

veteran medical care, I must rise in opposition to H.R. 2099, the VA-HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, in its current form, this bill eliminates two programs which promoted comprehensive and effective economic growth in disadvantaged communities—the community development financial institutions and the economic development initiative fund.

Through these programs, low-income individuals were given the opportunity to start their own businesses, small children benefited from community centers that kept them off the streets after school, families gained access to safe and affordable housing and good business was generated for America's financial services industry.

Mr. Speaker, by eliminating these programs, we are launching a double assault on poor communities. In essence, we no longer reward those individuals who take responsibility for improving themselves and creating a better life for their children; while, we simultaneously remove incentives for financial institutions to invest in these communities as well.

Mr. Speaker, we need to commend programs such as the CDFI and EDI fund because they do offer low-income individuals a hand-up, not a hand-out, which I am sure my colleagues on both sides of the aisle can appreciate.

I would urge my colleagues to consider the long-term effect that this disinvestment in America's urban communities will have on this Nation's economy. With that said, I hope my colleague will join me in voting against H.R. 2099.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SIGN BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am no great defender of the Washington press corps, but let me share this quote from this week's Newsweek magazine:

Unfortunately, the White House isn't yet truly bargaining. President Clinton has endorsed a balanced budget but has flagrantly misrepresented the GOP budget. He says it would "destroy" Medicare. This is an absurd description of a program whose spending would grow 62 percent by 2002. He says that "deep" education cuts would "undermine" schools. But the budget barely touches the largest education program—guaranteed college loans—and all Federal aid to public schools provides only 7 percent of their spending.

Newsweek is absolutely right. The President has only paid lipservice to balancing the budget. While he tries to portray the Republican budget as draconian and mean-spirited, he offers no plan of his own.

Instead of lipservice, the President should sign the balanced budget that is now sitting on his desk.

□ 1415

BOEING MOVES TO MEXICO

(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, earlier this year American workers in the Boeing Seattle plant won awards and trophies for worker productivity. Thirty days after the speeches and the trophies, Boeing is moving to Mexico; 2,000 more livable wage jobs down the chute.

The facts: Boeing paid \$18 per hour labor wage in Seattle. Boeing will now pay 76 cents an hour labor wage in Mexico. And if you really want to spill your Wheaties, ladies and gentlemen, Mexico has yet to purchase one Boeing jet. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

The trade deficit is at a record. Japan and China are literally raping our shores. If you want to get a job in this country, move to Mexico. The biggest export for NAFTA has been American jobs. Shame, Congress. Shame for turning your back on the American workers. What will be left? A couple more McDonald's jobs. Think about it.

ANTITERRORISM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to appear today as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a Member of this body very concerned about antiterrorism legislation that gives Government the tools it needs yet respects the rights of all of our citizens here to report to this House that we have worked out through the yeoman efforts of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] of the Committee on the Judiciary a piece of legislation that we intended to bring to the floor of this House very shortly and that goes a long way toward giving the Government the tools that it needs within the bounds of civil liberties, yet does not represent a vast expansion of Federal electronic surveillance power and intrusive technique and does not erode the very strict separation between military and domestic law enforcement by weakening posse comitatus.

I would like to report to the House that we will have before us a piece of legislation that will indeed strengthen our Government's hand to protect us against acts of terrorism yet is very mindful of the civil liberties that all of us, both individually and collectively, enjoy and should enjoy in this country.

NATO

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration is a constant source of amazement. It is ringing alarm bells about how American boys

need to save NATO by getting knee deep in Bosnia. Yet, while it's preaching about saving NATO, it is championing the cause of an avowed Marxist to be NATO Secretary General.

Last week, the Clinton administration approved the selection of Javier Solana, Spain's Foreign Minister to lead NATO at this supposedly critical time. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you about Mr. Solana. He has spent his life attacking NATO and the United States. He led the Socialist Worker's Party campaign to impose communism on Spain. He is an ally and admirer of Fidel Castro. He is virulently anti-American and represents a country which is not even part of NATO's military command.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton's argument that NATO will crumble in Bosnia without American troops is silly on its face, but to promote the likes of Javier Solana when American lives are on the line is nothing short of outrageous. If this is what Bill Clinton thinks of NATO, then the NATO's 'charter isn't worth the paper it's written on and it certainly isn't worth the life of one single American soldier.

BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it's been more than 2 weeks since President Clinton promised to balance the budget in 7 years. He still doesn't have a plan, but don't worry America, there is a solution.

It's called the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. It's a 7-year plan to balance the budget and ensure a bright future for our children and it's waiting for the President's signature.

I know, I know, Mr. and Mrs. America, you've heard all about the draconian cuts in this bill. But the Balanced Budget Act increases spending by more than \$2.5 trillion during the next 7 years. Medicare spending increases 62 percent, Medicaid spending increases 43 percent, student loan spending increases 49 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the President has it easy. We've already done the work. All he has to do is sign on the dotted line and he has helped save the next generation. Mr. Speaker, I hope he does the right thing—I hope the President signs the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

BALANCE THE BUDGET NOW

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Americans want Congress and the President to balance the budget and they want a plan now, not next year.

A public opinion survey of 7,200 registered voters show that when Americans are given the truth, they overwhelmingly favor the Republican proposal to balance the budget in 7 years.

Eighty-six percent believe "The President and Congress should deal with the budget issue now" compared to 9 percent who feel the issue should be put off until after next year's election.

Seventy-one percent believe that the President and Congress should submit a 7-year balanced budget scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

The Congress did this long ago.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the American people are eager to see the President's plan to balance the budget in 7 years. How else can we negotiate?

It's been 15 days since the President agreed to do this. The deadline is next Friday. Where's the President's 7 year balanced budget?

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BUDGET

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker, my friend from Maryland, said the American people want to know the truth about the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. I think they deserve it.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 will borrow \$296 billion for the next fiscal year budget. It will borrow \$118 billion from trust funds such as the Social Security trust fund that is supposed to be set aside to protect senior citizens Social Security payments in the future.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 will go on to borrow \$75 billion and give most of that money away in tax breaks for America's wealthiest 12 percent.

I am glad my friend from Maryland wants to know the truth, and I have just given it to him. I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and I hope all the Members of this body will correct the things that I just brought to our attention, because that is certainly not a balanced budget by anyone's scoring.

WAITING FOR THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to this particular chart here. As of today, it has been 1,280 days since candidate Clinton promised a national audience on "Larry King Live," "I would present a 5-year plan if elected President to balance the budget." It has been 17 days, not 16, 17 days since the President promised in writing to sign a bill by the end of this year that balances the budget in 7 years using honest numbers.

We Republicans have done our job. We have sent the President a detailed

fair budget plan to do just that. However, the President says he does not like our plan. Well, if that is the case, where is his plan? Let him put his plan on the bargaining table. That is negotiating in good faith.

Let me repeat that. If the President does not like our plan to balance the budget, then he should produce his own plan to balance the budget, not this. His budget has deficits in the range of \$200 billion well into the next century. The American people are tired of all the cheap political talk coming out of the White House, the political posturing, the demagoguery. They want to see action. They want to see how the President proposes to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, it has been 17 days so far. We are still waiting for the President's balanced budget plan. How many more days will we have to wait until he keeps his promise and signs a budget?

USING HONEST NUMBERS

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, we have passed a budget that will be in balance in 7 years using honest numbers. Medicare spending will increase by 62 percent. Medicaid spending will increase by 43 percent. Student loan spending will increase by 48.5 percent. School lunch spending will increase by 37 percent. Mr. Speaker, we are \$5 trillion in debt. We are allowing programs to continue to grow. We are making a responsible effort to balance our budget for the sake of our children and grandchildren's future.

What do we have from the President and other liberal Democrats? Nothing. Distortions. Misrepresentations. We have a plan to balance the budget; all they have is talk.

Mr. Speaker, some people would rather talk about balancing the budget. Some people don't want to make the hard choices. Some people just don't want to balance the budget. Meanwhile, we are working to protect the future for our children, to give them a chance for the American dream. That is what we were elected to do.

HELP THE PRESIDENT KEEP HIS WORD

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the current budget negotiations should be terminated. They undermine the President's ability to keep his word to the American people.

In June 1992, then candidate Bill Clinton said he would balance the budget in 5 years. "I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget," he pledged to the voters. That means he will have to balance the budget by 1997, 2 years from now.

Maybe Republican leaders should not be negotiating with the administration to balance the budget in 7 years. Let President Clinton keep his contract with the American people and show us how he would balance the budget in 2 years.

Of course, we'd have more confidence that the President meant what he said if he had any plan to balance the budget.

The Federal Government should not spend more than it collects, for two reasons: First, it will help the economy and the American people. Second, it will help President Clinton keep his word.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the President are now in the midst of a great debate about balancing the budget. The President has at one time or another promised to implement many of the items contained in Congress' Balanced Budget Act that is now on his desk.

He said he wanted serious welfare reform. He said he wanted to balance the budget in 7 years. And he also said that he wanted to give tax relief to working, middle-class American families.

But yet he persists in saying that the Republicans only want to give tax breaks to the rich. This is pure fantasy.

This chart clearly shows that the vast overwhelming majority of our \$500 per-child tax credit goes to those making less than \$75,000. In fact, 89 percent of this tax break goes to the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, the President should end the scare tactics, sign the Balanced Budget Act, and give tax relief to working families.

PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, we should make sure that we reach agreement on the Interior bill, the environmental bill. The House has rejected this extremist measure and, now that the American people have spoken, that we want to have mining reform, that we want to stop logging in the Tongass, that we want to deal with our parks in a sensible way, that it makes sense to come back with a moderate bill that the President can sign. Many times the House has said to those that want to gut the environment, we do not want that. We want you to reach agreement on this issue.

We are making progress on this, but let us put this appropriation bill to bed. There are so many appropriations bills that have not been dealt with that are still in controversy, that at least