SPECIAL ORDERS

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

THE AMBASSADOR FROM BELIZE

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell a story worthy of a Hollywood script.

In fact, if it was made into a movie, it would probably be called ''the Strange Case of the Billionaire, the Loophole, the Ambassadorship, and a Country Called Belize.''

For our purposes today, I just call it a window on the soul of the Gingrich revolution.

Mr. Speaker, our story begins in the small Nation of Belize.

You may have heard of Belize before.

It's a small Central-American nation known for its great vacations, its near-pristine tropical forests, and its great skindiving.

But recently, it made news for a different reason.

Last week, the Nation of Belize inquired about setting up a new diplomatic post in one of the most important cities in America.

Was it Washington, DC? New York City?

Nope. Belize wants to set up its diplomatic post in Sarasota, FL.

Now why, you may wonder, would they want to do that? It's not because Sarasota has an overly large concentration of Belizeans.

Well, it seems they would like to have a new ambassador to the United States.

A new ambassador by the name of Kenneth Dart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may have heard of Kenneth Dart before.

He's an American. At least he was an American.

Up until a year ago, he was a billionaire investor and styrofoam-cup maker living in America.

But last year, he renounced his American citizenship and moved to Belize.

Why did he do that?

Well, because under a provision in the U.S. Tax Code, by renouncing his citizenship, Mr. Dart could avoid paying his U.S. income taxes.

Tens of millions of dollars in U.S. income taxes.

So in exchange for becoming a billionaire Benedict Arnold, Mr. Dart got to keep millions of dollars.

Problem is, while taking his trip abroad, he's taking American taxpayers for a ride.

During the tax debate this year, Democrats offered a bill to close this loophole and force billionaires like Kenneth Dart to pay their fair share.

But when it came time for a vote, every Republican but six voted against it.

Instead, they voted to cut school lunches, student loans, and Medicare.

But now Mr. Dart has a new problem.

Under U.S. law, he can only come back to America once every 30 days.

Problem is, his family still lives in America.

And I'll bet you'll never guess where his family lives.

That's right—Sarasota, FL.

So, as a new Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Dart will indeed be visiting the white house—the white house he and his family own in Sarasota, FL.

The kicker to all this, Mr. Speaker is simply this: Under the Republican tax plan, Mr. Dart's family in Florida is still eligible to receive huge tax breaks.

Huge tax breaks that are being paid for by Republican cuts to Medicare.

So next time you hear people talking about the Gingrich revolution, stop and think for a minute about the ''Case of the Billionaire, the Loophole, the Ambassadorship, and a Country called Belize.''

Because that's the real Gingrich revolution.

POTENTIAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I would like to address the issue of a potential Government shutdown on October 1 and the appropriate funding level for any continuing resolution.

The American people sent a clear message in November that they would no longer allow the Federal Government to amass increasing amounts of debt at the expense of their children and their grandchildren. They voiced their frustration at the increasing size and scope of the Federal Government. And they expressed a great deal of impatience and frustration with what they saw as broken promises and a failure to change business as usual in Washington, DC.

It is my firm belief that the Republican party will stand or fall on our ability to deliver on our promises. The American people will reward us if we stand firm and deliver a balanced budget to them by 2002, and they will punish us if we fail.

I am proud of the progress that we have made thus far to achieve a balanced budget. The budget plan that we approved in June will put us on a glidepath to the first balanced budget since 1969. The appropriations bills that the House has passed are in compliance with the budget resolution and are strong bills which will help to make the Government more efficient and less intrusive.

But in spite of the impressive steps that we have taken to get our fiscal house in order, much more remains to be done. Although the House has passed all but one appropriations bill, we have only passed one conference report. Much more disturbing is the veto threat which hangs over most of the funding bills.

Everyone has begun to realize that a continuing resolution will be necessary to keep parts of the Government from shutting down on October 1. It is unlikely that we will complete action on all of the appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year.

What funding levels could be contained in a continuing resolution? There are several alternatives. Traditionally, a continuing resolution assumes the lowest of the current year's level, the new House-approved level, or the new Senate-approved level. This has been known as the Michel rule. But Congress can specify any funding level and any mix.

My fear is that unless we clarify the rules governing a continuing resolution, funding at 1995 levels will become the most attractive and least painful option for those who wish to preserve the status quo and block budget cuts.

History has shown instances in which segments of the Government were funded by continuing resolutions for a significant part of the year because of fundamental disagreements between Congress and the White House. Indeed, each year of the Reagan administration, at least one segment of the Federal Government was funded by a continuing resolution for the whole fiscal year.

We must make a continuing resolution an unpleasant alternative that will act as a catalyst for achieving our budgetary goals. Under no circumstances must a continuing resolution present proponents of the status quo with an easy way out.

In August, I introduced H.R. 2197, the Allard continuing resolution reform act. The Allard rule specifically amends the Rules of the House to require that if an appropriation has not been enacted by October 1, then a continuing resolution would fund the Government at the lower of the House-recommended level and the Senate-recommended level, and in no case could funding exceed 95 percent of the prior year's level. This would mandate a minimum of 5 percent real cuts in any continuing resolution.

The Allard rule is tough legislation. But it is the only reasonable solution. It will force opponents of change to the bargaining table. And it will force them to the table on our terms.

If we fail to adopt continuing resolutions which meet the stringent Allard rule criteria, we risk losing the budget battle to those who favor continuing the status quo. And we risk betraying the American people who sent us to Washington to restore responsibility to the Federal Government.

We must not pass on this opportunity to ensure fundamental change. I ask all