

that, they are already paid for. We have made \$151 billion worth of cuts in the discretionary spending.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would further yield so that I could just elaborate, that is what we do in our appropriations votes, when we vote out our appropriations bills to fund the Treasury Department or to fund HUD or any of these other programs, we reduce the amount of money that we are allowing these departments to have.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we are just trying to run government more effectively.

The next one is by consolidating. We went through some of the programs and we are consolidating and reducing some of the growths through block grants to the States, and we are going to reduce our welfare through welfare reform \$89 billion; through reform in the Federal workplace and retirement, we are going to reform that \$10 billion.

We are going to save, by extending the spectrum, when we auction off different waive lengths for radio and television, we are going to see a tax cut paid for with \$15 billion from extending the spectrum auction. We are going to sell off some of the raw resources we have. The uranium enrichment privatization plan is going to save \$1.7 billion.

Our total spending cuts are \$268.3 billion, if we add all of that up, and what are our tax cuts? Our tax cuts are \$245 billion.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I don't see anywhere in there, any savings in Medicare or Medicaid that contributed to the tax cuts. The tax cuts were funded, taken care of before we ever voted on Medicaid or Medicare.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] makes a very good point. It is totally unrelated, and it addresses the credibility gap that we have seen widening.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have about 3 more minutes, and I want to make sure that the gentleman is able to finish up on those issues that are important to him.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote my Uncle John Armstrong. He said, "If you want something bad enough, any excuse to get it is a good excuse."

I think about how we have had a shift in power and we have seen some of the top switch and we have had kind of a problem or a widening in the credibility gap. They said we are cutting student loans; they are going up. They have said that we are cutting Medicare; we are increasing spending. The income tax credit, we just talked about that. Nutrition programs, we just talked about that.

What we are talking about, though, is restoring the vision of the American people. That is why I believe that the President should sign the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act. That is why I think the American people want him to do that.

Mr. Speaker, if my colleagues would look at the provisions inside the bill, it encapsulates the visions of America, to having a balanced budget to secure hope for the future for their children, to preserve and protect Medicare, to reform welfare, and to give the tax breaks to the kids so that the parents can spend the money on them rather than the government. I think that restores the vision that the American public holds. So I hope that the President will sign the bill.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] for joining me in this effort, and I have learned a lot from his charts.

I would like to say that I have never been more proud to be part of a new majority than this Republican majority that candidly is trying to take on getting our financial house in order, balancing our budget, saving our trust funds, particularly Medicare, and transforming the social and corporate welfare state into what has to become an opportunity society. All of the new Members that we have made an incredible difference in this effort. They have been the driving force with some of the sophomore class as well, and it has just been absolutely a thrill to welcome our new Members and it has been a wonderful opportunity for me to share in this essential order, and I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his extraordinary good work, his dedication, and giving us the opportunity to be in the majority.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my 5-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from American Samoa?

There was no objection.

U.S. ACCESSION TO SOUTH PACIFIC NUCLEAR FREE ZONE TREATY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep sense of pride and to share with our colleagues and our great Nation an event of historic importance to the countries of the Pacific region.

On Friday, October 20, at the United Nations, the United States, France, and Great Britain formally announced they have decided to join the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty and will complete signing of the protocols to the treaty by mid-1996.

The South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty, commonly referred to by its acronym "SPNFZ," is known formally as the Treaty of Rarotonga since it was signed by the leaders of the Pacific na-

tions on the island of Rarotonga in the Cook Islands.

The Treaty of Rarotonga came into force in December 1986 after ratification initially by eight countries, thereby establishing the South Pacific nuclear free zone to combat nuclear weapons proliferation and the reckless disposal of nuclear wastes. Today, 11 Pacific Island nations—Australia, the Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and Western Samoa—are members of the treaty.

By banning the testing, stationing, manufacturing, and use of nuclear weapons in the zone, the Treaty of Rarotonga is a symbol for the peoples of the South Pacific, expressing their high level of concern regarding nuclear weapons and the possibility of a nuclear disaster in the region. The treaty also prohibits parties from dumping radioactive waste at sea in the treaty zone, and provides for verification safeguards by the International Atomic Energy Agency. The treaty protocols, in addition to the foregoing, require the nuclear weapon states not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons in the zone or against any South Pacific signatory of the treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the South Pacific nuclear free zone covers a vast area extending from the western coast of Australia and the Papua New Guinea-Indonesia border in the west, along the Equator in the north, to the boundaries of the Latin American nuclear free zone in the east, and the Antarctic nuclear free zone in the south.

I want to express my deepest appreciation and thanks to President Clinton for his decision to support the South Pacific nations in their desire to keep the region safe from nuclear destruction. The President's global leadership on nuclear nonproliferation, along with international outrage over France's resumption of nuclear testing in the Pacific, no doubt influenced France and Britain to join America in this historic development.

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has identified nuclear proliferation as one of the greatest threats to United States and global security. I and many of our colleagues have long argued that to enhance U.S. credibility to build international support for successful extension of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty [NPT] and negotiation of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty [CTBT], the administration should join the nuclear-free zone in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, since the Rarotonga Treaty took effect over 8 years ago, the island nations have eagerly sought United States support for a nuclear-weapon-free South Pacific. By refusing to sign the treaty, however, the United States was increasingly perceived as indifferent to the aspirations and concerns of our South Pacific allies—many of whom fought at our side during World War I, World War II, the Korean