

I think free speech is becoming more important every day.

Thank goodness that we were able to read about women and men and their biological views, as viewed by the Speaker, but it does scare me to death.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5, UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-2) on the resolution (H. Res. 38) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

HAITI: BELOW THE SURFACE

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 122 of the American occupation of Haiti, a friendly country just south of our borders. The United States command in Haiti has determined that a secure environment has been established. The United Nations is expected to rule on this question in the coming weeks and the process of transition to a United Nations mission will be on-line, hopefully for an end of March completion. What will this transition mean? Today, our forces in Haiti have the authority to arrest and detain troublemakers and to respond with force. And in fact they have been doing that.

The U.N. mission in Haiti, which will include approximately 2,500 United States troops, will be a chapter 6 mission—strictly one of providing presence and monitoring. Under current mission parameters, American soldiers provide the security in Haiti, to the degree that that security is real. They are the folks who are enforcing the security there, to the degree that there is any real security.

Today, our soldiers are involved at the local level in the day-to-day running of villages throughout the Haitian countryside. Our soldiers are serving as mayors and judges; they are serving as the electric company and waste disposal management company. In any given day, they might be called upon to deal with a charge that perhaps the local magistrate is engaged in extortion; they will probably buy the food for the prisoners in the local jail and make certain it is delivered; they will probably give out a few speeding tickets and might even confiscate a few

guns. As we always expect of them, our troops are doing an outstanding job. Whether or not it is an appropriate or safe job for them to be doing and what sort of track record they are building in the eyes of the Haitian people are questions still open for debate. We have lost one soldier tragically in action in Haiti—he was trying to force someone to pay a toll to an individual who apparently had no official authority to collect it. We are deeply troubled by this death and renew our call for a thorough review of United States policy in Haiti.

Knowing the degree of American financial and personnel involvement in Haiti, Americans were no doubt surprised to read in the national press yesterday that their men and women in uniform are not accepted with open arms by all Haitians. Despite the fact all we are doing for Haitians, apparently there are some problems. This is in sharp contrast to the pictures they remember of jubilant Haitians in Port-Au-Prince welcoming Americans to their shores. But there is more to Haiti than Port-Au-Prince.

It is true that in many Haitian villages, American soldiers are cheered as they drive through the streets, and that gladdens the heart of all Americans. But the feeling that American troops do not belong in Haiti also is real in many areas of the country.

It is a little bit of going back to the old days of the occupation that some remember, the gringoism that we have suffered for so many years in our hemisphere and tried to get away from through the good works we have done in so many countries in our hemisphere.

Haitians from the provinces will tell us that the soldiers have made little difference in their lives. They are disappointed. The farmers will tell us that they still have no one to go to when someone steals their crops or their livestock, or that if they do complain, nothing happens. People will tell us that the American soldiers have let themselves be used in some instances by thugs and vagabonds. Some will also tell us that they would prefer that no foreign soldiers be in their country. I guess we can understand that.

In other places, like Jeremie, they are crying foul because they believe the U.S. troops are too close to the military leaders who once terrorized that population. It is a very thin, delicate line our troops have to walk.

As we make the transition to a U.N. mission, any feelings of insecurity and resentment will continue to grow. We know that. That is not uncommon in a transition. But we have to add into the equation the fact that the Haitian Government is not up to the administrative and financial challenge of providing for its own security right now or for getting government up and running, even with the present monitoring of our United Nations mission. They are not going to be able to do that.

Haitian police forces do not have the respect of the public, and they do not

have the weapons or the vehicles to provide for law and order.

The conclusion I reach is that below the surface of the so-called secure environment there remain very serious problems that could become deadly in an instant once the transition is made.

Mr. Speaker, the U.N. mission in Haiti is not the end of the risk for our troops. In fact, it may even up the stakes. I hope the Clinton White House is looking below the surface to ensure the safety of our men and women in uniform.

And while they are thinking about Haiti, the Clinton administration might start thinking about the American taxpayers who are footing the bill for the hundreds of millions committed to bail out the Aristide ship of state, which many observers feel is a boat that will not float no matter how hard you bail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

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

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

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

A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, kind of a disturbing thing happened this week in so many ways that makes me wonder if the folks at the White House get it yet.

The President appointed a very liberal member of the Washington political establishment to run the National Democrat Party, and in his first press conference he personally told the Washington press corps elitists that he was against the balanced-budget amendment because he did not want to wait 7 years to balance the budget.

Well, neither does the American middle-class public. They are tired of it. The middle class in America are in a situation where they may need a new carpet, they may need a new washing

machine, or they may need a new car, but at the end of the month, when you do not have the money, you do not get to buy these things. What the middle class said to the U.S. Congress on November 8 is "We want you to start living under the same constraints that we do. We want you to learn how to say no. We want you to tighten your belt and we want you to balance the budget."

Under the current course that we are on, the President's budget, as estimated by his own budget folks, will add to the national debt \$1 trillion over the next 5 years. That is not what the middle-class public wants. They want a balanced budget amendment, and I will say to the President's newly appointed Democrat Committee Chairman, "If you don't want the balanced budget amendment, where are you going to cut?" I have heard from so many Members of the other party who say, "Show us your cards. What are you trying to hide?" as if it is the sole responsibility of one party.

□ 1340

We got into this debt situation not because of Democrat irresponsibility, but because of Democrat and Republican irresponsibility. This is a bipartisan debt. It is a bipartisan problem. And I resent members of the minority party saying "what are you going to do?" Yes, there are some proposals out there. What are your plans? So far all I have heard is attacks, personal and malicious attacks on Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. All I have heard are talks about the Committee on Ethics that haven't been formed because their party has not appointed anyone, and all I have heard is their new frequent flier fetish, as if mainstream America at civic clubs raises their hands, and right after asking about the national debt, they say "And what are you going to do about the frequent flier problem in America?" Well, that is real big farsighted legislation.

But I certainly hope that before this debate goes any further, that the Democrat Party will come up with substantive ideas to contribute to the debate, to say "Hey, here are some ideas that might balance the budget, and, you know, I might not be for a balanced budget amendment, but I think we can get there this way," instead of just being against it.

You know, just because a party is not in the majority does not mean they do not have any responsibility to come up with ideas. The best thought, the best concept in America, is when both parties get together and work for the better of the country, rather than just the petty politics as usual.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we approach the balanced budget amendment coming up in a very few weeks, I hope that all members of both parties will come forward and say "Here are my ideas." If I am against the balanced budget amendment, I have an alternative. Rather than just swinging away at NEWT GING-

RICH and the book deal, rather than just attacking frequent flier points, and rather than just getting mad at the Committee on Ethics, which their side hasn't appointed yet, let us hear some substance, because that is what we are elected to do, Mr. Speaker. The middle class of America wants a balanced budget. The middle class of America wants less spending. The middle class of America wants a smaller government. And I hope that members of the Democrat Party will join us in that effort.

#### MATTERS TO BE DEBATED ON HOUSE FLOOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the gentleman that just spoke has left, because I for one am a strong supporter of a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget and have always done that. I have voted on it repeatedly. I have signed discharge petitions. There are any number of members of the Democratic Party who feel just as strongly as many of the people on the other side about a balanced budget amendment. We just disagree maybe on some of the details.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOLKMER. Yes, I will yield. Even though your people would not yield earlier on 1-minute, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KINGSTON. I always yield on special orders because I feel it is a good time to have a little debate, and through the debate some camaraderie. I just wanted you to know I am back if you had any questions or anything that I could add to. If I heard you correctly, you said you are for the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. VOLKMER. I always have been, as the gentleman from New York can tell you.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am pleased to hear that. Can you tell me how many folks on your side of the aisle might be voting in support of it?

Mr. VOLKMER. Quite a few, but they are going to vote for the Stenholm provision, the Stenholm balanced budget amendment, and that is the one that we support.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, to my friend, I would say that if we can get their vote on the Stenholm amendment, that is a good positive step. I, as you know, am not part of the party leadership over here. Although I do support the Republican version with the three-fifths majority vote provision, I still think that the Stenholm amendment, which I supported last year on the floor, is a good step, and I am glad to hear it.

Mr. VOLKMER. The gentleman has been here long enough. All you have to do is go back in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. You can go all the way back to 1982 and see where HAROLD VOLKMER has voted consistently. And, like I said, I even signed a discharge petition when it was necessary to bring one out. I support a line item veto, too, maybe a little different than what you do, but I support the concept.

I also support mandates, that do something about them. I disagree, and I have an amendment that I hope to offer when we bring the bill up Friday, because I think there is a big loophole in that bill, you can drive a truck through, in that mandate bill. So there may be some disagreements on the details.

But what bothers me the most, and we could talk about these, and we have talked about a constitutional amendment for a balanced budget here since 1982. And I have been here 18 years, I am starting on my 19th year, and I have never come here with the idea that HAROLD VOLKMER would ever become rich because he is a Member of Congress. And I think it is improper for any Member to get outside income, to become rich because of his position in this House. We are here to serve the people, not to fill our own coffers and fill our own pockets, and to use our influence in order to do so. And I think Members who do that should have what they are doing all debated on this floor.

What bothers me is that we do not see the other side willing to debate that. We don't see an ethics bill. We think it is all right. We have it in our rules right now. You can take all the vacation trips with lobbyists and have them pay your full way and then you can vote for them on the floor of the House, everything they want on amendment or on a bill. And the other side, the Republican Party says that is the way it should be up here.

We now have a Speaker that had signed a contract for \$4.5 million to write a book. Boy, that is really pretty good. I don't think too many people have been able to do that. Now he says he will give that up and take the royalties instead.

Well, as the gentlewoman from Florida attempted to say here today on the floor, it really depends now on the publisher and how many books they sell, how much money he could make. He could make \$10 million if enough of his wealthy friends decide to buy a whole bunch of books. They could each buy 1 million books. He could make \$10 million off of it. And I don't think any Member of this body, any Member, should be able to do that. I think that is unconscionable. I think that this matter, the book deal, should be debated on this floor.

I welcome the majority party to come forward. I welcome the Speaker himself to come forward and stand in this well and debate his book deal. I think it should be debated.