week ago there was a balanced budget when, in fact, it is not.

LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE POOR

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very soon now, this House will be engaged in a great debate as to whether or not to preserve legal services to the poor as is now a part of the Federal establishment.

There is general agreement across the board from those who want to zero it out altogether and not spend one penny in the support of legal services from the Federal Government to those who would expand the legal services grouping, as we now know it; somewhere in the middle lies the final principle upon which this House will take action.

Do we want to provide legal services access to the courts for the poor? The answer is resoundingly probably, yes. But do we want to allocate Federal funds to a private corporation to dole out these sums to help the poor in the various States, or do we want to shrink the amount of money, send it to the States in the form of block grants and have them decide how to provide legal services for the poor?

These are the outlines for the debate that is yet to come.

IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME [SIDS]

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Representative TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota and I want to send a wake-up call to our colleagues about the No. 1 killer of infants during their first year of life: Sudden infant death syndrome, otherwise known as SIDS or crib death.

SIDS is defined as the ''Sudden death of an infant under 1 year of age which remains unexplained after a thorough case investigation, including performance of a complete autopsy, examination of the death scene, and review of the clinical history.''

The tragic and unexpected loss of a newborn is devastating to parents. What makes this disheartening experience even more agonizing is when doctors have no medical explanation for the infant's death.

SIDS is the leading cause of death among infants between the ages of 1 week and 1 year and strikes infants of all countries and cultures—in the United States alone, there are between 6,000 to 7,500 infants who unexpectedly die of SIDS each year.

As a new Member of the 104th Congress, I remain committed to increasing national public awareness about SIDS and educating parents about steps they can take to reduce the risks of SIDS.

In 1994, a national ''Back to Sleep'' public education campaign was launched by Federal and private entities.

The goal of this campaign is to encourage parents to place healthy babies on their backs or sides to sleep which research has shown to reduce the risk of SIDS.

Representative JOHNSON and I have sent important information to each office about the ''Back to Sleep'' campaign and SIDS public service announcements. We encourage our colleagues to send this vital message about SIDS prevention home to your constituents.

WHAT A DIFFERENCE A REPUBLICAN MAJORITY MAKES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the new Republican majority has decided to set an example for everyone else to follow. Today we are bringing to the floor our own funding bill, the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1996. It may come as a shock to the American people, but, this year we are cutting our own budget by $155 million. Yes, $155 million.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican majority can make. We have worked hard to eliminate unnecessary programs, privatize programs, and to streamline this huge bureaucracy that we call our home away from home. We are going to make Congress work better with less money. In fact, if every other program in the Federal Government were being proportionately reduced, we would save more than $130 billion during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican majority makes.

□ 1020

EFFICIENCY, COST SAVINGS ARE HALLMARKS OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority continues to make good on our promise to change the status quo by cutting Government. Today we are bringing to the floor two measures to prove our dedication—the legislative branch appropriations bill, and legislation to establish a Corrections Day.

Through the legislative branch bill, we will reduce our own budget by $155 million for the next fiscal year. We have cut congressional staff and eliminated unnecessary programs.

Corrections Day will help purge the Federal Government of ridiculous red tape. It will especially help State and local officials, who have been dealing with ridiculous regulations for too long.

Mr. Speaker, a smaller, less costly, and more efficient Government is our goal.

EXTENSION OF AGREEMENT ON FISHERIES BETWEEN LATVIA AND THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–86)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) 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 Resources and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Extending the Agreement of April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States. The Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Riga on March 28, 1995, and April 4, 1995, extends the 1993 Agreement to December 31, 1997.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Latvia, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1995.*

CUT CORPORATE WASTE

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, corporate welfare is defined as payment of Federal assistance in the form of subsidies, tax credits, and payments to business.

Such corporate welfare has grown to be so widespread that nearly every member of the Fortune 500 receives some sort of subsidy. Besides the enormous burden corporate waste places on the Federal budget, subsidies serve to weaken businesses; incentive to be competitive, efficient, and productive.

Reducing corporate subsidies is an important step in controlling spending. By sharply reducing these programs, we could eliminate unproductive programs while freeing much-needed funds for deficit reduction. In fact, cutbacks in corporate waste would have far more impact in reducing the deficit than many of the current efforts by Republicans to cut discretionary spending.

The Republicans have proposed to cut billions from programs that assist families, children, seniors, farmers, and veterans. Yet, while Republicans

seek to gut programs that allow American families to make ends meet, over $160 billion a year in corporate welfare is buried in our Tax Code in the form of giveaways and loopholes.

It is indefensible to ask Americans to sacrifice without asking big business to do its fair share. I challenge the majority to cut aid to dependent corporations.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 169 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 169

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for considerationation of the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with section 302(f) or 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during future consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to find passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 169 is a structured rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 1854, the legislative branch appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

The rule waives section 302(f), prohibiting consideration of legislation which exceeds a committee's allocation of new entitlement authority, and section 308(a) which requires a cost estimate in committee reports on new entitlement authority of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also waives clause 2, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations of legislative provisions in an appropriations bill, and clause 6, prohibiting reappropriations, of rule XXI against provisions in the bill.

In addition, the rule makes in order only the amendments printed in the report on the rule, to be offered only in the order printed, by the Member specified, and debatable for the time specified in the report. The amendments are considered as read and are not subject to amendment or a demand for a division of the question in the House or Committee of the Whole. Also, all points of order are waived against the amendments.

House Resolution 169 permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone consideration of a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and to reduce to 5 minutes the time for voting after the first of a series of votes.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, as in last year's legislative branch appropriations rule, House Resolution 169 is a fairly standard structured rule to allow for the consideration of H.R. 1854. Amendments were made in order that allow the full House to make changes in areas where there are true differences of opinion. Last year, a total of 43 amendments were submitted to the Rules Committee and 12 of those were made in order. This year, 33 amendments were filed at the Rules Committee, and House Resolution 169 makes 11 in order. Of this year's group of filed amendments, less than one-half, by the way, Mr. Speaker, of the amendments filed were submitted on time and several were repetitive. A full dozen of these amendments dealt with franked mail and the Rules Committee made three amendments that affect Members mailings in order. We also allow amendments that would restore functions that some Members want to retain. In addition, we allow the full House to vote on an amendment that would allow Members to return unspent portions of their office expense allotments to the Treasury to be used for deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege in being the only Member of Congress to currently serve on both of the Speaker-appointed committees, and in my role on the Committee on House Oversight, I am very proud of the reforms achieved in H.R. 1854 based on the recommendations by House Oversight. We had some tough choices to make, but getting our own House in order and tightening our own buckles is a necessary step if we are ever going to achieve a balanced Federal budget; which is, of course, our goal.

H.R. 1854 incorporates House Oversight plans to revolutionize the internal workings of the House of Representatives, and over the next few months alone, save the taxpayers $7 million by streamlining operations. This bill is below the subcommittee's 602(B) allocation and is over 8 percent below last year's spending level. H.R. 1854 eliminates, consolidates and reduces, paving the way for privatization of functions that will likely be less costly when performed in some instances by the private sector. Quite frankly, House Oversight and the legislative branch subcommittee did such a fine job that there really is not much room for improvement by way of further reductions on the floor.

I would like at this time to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight, as well as the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative, and of course the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, for their excellent work in bringing this bill forward. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that House Resolution 169 is a necessarily structured and yet fair rule, and I would urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we reluctantly oppose this rule for the legislative branch appropriations bill.

We are aware of the dilemma faced by the new majority in fashioning a rule for the consideration of this spending bill, which has for the past several years has proved especially contentious. We very much would like to be able to support this rule, but we do not oppose it because it makes in order only 11 of the 33 amendments that met the required pre-filing deadline. We do not oppose it because it waives points of order against provisions in the bill