

or Senator DOLE. No mention of record trade deficits. No mention of those two turkeys, GATT and NAFTA. No mention of declining wages. No mention of livable-wage jobs leaving this country.

Mr. Speaker, I say if the economy is so great, why do American families need three jobs to pay their bills? We do not need any more deals, we need a little bit more common sense and maybe people should get out of this denial phase and take a look at the reality that is hitting people on the streets of America.

□ 1215

THE TWO CLINTONS: RHETORIC VERSUS REALITY

(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, the blizzard in Washington, DC, may be over. But last night the American people had to trudge through the Clinton reelection snow job. It is amazing what some people will say to hide what they do.

The same President who pledged to balance the budget in 5 years, but vetoed the first balanced budget in 26 years, again poses as fiscally prudent.

The same President who promised to end welfare as we know it, but vetoed welfare reform, again masquerades as a welfare reformer. The same President who tried to socialize medicine, and today blocks efforts to save Medicare, disguises himself as protector of health benefits.

And the same President who pledged a middle class tax cut only to pass the largest tax increase in history but vetoed real family and small business tax cuts, again pretends to champion tax relief.

Promises are made to be kept, not ignored after the election's over. Words should have some correlation to actions. This President's promises and words about the future are directly contradicted by his policies of the past and the present.

WHY WE DO NOT HAVE A BUDGET DEAL

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, the President has presented a balanced budget: Seven years with CBO scoring. So why do we not have a budget deal? I will tell you why, because the Republicans insist that they want to give tax breaks to the rich. The President made prudent budget cuts, but he protected the beneficiaries of Medicare and Medicaid.

Medicare guarantees hospital care for seniors. Medicaid guarantees nursing home care for seniors and for the disabled. But the Republicans want to

cut these programs. They want to cut \$270 billion out of Medicare, they want to cut \$163 billion out of Medicaid, and they want to give a tax break of \$245 billion largely to the rich. According to the Treasury Department, half of the tax breaks go to people making over \$100,000 a year, and that is wrong.

There is a difference. The Republicans believe in an America that says every man or woman for himself. The President and the Democrats believe we are a caring society and the standard of that society is we take care of our seniors, our disabled people, and our young people. We have a balanced budget. The problem is they want to give tax breaks to the rich.

CLINTON SEES THE LIGHT—FINALLY AGREES TO LESS GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri who is in the back here was incorrect when he alleged the Speaker, speaking about the welfare bill this morning, did not have the vote count right. It was 87 to 12 that the welfare bill passed out of the Senate, and it was 52 to 47 on the conference report. The gentleman was confusing the conference report with the original welfare bill in the Senate which passed overwhelmingly. The Speaker was correct.

So with that, last evening the President gave his State of the Union. As I listened, I said to myself, it sounds like the Republican agenda. It is like the President has had a Damascus experience. He was reborn again. Sometimes he is reborn every 3 months.

Republicans should feel very satisfied because we have overturned the Democrats' control here in Congress, made a balanced budget a national priority, bipartisan priority, ended the idea that entitlement spending is holy, and started the debate on the complete rethinking of the Tax Code.

TRIBUTE TO BARBARA JORDAN

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, last week this Nation lost an American hero. Former Congresswoman Barbara Jordan died on Wednesday, January 17, 1996. Funeral services were held on January 20, 1996. Joining us in Houston were President Bill Clinton, Cabinet members, her former colleagues, and current Members of Congress.

Congresswoman Barbara Jordan was a great American and an outstanding public servant. She was an inspiration to us all. Tonight I invite my colleagues to join me in a special order tribute to the Honorable Barbara Jordan, an American who cherished the Constitution and lived its values.

OUR ARMED FORCES SHOULD NOT BE PLACED UNDER CONTROL OF FOREIGN COMMANDERS

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on the conference report on S. 1124, the 1996 Department of Defense authorization bill. I will vote for this bill because it contains so many good things: COLA equity for our military retirees, a needed pay raise for our Armed Forces, money to repair substandard family housing, and funds to protect this Nation from a deadly missile attack.

This bill does many good things, but, Mr. Speaker, S. 1124 has been changed to permit the men and women of our armed services to be placed under control of foreign commanders. This is wrong. I object to this provision.

In the future, the United States will certainly take part in international disputes. But when American volunteers volunteer to serve this Nation in armed conflict, they deserve to be led by Americans and not by foreign commanders.

I will vote for S. 1124 this time. As is so often the case, I must accept some good with the bad.

NUCLEAR TESTING IN SOUTH PACIFIC

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share with my colleagues and the American public an article that appeared in today's Washington Post. The article cites the French Government's admission that radioactive materials have leaked into the sea from its nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, while the French Government now tells the world it is just a small amount and it should be no problem, this radioactive material that has leaked into the Pacific Ocean from the Mururoa Atoll is iodine 131. Iodine 131 is produced only as a result of nuclear explosions.

Mr. Speaker, President Chirac of France has already exploded five nuclear bombs on the Mururoa Atoll; let alone the fact that on the same atoll total, the French Government has exploded some 177 nuclear bombs, and that the contamination now on this atoll is worth several Chernobyls.

Yet our Government is going to honor this man next week in Washington? Mr. Speaker, a defense secret report reveals that in 1979, the French Government detonated a 150-kiloton nuclear bomb only 1,300 feet below the surface of this atoll.

Shame on you, France, for doing this terrible thing to the people of the Pacific.