

Reagan? We have heard that a lot from the other side.

Well, let us just recount a few of the Reagan years so we can get this in perspective. Remember, President Reagan promised the people of the United States of America that he would balance the budget by 1984. Instead, his administration worked hand in glove with Congress to pile up the greatest amount of debt ever seen for this Nation. It took us 200 years to amass the first \$900 billion of debt, but in a mere 8 years, President Reagan's administration more than tripled the national debt to over \$3 trillion. Yes, they talked a great game about reducing the deficit and balancing the budget, but they never ever submitted a balanced budget. They never ever even submitted a budget within \$100 billion of balance.

And then finally in the twilight years, in the last year of the Reagan administration, Budget Director Miller submitted a list of what he said Ronald Reagan would have used the line-item veto on if only he had that power.

The deficit in 1988 was \$150 billion. After tremendous efforts downtown at the White House, President Reagan and Mr. Miller came up with a list of \$1 billion in cuts that they would have made had they had the line-item veto. So instead of \$150 billion deficit, it would have been \$149 billion, and, of course, not a penny would have come from the Pentagon, the largest single source of general fund spending.

Last year we passed a constitutional version of a line-item veto called an enhanced rescission. This year we have before us an empty gesture. Clearly, the bill that will be voted on finally today, the Stenholm amendment, the bill we passed last year having been defeated in a vote last Friday on the floor of this House, is unconstitutional, and will be thrown out by the courts.

So if what we want is a grandly symbolic empty gesture, then vote "yes" on final passage today.

Happy birthday, of course, to the ex-President.

His legacy of a \$3 trillion will stand as a monument for generations of Americans to come. I would hope this House would begin to take real steps toward cutting the Federal deficit and the Federal debt and no more gestures. Do not vote today for this empty gesture.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER] is recognized during morning business for 1½ minutes.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, in response, today President Clinton just introduced his budget, and if you heard, the previous speaker said the last 2 years of Ronald Reagan was \$150 billion in deficit and \$155. Today's budget introduced by President Clinton the deficit is \$210 billion.

The first 4 years of the Clinton administration will show a deficit of over \$1 trillion. This budget is not balanced.

But it is not the President's fault. It was not the President's fault for the last 26 years. Pick your favorite, was it Carter, was it Reagan, was it Ford, was it Clinton? Who is your favorite for unbalancing the budget? And the answer is this Congress. This Congress has had its foot on the accelerator for 26 years.

Never once has this Congress balanced the budget in 26 years. Never once has this Congress balanced the budget in 26 years.

Well, today is President Ronald Reagan's 84th birthday, and today we are going to give President Reagan and President Clinton a little present, and that is the line-item veto, because we need new tools. We have shown we cannot balance the budget ourselves.

Last week this Republican Congress passed the balanced budget amendment. This week we are going to give the President, whomever the President is, the tool to help us balance the budget with the line-item veto.

Let us remember it is not the President, it is the Congress. And we are going to allow the Executive and Congress to sit down together to continue to work toward a balanced budget in 2002 so that our grandchildren will not have to pay for the Government we use and are afraid to pay for.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE LINE-ITEM VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] is recognized during morning business for 1½ minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of the line-item veto which will effectively give the President the ability to strike out pork-barrel projects from otherwise good legislation.

The line-item veto will end the "Christmas Tree" practice of tacking on pet projects to wholly unrelated legislation—burying the details away from the public's eye.

Last year and in 1993 we saw this practice expand to an unprecedented level. The most flagrant abuse was after the city of Los Angeles was devastated by the earthquake. Congress eventually passed the emergency supplemental earthquake assistance bill, but not before slipping in \$10 million for a train station in New York, \$1.3 million for Hawaiian sugar cane mills, and \$20 million to add employees to the FBI in West Virginia.

This list of abuses goes on and on and the taxpayers are stuck with the bill and asked to pay more of their fair share. I don't think they would think that their share should include \$1.1 million for a national pig research facility in Iowa or \$35 million to eradicate screw worms in Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, tacking on these types of pet projects has become a runaway train and the American taxpayers are getting taken for a ride toward economic disaster. Let us keep the train on the tracks.

I urge all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, to support this critical piece of legislation.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LINDER] at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Open our eyes, O gracious God, so that we may see the magnificence of Your creation; open our minds to the promises of Your true and lively word; open our ears to hear the words of others and to listen to their thoughts and experiences; open our intellect so we can understand the mysteries of knowledge and the fruits of wisdom, and open our hearts so we can love and forgive, so we can hope and have faith, so we can be thankful for all Your good gifts of life and the blessings of each new day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House is approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EVERETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO MEET TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following

committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

The Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted, and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is quite correct. The minority has been consulted in the case of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and the Committee on the Judiciary. Once again we want to applaud the majority. This consultation, we think, is a very helpful and healthful process, and we look forward to continuing it in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1) "An Act to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments; to strengthen the partnership between the Federal Government and State, local and tribal governments; to end the imposition, in the absence of full consideration by Congress, of Federal mandates, on State, local, the tribal governments without adequate funding, in a manner that may displace other essential governmental priorities; and to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and for other purposes," agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROTH, Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. EXON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will: Force Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third, and cut the congressional budget; we have done that.

It goes on to state that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we have done this; unfunded Mandates Legislation—we have done this; Line-item veto; a new crime bill to stop violent criminals; Welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence; family reinforcement to crack down on dead-beat Dads and protect our children; Tax Cuts from Families to lift Government's burden from middle income Americans; National Security Restoration to Protect our Freedoms; Senior Citizens; Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; Government regulatory reform; commonsense legal Reform to end frivolous, lawsuits, and Congressional term limits to make congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

PRESIDENT'S BAILOUT OF MEXICO RAISES SERIOUS CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONS

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, if NAFTA is such a great deal, why do we have to bailout Mexico? That is the central question that must be answered before a single dime of our money is placed at risk.

The \$47 billion bailout is a raw deal for the American taxpayer. Adding insult to injury, the President is taking an end run around the people's elected Representatives and unilaterally placing our money at risk. Since Congress controls the power of the purse, this action raises serious constitutional questions.

A depression in the steel industry in the late 1970's and early 1980's cost the northwest Indiana district I represent 50,000 good jobs. The U.S. Government did not bailout a single person who had a mortgage, a car payment, or children attending college.

It is flat out wrong for our Government to bail out Mexico without first seeking permission from the American people, through their elected Representatives, whose money will be placed at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I urge acceptance of Mr. TAYLOR's privileged resolution so that we can find out what the bailout really means for the American taxpayer.

WHAT TOOK US SO LONG

(Mr. NORWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, for years, the American people have supported the line-item veto as another tool to help control Government spend-

ing and balance the budget. In November 1994, a poll showed that 77 percent of the American people supported the line-item veto, and in 1992, a poll showed a 68-percent approval rating. With this kind of support for a good Government measure, I have to ask what took us so long?

Putting aside any notion of partisan politics, the Republican majority has finally brought the line-item veto to the floor for a vote. We are delivering to the President a necessary tool to allow him to control Government spending and to kill pork-barrel politics. We are keeping our promise to the American people through our Contract With America. I hope my Democrat colleagues join me in supporting this legislation. Its time has finally come.

WELFARE QUEENS AND THE WELFARE KINGS OF THE CORPORATE WORLD

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget is already under attack, and that is par for the course. There are people who are still blasting welfare queens, but keep in mind that AFDC helps American children and food stamps help feed America's poor.

What bothers me is that no one talks about those welfare kings, with that \$51 billion in direct subsidies to corporations and \$53 billion in tax breaks for fat cats. And no one talks about welfare kings. Check this out: \$18 million for Sunkist to sell orange juice; \$5 million for Gallo to sell wine; \$1 million for M&M to sell candy; half a million to Ronald McDonald to sell chicken; and half a million to Campbell's Soups to sell V-8 juice. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

President Clinton's budget may not be perfect, but it has a heart and it has a soul, and that may be just a good place to start our debate from. Think about that.

TODAY'S VOTE ON THE LINE-ITEM VETO: A PRESENT FOR EX-PRESIDENT REAGAN

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are doing something today that the Democrat-controlled Congress over the past 40 years could never bring itself to do. Today we are going to vote on a line-item veto to give the President, regardless of party affiliation, the ability to control spending and Government growth. The President will finally be able to exert the same power that 43 Governors already enjoy—the line-item veto.

I am proud to stand here today in support of this important budget-control issue. It finally took a Republican majority to bring this item to the floor for a vote. Let us pass the line-item