majority defeated an amendment to exclude Social Security from cuts to balance the budget.

What about student assistance? Probably kiss it goodbye. Unemployment insurance? Major cuts. Medicare programs? Devastating cuts. What about cures for cancer? Our research institutions are facing massive cuts if this budget amendment passes.

These are just a few examples of the kinds of massive program cuts that will occur. It is time for this open Congress to be truly open and tell the people how it will balance the budget.

CONGRESSIONAL LAWMAKERS CAN COACH AMERICA TO FISCAL VICTORY

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1971, the Nebraska Cornhuskers won college football's national championship. One year later coach Tom Osborne became head coach, and over the last two decades has dedicated his life to challenging young athletes to achieve their very best.

Many times over this last quarter century the loyal fans of the Cornhuskers felt the ground swell of a pending national championship victory, only to know the disappointment as that victory slipped away.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, since 1935 the American people have diligently petitioned this body for a balanced budget. Year after year they watched and waited, believing reform was within their grasp, only to see the national debt and government spending increase.

They have waited patiently for lawmakers to bring them relief from the increasing tax burdens, only to suffer the disappointment of another legislative year gone by with no visible victory won over the skyrocketing debt.

Mr. Speaker, as lawmakers we have a chance to coach America's team to a fiscal victory. We came here armed with a mandate to pass the balanced budget. I encourage it to happen this year.

PUBLIC HEARINGS IN COMMITTEES ARE CONSISTENT WITH OPENNESS, PARTICIPATION, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my concern over the bypassing of an important legislative process, public hearings in committees. I would suggest that this need not unduly delay the Republican's 100-day agenda, if each bill is appropriately scheduled.

I realize that some of the proposals on which you seek prompt legislative action were the subject of hearings in the last Congress. However, that does not provide an adequate legislative record.

We have many new Members to Congress and some who are new to committees. Without hearings, Members are being asked to vote on legislation without the benefit of input from constituents, interest groups, the administration, or their colleagues.

This seems inconsistent with the recent reform of House rules which are intended to increase openness, participation, and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD 2 letters which address the two committees which have planned or have markups without hearings this week or next week.

The letters referred to are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Committee begins its legislative work for the 104th Congress, we wanted to express our concern about reports that the Committee is considering marking up bills without the benefit of prior public hearings on legislative proposals.

Hearings are an indispensable part of the legislative process. They provide Committee Members the opportunity to learn about the legislation, to ask questions, and to understand the impact of the legislation on interested parties. We realize that some of the proposals on which you seek prompt legislative action were the subject of hearings in the last Congress. But hearings in prior Congresses cannot provide an adequate legislative record for several reasons. First of all, fully half of the Committee Members are new to the Committee. Without hearings, they would be asked to vote on legislation without the benefit of hearing from constituents, interest groups, the Administration, or their colleagues. Such a procedure would hardly be fair to the new Members on either side of the aisle.

In addition, even if the bills have not substantially changed, the context of those bills within the broader agenda has changed considerably. For example, in the light of expected cuts in DOE's energy R&D programs, it will be difficult for Members to assess the importance of increasing funding for hydrogen research without a better understanding of how the hydrogen program fits into overall energy research and development budget priorities.

Finally, moving legislation without public hearings would seem to be inconsistent with recent Republican reforms intended to increase openness and accountability. We do not believe that either the Members or the public will be well-served by legislating in the absence of a record.

We understand your desire to begin the Committee's work quickly. Holding hearings need not be inconsistent with moving legislation expeditiously. Indeed, markups are likely to be far smoother when Members have had an adequate opportunity to understand the measure before them.

We know that you share our hope that we can move Committee legislation in a bipartisan fashion. To foster this cooperation, it is essential that both Majority and Minority Members have the opportunity to participate in a thorough, open legislative process that includes formal hearings on legislation that will be reported from the Committee. We appreciate your consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 1995.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CLINGER: We understand that you have scheduled a full committee mark-up of H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 for 10 a.m., January 10. We respectfully request that you honor the request of members of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee for a hearing on this important piece of legislation.

Under the leadership of Speaker Gingrich, your party has instituted a number of changes that are meant to ensure that Members of Congress and the citizens that they represent are fully informed about the legislation that is acted upon in the House of Representatives. We agree, and therefore, believe that a full committee mark-up of this legislation is premature. The hearing process allows interested constituent groups and Members of Congress an opportunity to express their views and familiarize themselves with the details of the legislative proposal under consideration. This is a fundamental and important step in the democratic process that should not be by-passed, especially in the case of legislation that addresses an issue as important as the relationship between federal, state, and local government.

We realize that hearings on unfunded mandates legislation have been held by the committee in previous Congresses. However, we understand that H.R. 5 contains new provisions. Returning members should have an opportunity to consider the new proposal prior to proceeding to the committee amending process. Also, there are many new members in the House who should be given an opportunity to examine the details of this proposal, to ask questions, and to hear the views of their colleagues and constituents through a formal hearing process.

Our hope is that we can work in a bipartisan fashion in the 104th Congress to develop sound legislation that will provide the greatest benefit to the American people. In order for this to occur, both majority and minority Members of Congress must be able to participate in a thorough, open legislative process which includes formal hearings on important legislation such as H.R. 5. We trust that you share our appreciation for the importance of maintaining an open, thorough democratic process within the House of Representatives and committees, and we thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.
JOHN D. DINGELL.
JOHN J. LAFALCE.
WILLIAM L. CLAY.
DAVID OBEY.
GEORGE MILLER.
JOE MOAKLEY.
HENRY B. GONZALEZ.
MARTIN O. SABO.
NORMAN Y. MINETA.
RONALD V. DELLUMS.
NORM DICKS.
VIC FAZIO.
DAVID BONIOR.

TIME FOR COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the people of Iowa's