund the various health care reforms that are floating around this House and around Washington today.

Besides providing important funding for the BICS Program, the motion to recommit would provide $9 million for the Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System that is called IAFIS. IAFIS will improve turnaround for criminal fingerprint checks from as long as 6 weeks to just 2 hours. The expedited time for fingerprint checks will help the Federal and State law enforcement agencies to identify criminals before they are released from custody.

□ 1730

This motion will add $13 million to the DEA to bring it to the President's level.

The House mark would result in a reduction of approximately 105 positions in the DEA.

These reductions come on the heels of position reductions totalling 176 in 1993, including 163 agents.

The combined agent loss in 1994 of 238 agents, 163 in 1993, and 75 in 1994, will result in roughly 1,825 fewer cocaine arrests, two-thirds of which are the highest level class I and class II cases, and an untold amount of asset seizures lost.

Worst of all is the message the cuts send the drug kingpins: That we are in retreat; that our commitment is waning; that we have lost and do not care about fighting the war on drugs.

The appropriations process is the place where this body sets its spending priorities. And while there may be debate on the merits of some programs in this bill, no one can question the importance of properly funding this country's law enforcement agencies. Law enforcement must be of the highest priority until our streets are safe.

Mr. Speaker, along with many of our Members, I wish that we could do more, but this, at least, is a beginning, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, this is a novel motion to recommit. It adds money. All of the motions to recommit we have had up to now took money out of programs.

This motion to recommit would add $81 million for a purpose that is close to my heart, always has been, law enforcement. But in the bill, we gave law enforcement more than the 95 percent of current services that we held most agencies to.

Then, if you will remember, when the budget was submitted last February, the administration requested some enhancements as part of its investment proposals. We could have the enhancements if we waived the Budget Act. But I am not about to believe that Members are going to waive the Budget Act. We could not give the administration all of the enhancements they requested. So when it is said that we did not give the Justice Department all they requested, it is because we did not give them all of the requested enhancements in the investment proposal. We just do not have the money.

Now for program enhancements, we gave them maybe half of their request. But we have to reserve money for the programs that were knocked out of the bill or points of order. If we do not reserve money, then we will not have the money to restore these programs when we go to conference.

So law enforcement was already over the 95 percent of current services that most agencies received in the bill.

Also, the Hunter amendment that the House just approved added another $60 million to the Justice Department.

Now, the money does not come out of nowhere; we have to get the money from somewhere. I need to know which Members believe law enforcement is a higher priority than all the other things in the bill. That is the reason I want a rollcall vote.

We need to know which Members believe law enforcement is a higher priority than all the other things in the bill. We can get the money; I am not going to say we cannot. We could get the money by killing the NOAA projects that are in the bill. For example, we can kill the Sea Grant Program, which is funded at $40.8 million. We could pick up a chunk right there.

We could kill the Coastal Zone Management Program, which is funded at $41 million. Those two programs together will give us the money to pay for the motion to recommit, if that is what Members want to do. It is your decision.

Marine sanctuaries, if we eliminated that program, it would save another $9 million. We can kill that program. We have already, in this bill, saved $17 million because the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee knocked out funds for the Travel and Tourism Administration on a point of order. We already spent three times that amount on the Hunter amendment which added $60 million for the INS.

That is what this motion is about. We do not have the money. If you do not have the money, do you want to increase $81 million over what is contained in the bill.

I say let us have a "no" vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 315, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—112

Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Bartlett
Bateman
Billirakis
Billey
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Buyer
Camp
Canady
Clinger
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Dunn
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goss
Grams
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hastert
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Kasich
Kim
King
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
McCandless
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
Mica
Michel
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Mollohan
Moorhead
Oxley
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Ridge
Rogers
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Schiff
Schumer
Shays
Shuster
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spence
Stearns
Talent
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wise
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—315

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Blute
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Duncan
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefley
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hutchinson
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Klug
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney

Manton
Manzullo
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schroeder
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Solomon
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—7

Conyers
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Tucker

□ 1752

Mr. STUMP and Mr. PAXON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. MICHEL, RAHALL, and WISE changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair reminds Members that this in a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 327, noes 98, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—327

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Barca
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bellenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Byrne
Calvert
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Furse
Gallo
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Grandy
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastert
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
Klecza
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Machtley
Maloney
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Ridge
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schenk
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)

NOES—98

Allard
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bachus (AL)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barcia
Bartlett
Barton
Boehner
Bonilla
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gekas
Gingrich
Goss
Grams
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hancock
Hansen
Hefley
Herger
Huffington
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson, Sam
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Manzullo
McCandless
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Murphy
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Ramstad
Roberts
Rohrabacher
Roth
Royce
Santorum
Schaefer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Slattery
Smith (MI)
Smith (OR)
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Upton
Walker
Weldon
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Conyers
Frost
Henry
Mann
Moakley
Packard
Pomeroy
Tucker
Washington

□ 1801

Mr. GALLO changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1850

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, while meeting with my constituents from North Dakota a few minutes ago, I inadvertently missed rollcall No. 346, a vote which represented final passage of the appropriations for Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary for fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Speaker, I would like the record to reflect that had I voted, I would have voted in the affirmative.

REPORT ON H.R. 2667, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR RELIEF FROM MAJOR WIDESPREAD FLOODING IN THE MIDWEST, FISCAL YEAR, 1993

Mr. NATCHER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-184) on the bill (H.R. 2667) making emergency supplemental appropriations for relief from the major, widespread flooding in the Midwest for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.