United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1996 No. 28

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. REGULA].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 5, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable RALPH REGULA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] for 5 minutes.

REGULATORY RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS COMMUNITY

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, it was 1 year ago today when during the flurry of activity that accompanied the floor action with respect to the Contract with America that this Chamber passed overwhelmingly several pieces of legislation, all combined to relax the stranglehold that the various agencies have had for generations over our small business community.

These regulations have served over the years to strangle competition, to subdue the freedom to exercise new ideas and innovative ways to bring new products and new services to the marketplace. So, as part of the Contract With America, the House endeavored very early, right at the outset of the new legislative year in 1995, to bring about hearings and examination of the issues involved. As a result we are now poised here in this week of legislative action to put the final touches on some of these relief measures for our small business.

Some of the important features that we have taken into the regulation reform arena are, No. 1, we have strengthened the hand of counsel for the Small Business Administration who before had a role to play, under the original act, in advising, so to speak, the small business community as to the impact of regulations. But now we strengthen his position by giving him additional powers and more flexibility and more actual power to be one of the decisionmakers as to the final texture of a rule or a regulation that would affect small business.

We have done other things with respect to the kinds of analyses that must be accorded to the public and to the small business community by the agencies involved so that they will have a better idea and a more involved undertaking on themselves to deal with the agencies and in a cooperative manner bring about the final product of a regulation. Thus, we would be having a rule or regulation offered in which the small business community, the one that would be affected, would have had a part in creating. That is a new way and a good way to do business in this very important sector of our business activity.

Third, and this, to me, is the most important new feature of what the Contract With America and what my committee and the committee chaired by the gentlewoman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS] has been able to accomplish, is to bring about for the first time an opportunity for judicial review. That is, a small business or entity or individual who is adversely impacted by a regulation that says you must do this. Many times the regulation has taken on the form of an edict, a mandate, an unappealable fiat, as it were.

What now we provide for is judicial review. So if in the final analysis, after this joint venture of trying to create a regulation that everyone can live with, if everything else fails, we also give to the disaffected regulatee, if there be such a word, the option to appeal to have a judicial review of that situation.

Now, this is important, of course, in its own right, just to bring about a new set of rules between the business community and the agencies of the Federal Government. But that is not the real reason, the real emphasis that we should be placing on what we are accomplishing here. What we are accomplishing here is creating an additional atmosphere for the creation of new jobs, for the creation of new business activity, for the lifting up of the American business community into a new and better stance for competitive enterprises throughout the world.

This is the importance of what we are about here today and for the remainder of this week. When these provisions become law, we will have fulfilled the Contract With America, that portion of which promised to the American people that we would unsnarl the number of lassos that are thrown around our business communities by the Federal agencies through their regulations and we would loosen them up for the business competition and activity with which they will lead the world.

WOMEN'S HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to talk about March because March is the month of National Women's History week. We keep saying, his story. I guess what we are really trying to do in this month is tell her story. I think women's role in history has really been left out in so many cases.

We have this great image that the men in America all came here on these dangerous ships, coming across the North Atlantic and all that and settling the great country. Yet women came in cruise ships, sitting around swimming pools getting their nails done and their hair done. It is not quite true.

Women were there shoulder to shoulder, came to this great country and said, we didn't come here to walk in front of you or behind you but alongside in building this Nation. I think it is important to remind ourselves that early on many of our forefathers got it right. George Washington, had everybody followed him, I think, we would be in great shipshape. George Washington insisted that the women in the Revolutionary Army be paid equally.

Most people did not even know there were women in the Revolutionary Army but, yes, there were. And there are women who were Revolutionary soldiers buried at West Point. How come they forgot to tell us that? George Washington also did something very interesting. We think of Martha Washington as one who sat home and waited for George. Martha was not that way at all. She ran a very sophisticated plantation. The minute the crops were in during all 3 years of the Revolutionary War, Martha Washington picked up everything she had and moved to winter camp.

So she was there in Valley Forge. She was in New Jersey, and she was in New York where the military was encamped those three terrible winters. The reason we know that is after the war was won and this great Republic began to come together, George Washington insisted that the Congress pay her for having been there and held the morale and the troops together winter after winter.

Is it not interesting they did the painting of George Washington shivering at Valley Forge but they forgot to put Martha in it. If you look at women of all different colors and backgrounds, they from the very beginning did innovative and wonderful things that held this country together. Harriet Tubman was probably one of the most brilliant strategists ever. She figured that if they ever wrote down anything about the underground railroad for which many African Americans were able to escape from slavery in the South, if they ever wrote it down, somebody would find it and that would be the end of the underground railroad. So they put it all in code and sang it in songs that the white folks thought were just nice little songs. They were really singing the map to the underground railroad. Is that not a brilliant, intelligent undercover operation? As I say, what a strategist.

Would Lewis and Clark ever have found the west coast if a native American woman had not helped them through the forest to get there?

This is not to say women did everything. But when you read the history books, they forget to tell us that women did anything. I think it is really reflected in the attitude that we have today about women's roles. If we look at America, women are still the major care giver, every woman I know, including myself. Life could be stopped tomorrow if someone in the family gets critically ill because we have given women absolutely very little help with any kind of those care giver roles. They are the ones that is to rush with the family's safety net whenever someone is in trouble, be they young, be they old, be they sick.

I think it is time that we do not do gender wars but we just treat each other as brothers and sisters and figure out how we are going to get on with this great country. How do we respect that? There is tremendous value to care giver roles. We should be trying to help women who are not only doing their care giver roles but are often forced out of the home to work because of this deplorable economy. It only generates more and more stress that gets reflected in the family and every other way.

So I would hope that during this month of Women's History Week more and more people would sit down and find out what her story really was and really realize we did not come on cruise ships. We did a lot to help build this Nation, too. We should start taking that into account as we plan our legislative strategy, as we do every other such thing. Because this is the way that the country will continue to be great.

SITUATION IN UNITED KINGDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the well today to share an insight with my colleagues. About 10 days ago I was in London, the United Kingdom, actually there by invitation of the Royal British Legion to discuss the gulf war illness issues to coordinate our research efforts between the two countries.

What brings me to the well today is, I was constantly asked the question, whether it be from the news media, members of the Parliament, House of Lords or even the citizens in the United Kingdom, what are you doing in the United States?

Many people in the United Kingdom were extremely upset with the United States, in particular the President of the United States, with a coddling of Gerry Adams of the IRA, now that they have broken away from the peace process and have continued the indiscriminate acts of terror. I was almost left speechless, having to defend the President of the United States in what he had done in the past and not only in the past, but I am now deeply disturbed that while in Northern Ireland they have broken away from the peace process, that the President continues to coddle Gerry Adams, the leader of the Sinn Fein, the political party of the IRA, while the citizens in London and the rest of the United Kingdom do not know if they can walk down the streets in safety, whether the phone booth will explode, whether they can ride on a city bus. And I can understand why they ask, what are you doing in the United States.

My only response is that for some reason this one does not resonate with the American people like it should. For so long we have been insulated from indiscriminate acts of terror, yet we had the explosion in the World Trade Center. We had the experience of Oklahoma City bombing. And how it moved everyone in this Nation that someone could actually commit a cowardly act of terror, such as the Oklahoma City bombing of the Federal building. Yet when trying to relate this to what Gerry Adams and others in the IRA are doing in London, for some reason it does not resonate. You see how would we feel if the President of the United States had coddled those involved with the Oklahoma City bombing at the White House prior to the Oklahoma City bombing, how would we feel in this country?

□ 0945

We probably would be having impeachment proceedings right now. Now what we have is the President, who now exempts them from the terrorist list, permits fundraising to occur in this country, and the President now, even though they have broken away from the peace process, says, OK, and we will grant this visa to Gerry Adams to come to the United States. Something is not right here. This is a disconnect. How can that happen?

So I want to share to my colleagues, if you are going to travel the United Kingdom, be prepared to answer that tough question, what are you doing in the United States coddling Gerry Adams and the Sinn Fein Party while indiscriminate acts of terror are occurring?

You know we are going to have an antiterrorism bill come to this House floor here relatively soon, and I think what we should do is take a good hard look here as to whether or not it is going to permit fundraising to occur. Perhaps what the President should do; he has not asked for my advice; but I think what he should do is in fact not grant the visa to Gerry Adams, play a much harder line. I would also stop any

forms of fundraising to occur in this country. We all want the peace process to be successful in the United Kingdom with regard to Northern Ireland.

So I wanted to share with the American people and with my colleagues my dismay and my disappointment with the President of the United States and with regard to how he is treating Gerry Adams and the Sinn Fein Party.

WE MUST SPEAK UP AGAINST TYRANNY AND HORROR AND EVIL SO IT WILL NOT BE REPEATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday in Houston we had somewhat of the joy and celebration and elation of long years of toil for Jewish citizens in our community to give back a measure of their life and their history to those of us living in Houston, TX, for 2,000 individuals attended the opening of the Holocaust Museum in Houston, TX. Participating in that ceremony, I listened to the recounting of the toiling and the hard work that helped to bring about this outstanding facility for our community. There was a chronicling of how the idea started, and how it generated, and how it grew. But there was a sense of love and appreciation for all who gathered for a recognition of the true symbol of this Holocaust Museum, an acknowledgment of the tragedy of tyranny and the horror of silence, 6 million lost in Germany and other places before and through World War II.

We heard from Benjamin Meed, president of the American Gathering Federation of Jewish Holocaust Survivors, and he eloquently reminded us, ''every survivor, and there are many here, can recall someone near death saying, if you survive, tell the story.'' It was not done in harshness or meanness, but it was done in the spirit of educating all of us that if we fail to speak up against tyranny and horror and evil, we are doomed to repeat that same horror.

It was interesting to hear holocaust survivor William Morgan describe what the building meant to some 350 survivors in the Houston area. ''This holocaust museum in Houston I call the House of Love,'' Morgan said. ''It will remove the hate from the hearts that enter. It will unite all of us no matter what race or color.''

I found that to be most striking in the shadow of the tragedies that are occurring all over the world, and I stand now to vigorously condemn the horrorful bombing that is occurring in Israel, horrorful and vicious and inciting, clearly a major effort to undermine the powerful efforts of good men and good women. Certainly not in the spirit of Prime Minister Rabin and his efforts, followed now by Prime Minister Peres and Yasser Arafat, there would be those who call for death and condemnation of those leaders, and I simply ask for a reckoning, a reckoning that we must move forward in peace, however vile these acts, however wrenching, however deep the pain we feel embedded in our heart.

As I read yesterday's paper, the headlines said everybody is crying, crying with our soul, crying with our minds, crying in confusion. But you see that is the purpose of the evil doers, for they are certainly seeking to destroy the progress made in the peace talks.

I would ask that this Congress, as it gathers to deliberate, and this administration, seek to reinforce the policies that have allowed the peace discussions to go forward, be tempered in their discussion and debate to find the real solution that will respond to the evil doers by punishing them, and promote those who would do good. These peace talks, as I understand from the leadership on both sides of this issue, from the Arab world and the Israeli world, must go forward, and it is certainly difficult in the shadow of these great tragedies, and it is great, the loss of children, men and women, disruption of families, the fear for their lives, the violation of the sanctity of a sovereign nation. But we must stand for peace and moving forward.

I will simply ask that as we rise to speak, in grief of course, that our remarks are in fact tempered, but that they are strong with the desire to ensure that people can live in peace, and that peace negotiations are respected, and that the evil doers be caught and condemned and penalized.

As I listened to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], this is the month to celebrate women, and it was interesting, Mr. Speaker, as I close, that we had a schoolteacher, dressed in a mask for the Purim celebration, bring to our attention God's, promise to Noah in Genesis 9: 14–15:

> And it shall come to pass when I bring a cloud over the Earth that the bow shall be seen in the cloud and I will remember my covenant and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh.

Let us believe, and let us realize together that we can bring peace to this world, to Israel and the Arab world.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 53 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ROGERS] at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

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

Open our eyes, O God, so we have a better vision of Your glory; guide our words so we speak good news; strengthen our hands so we do the works of justice and peace, and move our hearts to feel compassion toward every person. For all these gifts and the blessings of life, we offer this prayer of thanksgiving. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of order is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Wyoming [Mrs. CUBIN] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. CUBIN 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.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

ON AMENDMENT PROCEDURE ON H.R. 2703, THE EFFECTIVE DEATH PENALTY AND ANTITERRORISM BILL

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is planning to meet this Friday, March 8, to grant a rule on H.R. 2703, the effective death penalty

and antiterrorism bill. Subject to the approval of the Rules Committee, this rule may include a provision limiting amendments to those specified in the rule.

Any Member who desires to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by noon on Thursday, March 7, to the Rules Committee, at room H–312 in the Capitol.

Members who filed amendments last December to H.R. 1710, the Comprehensive Antiterrorism Act, do not have to file those same amendments again. Those amendments were already drafted to the text of H.R. 2703. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

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

Mr. GOSS. 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. Committee on Agriculture, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on National Security, Committee on Resources, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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 Florida?

There was no objection.

IN SUPPORT OF ANTITERRORIST LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the heinous terrorist bombings in Israel that have claimed the lives of more than 50 Israelis, Americans, and others, and injured more than 150 have shocked all Americans. They must be stopped.

Today I plan to introduce legislation calling upon Yasir Arafat, and the Palestinian leadership to crack down decisively against the terrorists and those who support them.

My resolution also calls for a review of United States assistance to the Palestinians, and calls upon President Clinton to consider making available to Israel appropriate antiterrorist and intelligence resources.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support his measure.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our Committee on International Relations will hold a hearing on Tuesday, March 12, into these vicious attacks, and on compliance of the PLO with the commitments it has made to the peace process.

SMALL BUSINESS RELIEF

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Republican leadership is brining up the Small Business Relief and Regulatory Accountability Act. This is nothing more than the Contract With America repackaged.

It is an effort to bog down Federal agencies, particularly those involved with the environment such as the EPA, so that they cannot get the job done. From the beginning of this session last year, the Republicans made a point that they were going to push through regulatory reform. But this regulatory reform is nothing more than but an effort to burden departments and agencies that protect our public health and safety with duplicative and unnecessary paperwork and bureaucracy.

It is a shame that the Republican leadership is going to try again to raise this issue and do what is necessary, what they think they can do to break down environmental protection and make it impossible for the EPA and other agencies that protect our environment and protect our public health from doing their job. But we will have to fight it again today and make the point that this is not the way that Congress should be run.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 994, SMALL BUSINESS GROWTH AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, working Americans have suffered under the proregulation, protax policies of the Clinton administration. In 1993, Bill Clinton enacted the largest tax increase in history. Since then, average working Americans have had to deal with higher taxes on one hand, and stagnant wages on the other.

Under President Reagan family income increased, the economy grew, and economic confidence soared. Today, the Clinton administration is overjoyed if growth is over 2 percent in a year. That's simply not getting the job done. We need faster economic growth and the way we do that is by easing the burden of Government. We need to cut taxes for families and cut repetitive and burdensome regulation on small business.

Mr. Speaker, later today we will vote on H.R. 994. This bill will help create a cheaper and more effective regulatory system and let small businesses do what they do so well—create jobs and grow the American economy.

EDUCATION CUTS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited a local school in my district and met with parents and educators, the people we entrust with the lives of our children, with the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, these dedicated people are afraid that the devastating education cuts passed by my Republican colleagues spell disaster for our schools and for our children.

The temporary spending bill which expires in a week includes deep cuts in basic skills training and in Federal violence prevention funds to keep our schools safe. In my State of Connecticut, these cuts alone amount to a $9 million loss in aid to education.

At a time when Americans are anxious about their job security and in an age the income you earn is tied to the skills you have learned, education is the last place we should cut.

This week, we are scheduled to take up an extension of the spending bill through the end of the fiscal year. I urge my Republican colleagues to do more than pay lipservice to the anxiety in the American workplace. Retreat from your extreme agenda. Restore the funds you took from our classrooms, and give our students the tools they need.

PASS H.R. 994

(Mrs. CUBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, later today we will take up H.R. 994, the Small Business Growth and Administrative Accountability Act. H.R. 994 will improve the Federal regulatory system and is the first step toward ending the Clinton crunch.

For too long small businesses have been subjected to a flood of regulation and compliance costs. It is estimated that for the smallest of businesses—those with only one to four employees—the regulatory costs per employee are over $30,000. It is no wonder that so many people today feel that the entrepreneurial spirit is being choked by Washington taxes, Washington regulation, and Washington interference.

Today we have the chance to do something about this problem. Today we can send a message to small business owners and those who dream one day of owning their own business. Let's pass H.R. 994 and fix the burdensome regulatory system and let small businesses do what they do best: create jobs.

SUPREME COURT RULING

(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 Supreme Court ruled it is OK for the government to seize the car of an innocent wife, innocent because her husband had sex in the car with a prostitute. Watch out Hertz and Avis here.

Mr. Speaker, has the Supreme Court lost their marbles? This ruling is tantamount to allowing the government to seize your home, your car, your boat, your BVD's, your rubber duckies, even if you had been victimized by the action and you are innocent and did nothing wrong. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

Whatever happened to government of the people, by the people, and for the people? Now the Supreme Court says, it is government from the people. Beam me up again here. It is not the President evidently who smoked dope; it is the membership of the Supreme Court who voted for this, and it is absolutely evident they inhaled all the way through.

Congress, do something. The Supreme Court should not set the law in America. That is the legislative role.

AN ARGUMENT FOR EDUCATION REFORM

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I am a former schoolteacher. I taught the seventh and eighth grades in an inner city school in Cincinnati. There is perhaps no greater argument for education reform than the school system right here in Washington, DC. The numbers and the statistics are shocking.

The District spends 76 percent more per pupil than any other jurisdiction in the Nation. Yet its students rank last in eighth-grade math proficiency, last in fourth-grade math proficiency, and last in fourth-grade reading proficiency.

Washington, DC teachers are among the best paid teachers in the entire country, and they have a very favorable student-teacher ratio. But even with these advantages, the District ranks 49th in on-time graduations. Despite these shortcomings, the liberal special interests continue to block any meaningful reform of Washington schools, including school choice.

Let us improve educational opportunities and the lives of the children here in Washington and across the Nation. Even more importantly, let us pass the Back to Basics Education Act, which takes the power and the money away from the bureaucrats here in Washington and gives it back to parents and teachers and local school boards where it ought to be.

GOP RECORD ON EDUCATION

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, in the 103d Congress, the Congress that preceded this, I had the honor of serving on a committee then known as the Committee on Education and Labor. We were known collectively in the 103d Congress as the education Congress. We had done school to work transition, goals 2000, reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Now in this Congress, the 104th, the GOP piecemeal governing strategy is threatening to wreak havoc on our educational system and on the local school districts. The constant uncertainty about Federal funding has meant nothing short of chaos for school districts across this Nation who are awaiting final word on the future funding levels for elementary and secondary education programs.

This uncertainty, coupled with the likelihood of sharply reduced funding, has made it difficult for schools to plan for next year. The result could be fewer teachers, larger classes, and a decline in the quality of education, and that is not what Americans want for their children.

The GOP record this year so far has been the largest education cuts in the history of this Nation. If congressional Republicans decide to extend their current short-term budget for the remainder of the year, the result would be the largest setback in education in the history of this country. These cuts would include basic reading, math skills, drug and safe schools, and vocational education. We cannot afford this.

□ 1115

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, over the last year the American people watched the actions of this body very closely. And they learned many things. One thing learned is how very differently the two parties think about the great issues that face them.

They see that Republicans fight for tax cuts and a smaller government. They also see that liberal Democrats fight for more government and higher taxes.

During the budget negotiations, the American people saw for themselves very clearly that liberals, including the President, will go to bat for government programs, but not for the average taxpayer and worker.

Mr. Speaker, the American people's desire for government reform has not subsided. That is something that is not going away overnight. Big government advocates are on the wrong side of history. America's future depends on less government and less taxation. And that is something that is obvious to all Americans.

MOST AMERICANS FAVOR RESTORATION OF FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

(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, the Republican majority is out of step with the bedrock concerns of the American public when it comes to education funding. A recent Gallup poll shows two-thirds of the Americans rank quality of education as their top priority over such issues as crime, health care, and the deficit. A January Wall Street poll shows 9 out of 10 Americans favor increased spending in education. A January Post poll shows 8 of 10 Americans oppose cutting education.

Despite these dramatic and overwhelming numbers, the current continuing resolution cuts $1.5 billion nationwide and $64 million in Michigan, my home State, for title I, vocational education, drug free schools and other programs. If we extend the continuing resolution to year's end, more than a million young people will be deprived of services in the title I program alone. Our budget process has been turned upside-down this year.

Let us get back to common sense. Our real contract with the American people demands that we restore funding to education, protect our children, and invest in America's future.

ENDING THE CLINTON CRUNCH

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, Americans are feeling the pinch of the Clinton crunch. Their taxes go up, but their real wages decline, and not only are families feeling the pinch, but small businesses are being ground down by overtaxation and overregulation. This is sad because, if you look at the record, small businesses account for more than 70 percent of the jobs in America.

According to a recent survey, nearly half the small businesses surveyed said that overregulation had a substantial adverse effect on profit making. Small businesses today are faced with a barrage of Federal regulations and a sea of redtape. Sometimes these rules are contradictory or they are just too complex to understand.

Mr. Speaker, American small business people deserve a break from senseless overregulation. Today Congress should apply the brakes to overregulation and take a huge step toward ending the Clinton crunch.

A WORLD-CLASS EDUCATION FOR OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, among the highest priorities for America's families and America's parents is a good education for their children and the ability of their local schools to be able to deliver world class standards in world class education for our young people and, at the same time, to make sure that today's students go to school in a safe environment and a drug-free environment.

Unfortunately, under the current funding plan proposed by the Republicans we see funding for safe and drug-free schools cut by 25 percent, funding for title I that for the first time is bringing the advances in technology and teacher improvements to economically disadvantaged schools cut by 17 percent, Goals 2000 that allows the Governors of States to implement world class standards in reading and mathematics and critical thinking in the sciences for the first time so that young people can compete against the best the world has to offer to keep America's economy strong; we see these programs slashed in this funding resolution. Hopefully on March 15 we will reverse that trend and restore aid to education.

PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH AS OPPOSED TO INSTABILITY THROUGH WEAKNESS

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

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, Presidents Bush and Reagan brought down the Berlin Wall with a defense policy that was called peace through strength. They built up our military, rebuilt declining forces, and they forced the Soviet Union to the bargaining table, and they, by doing that, brought stability to the world.

Mr. Speaker, despite President Clinton's own Joint Chiefs of Staff recommending that he spend more money on defense to give the right kind of equipment to these young troops that he is deploying all over the world, he has refused to do that. His new defense budget has come down. It drastically cuts the new equipment that his own people recommended he give to his troops, and this President apparently follows a policy of instability through weakness.

TAX RELIEF FOR UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA.

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2778, tax relief for United States troops in Bosnia. We have before us today a piece of legislation that really is an excellent piece of legislation. It shows that we can in fact work in a bipartisan manner.

Mr. Speaker, as men and women struggle to bring peace to a region that has seen more than its fair share of horror and tragedy in Bosnia, we have decided that it is very timely at this time of year, before April, to address the concerns of our men and women in Bosnia and their tax situation, and what we have done is make it easier for men and women in Bosnia to file their income tax returns and have their combat pay exempt from taxation.

Also, it was realized that officers in the area had a cap on their compensation that could not end. As a result, only a part of it could be tax free.

I am pleased that the Committee on Ways and Means was able to report this important legislation in a bipartisan manner, and I also am pleased that we are able to relieve our men and women in Bosnia from the worries that all of the rest of us across the United States have concerning getting ready to pay our taxes to the United States Government.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS) laid before the House a communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 27, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, Maryland. This subpoena relates to her employment by former Representative Kweisi Mfume.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which a vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV. Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after the debate is concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2778) to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for the peacekeeping effort in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be entitled to certain tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2778

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING SERVICES IN CERTAIN HAZARDOUS DUTY AREAS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, a qualified hazardous duty area shall be treated in the same manner as if it were a combat zone (as determined under section 112 of such Code):

(1) Section 2(a)(3) (relating to special rule where deceased spouse was in missing status).

(2) Section 112 (relating to the exclusion of certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces).

(3) Section 692 (relating to income taxes of members of Armed Forces on death).

(4) Section 2201 (relating to members of the Armed Forces dying in combat zone or by reason of combat-zone-incurred wounds, etc.).

(5) Section 3401(a)(1) (defining wages relating to combat pay for members of the Armed Forces).

(6) Section 4253(d) (relating to the taxation of phone service originating from a combat zone from members of the Armed Forces).

(7) Section 6013(f)(1) (relating to join return where individual is in missing status).

(8) Section 7508 (relating to time for performing certain acts postponed by reason of service in combat zone).

(b) QUALIFIED HAZARDOUS DUTY AREA.—For purposes of this section, the term ''qualified hazardous duty area'' means Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, or Macedonia, if as of the date of the enactment of this section any member of the Armed Forces of the United States is entitled to special pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code (relating to special pay; duty subject to hostile fire or imminent danger) for services performed in such country. Such term includes any such country only during the period such entitlement is in effect. Solely for purposes of applying section 7508 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of an individual who is performing services as part of Operation Joint Endeavor outside the United States while deployed away from such individual's permanent duty station, the term ''qualified hazardous duty area'' includes, during the period for which such entitlement is in effect, any area in which such services are performed.

(c) EXCLUSION OF COMBAT PAY FROM WITHHOLDING LIMITED TO AMOUNT EXCLUDABLE FROM GROSS INCOME.—Paragraph (1) of section 3401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining wages) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: ''to the extent remuneration for such service is excludable from gross income under such section''.

(d) INCREASE IN COMBAT PAY EXCLUSION FOR OFFICERS TO HIGHEST AMOUNT APPLICABLE TO ENLISTED PERSONNEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 112 of such Code (relating to commissioned officers) is amended by striking ''$500'' and inserting ''the maximum enlisted amount''.

(2) MAXIMUM ENLISTED AMOUNT.—Subsection (c) of section 112 of such Code (relating to definitions) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The term 'maximum enlisted amount' means, for any month, the sum of—

''(A) the highest rate of basic pay payable for such month to any enlisted member of the Armed Forces of the United States at the highest pay grade applicable to enlisted members, and

''(B) in the case of an officer entitled to special pay under section 310 of title 37, United States Code, for such month, the amount of such special pay payable to such officer for such month.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the provisions of and amendments made by this section shall take effect on November 21, 1995.

(2) WITHHOLDING.—Subsection (a)(5) and the amendment made by subsection (c) shall apply to remuneration paid after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE USER FEES.

Subsection (c) of section 10511 of the Revenue Act of 1987 is amended by striking ''October 1, 2000'' and by inserting ''October 1, 2003''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2778.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring before the House today a bill I sponsored to make sure that our brave men and women serving in Bosnia are able to receive the benefits that they deserve while risking their lives in the service of their country.

The Internal Revenue Code provides specific benefits to our service personnel who are on active duty in a combat zone. But, these benefits are available only if the President issues an Executive order designating the area as a combat zone.

Unfortunately, the peacekeeping operations in the former Yugoslavia have not been designated by the President as being in a combat zone.

There have already been casualties in Bosnia and more are likely. That means that our service personnel are in a combat zone type situation even if the President has not declared it a combat zone.

Let us be honest. When you are being shot at or dodging landmines you are in a combat zone. Diplomatic niceties aside, these brave warriors are in danger because of the policies of their Government and we must take care of them.

Quite frankly, we must act to insure that we do not have a repeat of what happened in Somalia.

In Somalia, the families of the soldiers who lost their lives could not receive the benefits that should have gone to them under the Tax Code because the President never declared it a combat zone.

Two of those who were killed were Congressional Medal of Honor winners. But because of the technical language of the Code they could not receive the tax benefits because Somalia had not been designated as a combat zone.

H.R. 2778 provides that members of the Armed Forces in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, or Macedonia who receive hostile fire or imminent danger pay will receive combat zone tax benefits.

That means enlisted personnel stationed in these countries would not be taxed on their pay for any month that they receive hostile fire or imminent danger pay.

Officers would be taxed on only a portion of their pay. Members of the Armed Forces would be eligible to postpone their tax filing and payment obligations. Additional benefits would also apply.

The bill also makes some technical and administrative improvements to the combat zone tax provisions. More importantly, it makes some long-needed changes to the combat zone tax laws.

Currently, enlisted personnel in a combat zone are not taxed on their pay for any month they are in the combat zone, but officers are allowed to receive only $500 each month tax-free.

This $500 was set in 1966 and has not been increased for inflation. This bill would raise that $500 limit to equal the top pay grade for enlisted personnel.

The bill also extends one of the combat zone tax benefits, the suspension of tax filing and payment obligations, to personnel involved in Operation Joint Endeavor even if they are not physically located in the former Yugoslavia.

Members of the Armed Forces and Department of Defense personnel who have been deployed as part of Operation Joint Endeavor outside of the United States and away from their permanent duty stations would be eligible for this benefit.

Plainly, these people do not have easy access to their tax records and have concerns other than finding the nearest post office.

This is truly a bipartisan bill. More than 120 Members of Congress have cosponsored this bill. It was reported by the Ways and Means Committee on a unanimous voice vote.

Moreover, as it was reported by the Ways and Means Committee, the bill incorporates the best of practically all of the various combat zone benefit bills introduced in recent months.

In short, the bill before us reflects the input of many Members, Democrats and Republicans, as well as the Defense Department and the Treasury Department.

In particular, I want to recognize Chairman BILL ARCHER, SAM GIBBONS, and IKE SKELTON for their contribution to this report.

Making sure that our military personnel in Bosnia receive all of the benefits that we can give them under the Tax Code is the least that we can do for them.

I hope that we will demonstrate our unqualified support for our troops in Bosnia by adopting the bill before us today.

This is not about whether you agree with the policy that put United States forces in Bosnia. Many of us have had grave reservations about the policy that sent our troops there in the first place; but, the point is—they are there.

And, since they are there, we need to do everything in our power to make sure that they are treated fairly in the Tax Code. This bill does that.

□ 1130

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

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a needed piece of legislation. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation. The chairman has adequately and totally described it. I support what he is doing, what we are doing on a bipartisan basis. I would only say that it makes good common sense that soldiers who go to zones, such as the one they are now occupying in the former Yugoslavia and its surrounding areas, do not take with them their tax records. They are not in a position to file an income tax return. They are certainly entitled to all of the benefits that are included in this bill.

This is something we have done in various forms for most soldiers, at least since World War II, in my own memory, so I urge a unanimous vote for it as a show of solidarity that we support those whose lives are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON]. He is a distinguished member of this committee whose record is replete with his concern for the welfare of our country and of the military personnel who make it up.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I especially appreciate the gentleman's kind words. I am grateful for the opportunity to express my support for H.R. 2778. I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], the ranking member, and the Committee on Ways and Means for bringing this legislation to the floor. I especially thank the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] for his hard work. I commend him for his thorough and painstaking effort. It was a pleasure to work with him on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, late last year I began working with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] to draft legislation providing tax relief for United

States troops serving our Nation in contingency operations overseas, particularly those in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Macedonia. I introduced my own legislation, H.R. 2776, to meet this end. I am pleased the committee adopted a key provision originally from my bill that would expand a pay exemption.

We need to take care of our troops. The American people can be proud of the fine service of the members of our Armed Forces. We are sending them into dangerous and difficult missions as participants in Operation Joint Endeavor and Operation Able Sentry, thousands of miles from their friends and families.

It is only proper that we extend an exemption from Federal income taxes during their deployment, as we did those who served in the gulf war in Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm. In some instances, the living conditions and dangers are as bad or worse than some experienced in the gulf war.

H.R. 2778 deserves, and I am sure will receive, a wide bipartisan support. Let us all express our support for our American troops by passing this legislation, hopefully unanimously, today.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2778. I compliment the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security of the Committee on Ways and Means, for his leadership in introducing this bill, even though it does not have anything to do with Social Security.

He has done a great service for our service men and women in Bosnia by pointing out the appropriateness of this legislation, because those people over there, as we know and we have heard, are placed in the same sort of danger as if it were a combat zone.

Quite honestly, I do not know why the President did not declare it a combat zone. It clearly is a combat zone. But by the President failing to declare it as one, he has denied, effectively, the benefits to our service people over there that they would otherwise be entitled to. This legislation provides our troops and their families with a little relief and demonstrates Congress' support for our troops.

In the past they would have, as I mentioned, in a combat zone automatically have received these benefits which now we will give especially to them by this legislation. This bill enjoys great bipartisan support, and I know of no opposition to it. I therefore urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2778, a bill to provide combat zone type tax exemption to our troops in the former Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, many Members of this body, including myself, may have considerable doubt about the wisdom of the President's decision to commit military forces to uphold the Dayton Peace agreement in Bosnia. But there is one thing about which there is no doubt in my mind, and that is my unshakable support for the military men and women assigned this arduous duty. I am confident that the vast majority of this House will not falter when the welfare of our troops is at stake, especially when they serve in such a dangerous place such as Bosnia.

H.R. 2778 as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means is a superb bill. It provides full exclusion of income for enlisted members and warrant officers as would be provided under current law in a combat zone. Another important aspect of the legislation is the long overdue update in the income exemption for officers. We on the Committee on National Security have been working since the Persian Gulf war to update the $500 cap on officer exemptions in current law. The $500 cap dates back to 1966 and has long since lost any relevance to officer income levels. H.R. 2778 not only restores the value of this benefit for officers, it precludes this problem from reoccurring by linking the cap to the maximum pay for an enlisted person, or $3,377.10.

The other very important aspect of this bill is that it provides a series of benefits to the survivors of members who lose their lives in Bosnia. We all hope that we have seen the last United States servicemember die in Bosnia, but we must acknowledge that the prospect for further casualties remains very real. H.R. 2778 ensures that a second tragedy is not visited upon a deceased member's family by the Internal Revenue Service.

H.R. 2778 is an important bill that supports our troops. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in the strongest possible support for H.R. 2778, legislation designed to provide that members of the Armed Forces serving in Bosnia will be entitled to combat zone tax benefits.

The benefits provided in this legislation are relatively modest. Enlisted personnel will not be taxed on their base pay, and officers receive a $500 exclusion. Servicemembers killed in Bosnia are granted a reduced estate tax. They are given a filing extension so that our peacekeeping operation does not shut down on April 15 while our troops are filling out returns. Telephone calls back home are not subject to a 3-percent excise tax.

But while the provisions may seem modest, the effect on the morale of American troops serving in Bosnia, Croatia, and Macedonia will be significant. This Member recently had the opportunity to visit with General Nash, commanding general of the U.S. Army's 1st Armored Division in Bosnia. He expressed the troops' strong support for the passage of H.R. 2778. It was, General Nash argued, at this point perhaps the single most positive and personally important expression of support that the Congress could send to the troops serving in IFOR.

Mr. Speaker, the very least we can do is ensure that, when our troops return, they will not be met at the airport by the IRS. This Member urges swift passage of H.R. 2778.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2778, a bill to give special tax treatment to U.S. troops in Bosnia. This legislation will assist the families of those troops serving in the Balkans with filing their taxes and is an appropriate gesture in response to the peacekeeping efforts of those troops who are serving in that region.

The Dayton Peace Accord, signed in December 1995, outlined a peaceful settlement for the 3 year old conflict in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Part of this agreement called for the deployment of a NATO peackeeping force to enforce the cease-fire which was the foundation of the accord. The U.S. commitment to this force in Bosnia was 20, 000 soldiers. Furthermore, an additional 12,000 Americans are stationed in Croatia, Italy, Hungary, and other neighboring countries to provide support for the implementation force [IFOR]. In December, the Secretary of Defense estimated the cost of this mission to be $2 billion.

Additionally, there are 550 Americans serving as part of a 1,000 man U.N. force in Macedonia. The purpose of this mission, Operation Able Sentry, which began in 1993, is to prevent the conflict in Bosnia from spilling over into Macedonia.

Under current law, U.S. military personnel serving in Areas designated by the President as a combat zone are exempt from performing a number of tax-related duties, including filing tax returns, paying taxing, or filing a claim for credit until the individual is no longer serving in the designated area. This allows these individuals to attend to their financial affairs after their service is complete. Additionally, the families of active service personnel killed in a combat zone are not subject to income tax for the year of death and are entitled to a reduction in estate taxes.

To date, President Clinton has not declared any areas within the Balkans as combat zones. By not classifying the area as a combat zone, the families of soldiers killed in service will not be able to receive a variety of special tax waivers and benefits.

This legislation will correct the oversight of the administration and allow personnel serving in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Macedonia, all qualified hazardous duty areas, to be eligible for the eight specific provisions of the Internal Revenue Service Code which relate to personnel serving in a combat zone.

In addition, this legislation will raise the amount of income an officer may claim as tax-exempt combat pay from $500 to the highest rate of basic pay for any enlisted member of the Armed Forces.

I strongly support this legislation and urge its passage. By doing so we will be sending a vote of confidence to our troops in the Balkans regarding their ability and dedication to enforcing peace in a war-torn land.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to express my sadness that our colleague, Representative GIBBONS, is retiring. We will miss your leadership.

I strongly support this bill to give favorable tax treatment to American troops, just as I strongly supported American troops during the debate on Bosnia. American service men and women who are keeping the peace in Bosnia deserve all of the support that we in Congress can give.

Under this bill, we will allow our Armed Forces to focus on the difficult task at hand—keeping peace in a land ravaged by nearly 4

years of fighting—without worrying about filing their tax forms on time. We will signal how much we value the extraordinary service of American troops by exempting Operation Joint Endeavor pay from taxation. The bill also will make it easier for families to stay in touch during a time of separation by waiving the excise tax for troops to call home from Bosnia.

This bill corrects a technicality, but one that I believe is extremely important. Troops in combat zones have traditionally received tax breaks, but American forces in Bosnia are there not to fight a war, but to keep the peace. I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and show our troops in Bosnia that we understand their sacrifice and value their service.

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, while I do not believe the President ever made the case to the American people and Congress that sending United States ground troops to Bosnia is clearly within our vital national security interests, I cannot express how profoundly proud and deeply appreciative I am of the men and women that once again have been called upon to serve our great Nation.

The men and women of our military risk their lives every day in Bosnia. I believe if our Government can do anything to help our soldiers and their families during these difficult times, it is our obligation to do so. That is why I am so disappointed that the President has not extended combat zone tax benefits to troops serving in Bosnia. In the past, these benefits have been automatic.

As a Member of the 104th Congress, I am proud this body has chosen to step up to the plate and show how profoundly grateful we are for those troops serving at the request of the President. Today, we will pass a measure to provide tax relief to our troops serving in Operation Joint Endeavor. This will include eliminating taxation of combat pay, reducing estate taxes in the event of combat-related death, and forgiving income tax upon a combat-related death.

This tax relief cannot fully compensate members of the military for their service, but if it helps one family or service member through this trying ordeal, then it will have been worth it.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 2778. This important legislation would ensure that American soldiers now serving in the former Yugoslavia receive the same tax benefits as other soldiers in combat zones.

Our troops serving in Operation Joint Endeavor face special dangers and challenges unique to their mission, including mine clearance and monitoring the withdrawal and redeployment of armed groups. Though they are not serving in conventional combat conditions, their work is no less dangerous. Clearly, they should not be treated any differently than other American soldiers who serve overseas in an area of potential danger.

Unfortunately, without this bill, our troops in Bosnia would not get the same tax benefits as soldiers serving in a combat zone. This legislation will correct this discrepancy and ensure that the young American men and women enforcing the Dayton Peace Accords in the former Yugoslavia are treated the same as soldiers serving in equally hazardous areas.

I am glad to see Congress take action on this issue, and I urge the prompt passage of the legislation to correct this oversight.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2778, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR BULGARIA

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2853) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Bulgaria.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2853

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTION.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that Bulgaria—

(1) has received most-favored-nation treatment since 1991 and has been found to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements under title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 since 1993;

(2) has reversed many years of Communist dictatorship and instituted a constitutional republic ruled by a democratically elected government as well as basic market-oriented reforms, including privatization;

(3) is in the process of acceding to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and the World Trade Organization (WTO), and extension of unconditional most-favored-nation treatment would enable the United States to avail itself of all rights under the GATT and the WTO with respect to Bulgaria; and

(4) has demonstrated a strong desire to build friendly relationships and to cooperate fully with the United States on trade matters.

(b) SUPPLEMENTAL ACTION.—The Congress notes that the United States Trade Representative intends to negotiate with Bulgaria in order to preserve the commitments of that country under the bilateral commercial agreement in effect between that country and the United States that are consistent with the GATT and the WTO.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV OF THE TRADE ACT OF 1974 TO BULGARIA.

(a) PRESIDENTIAL DETERMINATIONS AND EXTENSION OF NONDISCRIMINATORY TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any provision of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2431 et seq.), the President may—

(1) determine that such title should no longer apply to Bulgaria; and

(2) after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to Bulgaria, proclaim the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of that country.

(b) TERMINATION OF APPLICATION OF TITLE IV.—On and after the effective date of the extension under subsection (a)(2) of nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of Bulgaria, title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 shall cease to apply to that country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2853.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2853, which would extend permanent most-favored-nation [MFN] tariff treatment to the products of Bulgaria. This legislation, which was introduced by myself and the ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, Mr. RANGEL, is non-controversial and is identical to legislation that the House passed last year, H.R. 1643, by a voice vote. The House needs to take action on this important legislation again because the provisions on Bulgaria were not contained in the version of H.R. 1643 that was ultimately enacted.

The reasons for the normalization of trade relations between the United States and Bulgaria through the passage of H.R. 2853 remain the same as they were at the time of the House's consideration of this issue last year. At present, Bulgaria's MFN status is regulated by title IV of the Trade Act of 1974, which is commonly referred to as the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Since 1993, Bulgaria has received MFN status after the President has found the country to be in full compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements contained in this provision of United States law.

The political and economic circumstances in Bulgaria have changed considerably since the enactment of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which was intended to address United States trade relations with nonmarket economies. In recent years, the Communist dictatorship in Bulgaria has collapsed and a democratically elected government has taken office which has implemented basic market-oriented principles, including privatization. Normalizing United States trade relations with Bulgaria, as has been done for

other East European countries, will enhance our bilateral relations with the country. Moreover, it will foster the economic development of Eastern Europe by providing the business community with greater certainty with respect to Bulgaria's status under United States law.

At present, Bulgaria is also in the final stages of its negotiations to become a member of the World Trade Organization [WTO]. In this process, Bulgaria has presented a market access offer that would further open the Bulgarian economy to United States exports. For this reason, passage of H.R. 2853 is important in order for the United States to avail itself of all WTO rights in our trade relations with Bulgaria at the time of the country's accession to the agreement.

The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that its baseline revenue projections assume that Bulgaria's conditional MFN status will be renewed by the President in the future. Therefore, enactment of H.R. 2853 will not affect projected Federal Government receipts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CRANE] has adequately explained this bill. I will not belabor the time. I had planned to do a little filibustering here, because I was waiting for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] to reach the floor, but he is already here, so I will not do the filibuster.

I was going to point out at great length the strides Bulgaria has made since it has become a free nation. It has joined the family of nations very well, conducted itself as well as we can really expect, considering the tortuous history that this country has gone through.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend all the people in Bulgaria for what they have done. I do not think it is widely known here in the Congress or widely known throughout the world, but Bulgaria has modernized its revenue collection system, and has adopted a very comprehensive value-added tax. Now, that is something that we are going to hear more about in our future around here, but the gentleman from Illinois is here, and I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, before we conclude this exchange on this important piece of legislation, I want to take this opportunity briefly to pay tribute to the former chairman of our Committee on Ways and Means and the man under whom I served when he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade. I refer, of course, to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. Speaker, I have often mentioned to folks that it was the Democratic party traditionally that embraced free trade, and it was the Republicans that tried to put the Great Wall of China around this country. In the post World War II era, our positions tended to shift somewhat, but not totally. It was, in fact, McKinley, a Republican, who imposed what at that point was the highest tariff in our history in 1890. That brought on the panic of 1893.

Grover Cleveland was reelected in 1892, and he got the tariffs lowered and he restored a stable economy again. He said in a State of the Union message at that time, when you put those walls around your country, you inflict the greatest injury on that man who earns his daily bread with the sweat of his brow. That was a profound truth that he uttered. But I have mentioned to many people that the gentleman from Florida, SAM GIBBONS, is our Grover Cleveland, and he has faithfully stood on behalf of those free market principles, and has tried to advance them, and we have worked amicably on a bipartisan basis on all of these issues. His announcement of his retirement I deeply regret. He will be profoundly missed. I salute you, SAM, and thank you for your guidance.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in support of H.R. 2853, which would extend nondiscriminatory most-favored-nation treatment—normal tariff status—to the export products of Bulgaria. This Member commends his colleagues from the Ways and Means Committee, especially the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], for bringing this legislation to the House floor. This Member would also commend the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], who has recently announced his retirement and who will be sorely missed by this Member and all Members of this body.

He is among the first Members of Congress who took a deep interest in the nations of Eastern and Central Europe even before these countries emerged from behind the Iron Curtain. This Member first visited Bulgaria in the early 1980's as part of a Gibbons-led trade delegation. His good counsel and knowledge about these countries has helped us facilitate our relations with those emerging democracies and active trading partners.

Finally, this Member congratulates the chairman of the Ways and Means Trade Subcommittee, Mr. CRANE, and the ranking minority member, Mr. RANGEL, for their leadership on this important legislation. Their effort is appreciated by this Member.

There are four major reasons that Bulgaria has earned most-favored-nation status. First, Bulgaria has received MFN treatment since 1991 through the waiver process, and has been found to be in compliance with the freedom of emigration requirements of the Trade Act of 1974. Second, Bulgaria has reversed many years of Communist dictatorship and has instituted a constitutional republic, a democratically elected government and basic market-oriented reforms. The Bulgarian people enjoyed their first direct Presidential elections in 1992. Third, Bulgaria is in the process of acceding to the World Trade Organization [WTO] and extension of unconditional MFN would enable the United States to avail itself of all rights under the WTO with respect to Bulgaria. Fourth, finally, Bulgaria has demonstrated a strong desire to build friendly relations with the United States and to cooperate fully with us on trade matters.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member reiterates his strong support for H.R. 2853 and urges his colleagues to join in this support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2853, a bill extending most-favored-nation trade status to Bulgaria.

Bulgaria emerged from Communist dictatorship in November 1989, when Communist leader Todor Zhivkov was removed from power and the path was laid for the free elections that were later held in June 1990.

Just as the other Eastern European countries that emerged from Communist dictatorship after 1989, Bulgaria has faced considerable challenges in transforming its economy and building a new foreign policy focused on integrating Bulgaria into European and trans-Atlantic institutions.

Unfortunately, Bulgaria and the problems it faces have not often received sufficient attention from the international community.

In fact, given the pressing problems elsewhere in the region—particularly the conflicts in the nearby states of the former Yugoslavia—many have preferred to see Bulgaria as simply an oasis of stability in the otherwise turbulent Balkans, overlooking the fact that Bulgaria's economy has suffered from more than just the problems associated with transforming a Communist economy to one based on a market mechanism.

The reality is that, in the last few years, Bulgaria's economy has been adversely affected by its observance of economic sanctions placed on two of its traditional trading partners by the international community.

Since the early part of this decade, sanctions on Serbia and Iraq have resulted in considerable commercial losses for Bulgaria—losses Bulgaria has accepted as a member of the international community, but losses nonetheless.

The United States has tried to assist Bulgaria in this difficult time with direct aid for political and economic reform and as a member of the G–24 group of nations coordinating aid for that country.

It is now time, however, for us to try to do a little more to help Bulgaria and its people as they work to transform their economy and join in a new, modern, prosperous, and democratic Europe.

I hope my colleagues will join in supporting this measure, which should help Bulgaria by providing it with most favored nation—or MFN—trade status for its exports to the United States.

Let us today voice our support for those positive steps that Bulgaria has taken since emerging from communism just a few short years ago, and urge it forward toward a prosperous and democratic future.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2853.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the

ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□ 1145

NATIONAL GAMBLING IMPACT AND POLICY COMMISSION ACT

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 497) to create the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.

There is established a commission to be known as the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission (in this Act referred to as the ''Commission'').

SEC. 3. MEMBERSHIP.

(a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—

(1) GENERALLY.—The Commission shall be composed of 9 members, appointed from persons specially qualified by training and experience to perform the duties of the Commission, as follows:

(A) three appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(B) three appointed by the majority leader of the Senate; and

(C) three appointed by the President of the United States.

(2) CONSULTATION BEFORE APPOINTMENT.—Before the appointment of members of the Commission (including to any vacancies), the appointing authorities shall consult with each other to assure that the overall membership of the Commission reflects a fair and equitable representation of various points of view.

(3) TIMING OF APPOINTMENTS.—The appointing authorities shall make their appointments to the Commission not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) DESIGNATION OF THE CHAIRMAN.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and majority leader of the Senate shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among the members of the Commission.

(c) PERIOD OF APPOINTMENT; VACANCIES.—Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(d) INITIAL MEETING.—No later than 60 days after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, the Commission shall hold its first meeting.

(e) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the Chairman.

(f) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

SEC. 4. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be the duty of the Commission to conduct a comprehensive legal and factual study of—

(A) gambling in the United States, including State-sponsored lotteries, casino gambling, pari-mutuel betting, and sports betting; and

(B) existing Federal, State, and local policy and practices with respect to the legalization or prohibition of gambling activities and to formulate and propose such changes in those policies and practices as the Commission shall deem appropriate.

(2) MATTERS STUDIED.—The matters studied by the Commission shall include—

(A) the economic impact of gambling on the United States, States, political subdivisions of States, and Indian tribes, both in its positive and negative aspects;

(B) the economic impact of gambling on other businesses;

(C) an assessment and review of political contributions and their influence on the development of public policy regulating gambling;

(D) an assessment of the relationship between gambling and crime;

(E) an assessment of the impact of pathological, or problem gambling on individuals, families, social institutions, criminal activity and the economy;

(F) a review of the demographics of gamblers;

(G) a review of the effectiveness of existing practices in law enforcement, judicial administration, and corrections to combat and deter illegal gambling and illegal activities related to gambling;

(H) a review of the costs and effectiveness of State, Federal, and Tribal gambling regulatory policy;

(I) an assessment of the effects of advertising concerning gambling, including—

(i) whether advertising has increased participation in gambling activity;

(ii) the effects of various types of advertising, including the sponsorship of sporting events;

(iii) the relationship between advertising and the amount of the prize to be awarded; and

(iv) an examination of State lottery advertising practices, including the process by which States award lottery advertising contracts;

(J) a review of gambling that uses interactive technology, including the Internet;

(K) a review of the extent to which casino gambling provides economic opportunity to residents of economically depressed regions and to Indian tribes;

(L) a review of the effect of revenues derived from State-sponsored gambling on State budgets; and

(M) such other relevant issues and topics as considered appropriate by the Chairman of the Commission.

(b) REPORT.—No later than 2 years after the Commission first meets, the Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress which shall contain a detailed statement of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations for such legislation and administrative actions as it considers appropriate.

SEC. 5. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) HEARINGS AND SUBPOENAS.—

(1) The Commission may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and require by subpoena the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such materials as the Commission considers advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(2) ATTENDANCE OF WITNESSES.—The attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place within the United States.

(3) FAILURE TO OBEY A SUBPOENA.—If a person refuses to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1), the Commission may apply to a United States district court for an order requiring that person to appear before the Commission to give testimony, produce evidence, or both, relating to the matter under investigation. The application may be made within the judicial district where the hearing is conducted or where that person is found, resides, or transacts business. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as civil contempt.

(4) SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.—The subpoenas of the Commission shall be served in the manner provided for subpoenas issued by a United States district court under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure for the United States district courts.

(5) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—All process of any court to which application is to be made under paragraph (3) may be served in the judicial district in which the person required to be served resides or may be found.

(b) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency may furnish such information to the Commission.

(c) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement, and such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

SEC. 6. COMMISSION PERSONNEL MATTERS.

(a) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Subject to the limitation provided in subsection (e), each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government shall be compensated at a rate equal to the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day (including travel time) during which such member is engaged in the performance of the duties of the Commission. All members of the Commission who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as officers or employees of the United States.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Subject to the limitation provided in subsection (e), the members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission.

(c) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint and terminate an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties. The employment of an executive director shall be subject to confirmation by the Commission.

(2) COMPENSATION.—Subject to the requirements of subsection (e), the executive director shall be compensated at the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. The Chairman of the Commission may fix the compensation of other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for such personnel

may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(d) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The Chairman of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(e) LIMITATION.—No payment may be made under the authority of this section except to the extent provided for in advance in an appropriation for this purpose.

SEC. 7. TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall terminate 30 days after the date on which the Commission submits its report under section 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] each will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

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

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act (H.R. 497) would create a national commission to study the economic and social impact of gambling in our country.

The legislation is the concept of our colleague, and my good friend, Congressman FRANK WOLF of Virginia. This measure is on the floor of the House largely because of his articulate advocacy and persistence. A study of the impact of gambling on our society—focusing on both its positive and negative aspects—will be a helpful tool for policymakers at the Federal, State, and local government levels. FRANK WOLF has identified a very important public policy issue and he deserves high praise for his efforts.

On September 29, 1995, the full Judiciary Committee held a hearing on H.R. 497. At that time, we heard from 15 witnesses, including 8 Members of Congress. Also, subsequent to our hearing, the committee received 15 additional statements for the record from other interested organizations and individuals.

During our hearing, we heard virtually every point of view on gambling and its effects. For example, we had testimony on the problem of compulsive gambling. We also heard from a university professor focusing on the economic aspects of gambling—that is, job creation, impact on tourism, State and local government revenue, et cetera. We also heard testimony from the chairman of the National Indian Gaming Association, documenting how the emergence of an Indian gambling industry in recent years has had a positive impact on employment, economic development, and overall self-sufficiency for Indian tribes. Still others testified regarding the relationship between gambling and crime, including organized crime.

Based upon this extensive committee record and personal study, I concluded that a study commission on gambling in the United States is a good idea. As the Washington Post proclaimed in its headline for an editorial endorsing the bill: ''For Once, a Useful Commission!'' The Post went on to observe that ''commissions can * * * play the useful role of bringing to national attention issues that were previously submerged or debated in fragmentary ways.''

In my view, it is particularly timely for us to have a balanced, impartial, and comprehensive look at whether or not the spread of gambling is good for this country. Over the last two decades, legalized gambling has expanded extensively throughout our country. Currently, 48 States allow some form of legalized gambling. We have State-conducted lotteries, riverboat gambling, Indian gambling, and casino gambling. For better or worse, gambling has become a commonplace part of the American culture. Just this week, the Washington Post illustrated the explosive growth of gambling:

> What had been a mob-infested vice has become state-approved fun—a new national pastime. While 70 million people attend professional baseball games each year, 125 million go to government-sanctioned casinos. Adults now spend more money gambling than they spend on children's durable toys. Three times more pilgrims from around the world visit the pyramid-shaped Luxor Hotel in Las Vegas than visit Egypt. Casinos rake in more profits than movie houses and theaters and all live concerts combined.

The Washington Post, March 3, 1996 at A1.

Many believe that this widespread expansion of legalized gambling has had numerous negative effects. In some instances, this conclusion is undoubtedly true. For example, many opportunities to gamble are now available to minors who are not ready to make a mature judgment about the nature of this kind of activity. Furthermore, compulsive gamblers frequently have a negative, sometimes tragic, impact on their families.

The traditional linkage between gambling and crime is also an obvious concern. To give just one example, a GAO report issued in January concluded that ''the proliferation of casinos, together with the rapid growth of the amounts wagered, may make these operations highly vulnerable to money laundering.'' General Accounting Office, ''Money Laundering—Rapid Growth of Casinos Makes Them Vulnerable,'' GAO/GGD–96–28, B–259791 (January 1996) at 2. As gambling continues to spread, these negative effects and others spread with it.

In addition, the proponents of H.R. 497 have pointed out the lack of reliable information about the actual effects of gambling. We simply need better and more accurate scientific and behavioral data concerning gambling. Because of this lack of information, State and local policymakers, who are considering the legalization of gambling in various forms, are often vulnerable to exaggerated claims about the positive effects of gambling and the prospects for painless revenue generation. Just 3 months ago, a Maryland State study commission concluded:

> The Maryland Congressional delegation should support the immediate creation of a national commission to study issues related to commercial gaming and should recommend that the commission complete its work within one year.
>
> States are unable to confidently make decisions about casino gaming because of competitive concerns about the decisions of their neighbors and because of the inadequate data and analysis available to them. *The Task Force believes that the proposed national commission on gambling, currently being considered by Congress, could make a significant contribution to public policy development.*

Final Report of the Joint Executive-Legislative Task Force to Study Commercial Gaming Activities in Maryland, December 1995, at xiv (emphasis added).

I also want to stress that I have listened to the critics of H.R. 497 as introduced, and they too have some valid points to make. In particular, they said that they do not fear the outcome of an objective study. However, they did express concern that the Commission as proposed in the original version of H.R. 497 might be biased against gambling per se and that it was only charged with looking at the negative effects of gambling.

I believe that this Commission can do the most good if its study is as neutral, objective, and comprehensive as possible—considering the views of all sides of this issue. In that spirit, I proposed a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 497, which the Judiciary Committee adopted on a voice vote.

My substitute included the vast majority of the provisions contained in H.R. 497 as originally introduced, but it added language so as to assure that all points of view would be represented on the Commission. Specifically, the bill now requires that the appointing authorities consult together to ensure that the overall makeup of the Commission fairly and equitably represent various points of view. It also drops the requirement that one seat on the Commission go to a State Governor. I want to avoid going down the difficult road of specifying which group gets what seat on the Commission because I believe that is a decision better left to the collective wisdom of the appointing authorities—the President, the Speaker, and the majority leader of the other body.

In addition, the amendments add language that would require the Commission to study both the positive and negative aspects of the economic impact of gambling. I believe that the opponents of H.R. 497 will agree that these changes are a good-faith effort to address their concerns about the fairness and balance of the Commission.

At the Judiciary Committee hearing, I heard members of the committee express particular concern about the

issue of advertising concerning gambling activities. Because of that concern, the amendment adds language that would require the Commission to study that issue. At the suggestion of our colleague, Congressman HOKE, we added even further specificity to the advertising language, and I appreciate his contribution and his willingness to work with us on this issue.

Senator DICK LUGAR, as well as the Governor of my own State of Illinois, Gov. Jim Edgar, raised the issue of gambling through the Internet and other interactive technologies. The amendment adds language directing the Commission to look at this aspect of the issue. We have also added language that will require the Commission to study the impact of revenue from State-sponsored gambling on State budgets. With respect to all of these changes, my thinking is that the more comprehensive the Commission's study is, the more useful it will be.

Another major change the amendment would make is to shorten the time period for the study commission from 3 to 2 years. The Maryland study commission urged that we make the time period even shorter. This will reduce the costs involved with this effort. The amendment also made changes of a technical and conforming nature.

During committee consideration of this bill, Congressman BONO, Congressman SCHIFF, and Congressman GALLEGLY expressed concerns about whether the proposed Commission would end up being overly biased against gambling operations in general, and Indian gambling operations, in particular. I worked with these members to craft language to amend H.R. 497 to address these concerns. These changes include: First, language to clarify that the Commission is to study all forms of commercial gambling include State lotteries, casino gambling, pari-mutuel betting, and sports betting; second, language that clarifies that the study of political contributions should include all political contributions that influence public policy on gambling, not just those of gambling operators; and third, language originally suggested by Congressman FRANK that would require the Commission to study the extend to which casino gambling has provided economic opportunity for Indians and residents of economically depressed areas. I also agreed to add language to the report that further addresses their concerns about the fairness of the makeup of the Commission.

Subsequent to our consideration of the bill, the Resources Committee sought and received sequential referral of the bill to review specifically its effect on Indian gambling. After its consideration, that committee made a suggestion of one amendment that would clarify the bill's description of the gambling regulatory policies to be studied so that it now includes tribal regulatory policy. I have accepted that amendment, and it is part of the substitute text we consider today. I want to thank Chairman DON YOUNG for his cooperation in this matter. I also want to note that by cooperating with the Resources Committee, the Judiciary Committee does not waive any of its traditional jurisdiction over Federal gambling statutes and gambling issues generally.

I think all of these changes make the bill more balanced and comprehensive, and I appreciate the contributions of all of these members in working with us to make this a better bill.

I have discussed the various changes contained in my substitute amendment, as well as the Resources Committee amendment, with Congressman WOLF, and he has indicated his full support for all of these changes.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the improvements embodied in the committee amendment and to pass H.R. 497 as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this legislation, H.R. 497, which would create a national gambling commission to study the impact of gaming on this country. My time is short and my opposition is well documented in my testimony last year before the Judiciary Committee.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, what we are about to do here today goes against everything this new Congress is supposed to stand for—and that is limiting the ever increasing intrusion of the Federal Government into our everyday lives. Gaming and its regulation has been the sole responsibility of our individual States and it is my belief that this is where that responsibility must remain. Creation of a national gaming commission to study the impacts of gaming simply infringes on that right and we should be taking a very dim viewpoint of that action.

Quite honestly, Mr. Speaker, this proposed commission leaves the States out in the cold. The proponents claim that the purpose of the study is for the States to be well informed about the gaming industry. First, let me say that the States are extremely well informed about what their job is and they don't need Washington to tell them how to do it. After all, they deal with the regulation of gaming on a daily basis. But this proposed commission avoids the State's expertise by precluding our Governors, State legislators, mayors, and locally elected officials from a major role in the study. This is of such concern that in a recent letter, Governor Roy Rowland of Connecticut, cited his deep concern and specifically requested that State and local lawmakers have representation on the commission.

The approach taken by this bill is the usual Washington-knows-best syndrome. Let's just say, I object to that premise.

This legislation should also require that commission recommendations regarding State gaming policy issues must be directed to State and local governments. But it does not. Does this mean new costly Federal laws or regulations will be implemented on gaming at a time when we are working to reduce regulation? And, once again, when our States are the best ones to be handling this issue, why are we advocating more Federal intrusion?

A final point I'd like to make is that if we are going to have a study, this bill should be inclusive of all forms of gaming present in 48 of the 50 States including casino gaming, State lotteries, charitable gaming, Native American gaming, Internet gaming, sports betting, horse and dog racing and other pari-mutuel activities. Why does this bill exclude charitable gaming from its study? If you want a study on gaming, why are we picking and choosing, rather than including every type of gaming?

Mr. Speaker, we don't need another costly Federal study and we don't need more intrusion on our States' right to guide their existence. I urge defeat of this bad legislation.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], a cosponsor of the bill.

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 497, the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act. I wish to commend my colleague from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], for his efforts and his leadership in bringing this legislation to the House floor today.

The legislation before us today addresses issues and concerns that I have sought to bring to the attention of Congress since 1994. As chairman of the Committee on Small Business, I conducted hearings in 1994 that documented the rapid proliferation of casino gambling throughout the United States and examined the economic impact of Government-sponsored gambling on small businesses, on individual communities, and on the Nation as a whole.

Based on the findings of those hearings, I introduced in 1994 the National Policies Toward Gambling Review Act to authorize a Federal study of the economic and social implications of this widespread growth of legalized gambling. This proposal, like that introduced by Mr. WOLF, creates a new national commission, along the lines of the commission that last studied gambling in 1976, and would expand its study to all aspects of gambling in all States and localities. I reintroduced my bill in the current Congress as H.R. 462, and was delighted to sign on Mr. WOLF as my first cosponsor. When he subsequently introduced his most similar bill, H.R. 497, I was pleased to sign on as his lead cosponsor.

The 1994 Small Business Committee hearings convinced me that widespread legalized gambling has raised serious

questions that few local officials, and American society generally, are prepared to address. The hearings also confirmed what a New York Times article headline had proclaimed several weeks earlier, that gambling is now bigger than baseball as a national pastime. Some 125 million people visited casinos in 1994, a whopping 36 percent increase from 92 million in 1993. Annual attendance at professional baseball games averaged only 70 million. Casino revenues increased by a whopping 33 percent between 1993 and 1994, from $30 billion to $40 billion, and easily exceed the combined revenues for other major leisure activities, including movies, books, recorded music, spectator sports, theme parks, and arcades.

Americans wagered $462 billion on all forms of legalized gambling in 1994, more than the entire gross national product of Communist China. More than $360 billion was wagered in casinos in 10 States and on Indian reservations in 24 States, most of which were built after 1991. All but three States now permit parimutuel betting, slot machines, video poker, keno, bingo, or other forms of gambling. And 36 States actively encourage gambling with government-run lotteries.

This is a far different situation than existed when the last national commission issued its report on gambling in 1976. Legalized gambling was then confined to Nevada, and was under consideration in Atlantic City. The focus of the commission's study was the influence of organized crime in gambling, not the various economic and social implications of widespread gambling across the country. For Nevada, and later Atlantic City, gambling provided what experts termed a monopoly export economy—the popular conception of gambling as a model for economic development in which new jobs, higher tax revenues, and other economic benefits are created for a local economy by tourists from other locations. This model offered the added benefit of hiding the economic and social problems of gambling—including bankruptcies, gambling addiction and crime—which tourists simply took home with them.

As gambling has spread across the United States, and even to locations on our border with Canada, it has become clear that this model of gambling as economic development is no longer effective. States and localities now compete with Indian reservations, with other States and with other countries to lure potential gamblers or, at minimum, to keep their own gambling revenues at home. Casinos that were touted as bringing jobs and economic enrichment to communities in 1994 are now going bankrupt.

What we now have is an economic model of gambling that the casino industry itself refers to as ''convenience'' gambling. Rather than confining gambling to specific locations for purposes of economic development, gambling is made readily available to all potential customers. In a convenience gambling economy, discretionary spending is diverted from other forms of entertainment and consumer expenditures to casinos and other gambling establishments. Restaurants, hotels, and other competing local businesses lose revenues and fail. Scarce resources are diverted to the least productive local activities and economic wealth becomes concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. In short, rather than the economic panacea promised by gambling promoters, the opposite of economic development appears to be occurring in many communities.

The social costs of gambling also have become more visible as gambling has spread to more locations. However, there is little comprehensive data, for example, on the costs of gambling-related crimes, on personal losses and bankruptcies or on lost jobs and work time due to gambling. Nor do we know the costs inflicted on families in terms of gambling-related alcoholism, abuse, divorce, or suicide.

Recent studies in Iowa and Missouri found that between 3 to 6 percent of gamblers become compulsive gamblers and that a large percentage of compulsive gamblers resort to crime to cover their losses. Other studies have estimated the public costs of each problem gambler, in terms of treatment, services and court expenses, as between $13,000 and $35,000. Even at the lowest cost estimate, according to witnesses in our 1994 hearing, an increase in gambling addiction of only one-half of 1 percent of a State's adult population would translate into added costs of $73 million a year in a small State like Iowa and more than $780 million in new costs in a large State like California. Such costs could eventually nullify any economic gains from gambling.

Concern with the economic, social and moral implications of Government-sponsored gambling has created something of a public backlash against the gambling industry. In the November 1994 elections voters from Florida to Wyoming rejected 90 percent of all State and local referenda to legalize or expand gambling operations. Last November, gambling initiatives were defeated in Washington and Massachusetts, while special panels in Maryland and Connecticut rejected new casino proposals. This suggest a growing public consensus that the pace of future casino development should be more measured and that future growth of gambling generally must be given greater scrutiny at the local, State, and national levels.

A report issued in November by a special Maryland task force to study casino gambling is particularly instructive and highlights two of the most important issues in the legislation before us today. In recommending against casino gambling, the task force concluded that casino gambling is an issue Maryland cannot address on its own. Since the economic benefits of gambling come largely from reductions in other consumer spending or by attracting spending from other States, the task force said that the issue must be addressed on at least a regional, if not national, basis. The task force also concluded that, given the limited statistical and economic analysis available, it needed far more information to understand all potential consequences of initiating casino gambling.

Contrary to the arguments of some in the gambling industry, the bill before us today does not seek to restrict or regulate organized gambling, nor is it intended as a preliminary step toward such regulation. It merely responds to a growing public demand for more and better information about gambling. And it responds to requests by officials in Maryland and elsewhere for a broad analysis of gambling that can incorporate information from all States and from Indian tribal jurisdictions.

As State and Federal funding for social services and other programs continue to decline, local officials will come under even greater pressure to heed promises of new revenue and greater prosperity in legalized gambling. It is imperative that these officials, and the public generally, have all the information available to make reasoned and prudent policy decisions.

Nearly 2 years have passed since I first proposed legislation to create a national commission to study gambling. It was needed then, it is imperative now. I urge adoption of this important legislation.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], the chief sponsor of this bill.

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong, strong support of this bill. The bill has over 150 to 160 cosponsors.

Let me begin by thanking Chairman HYDE personally for his work on this effort. I want to commend the gentleman. I appreciate the good work that he has done. I also want to thank Alan Coffey, who I have known for about 30 years, for his outstanding work; and lastly for Joe Gibson, your staff, and your other staff people who have done a superb job.

This is important. There are now 48 States that have some form of gambling, whether it be lottery, casino gambling, and whatever the case may be. This is important to stop and take a close look at it. Now, there are going to be many other things, and I have spoken from the floor on this issue many, many times.

I believe it is inappropriate, the spread of gambling that has taken place in the country. All you have to do is read the Washington Post series that was on Sunday and Monday and Tuesday and again tomorrow to see that from two States we have grown to roughly 48 States.

Let me just say—it is not in my statement—for the record, powerful interests in this city have been hired to derail this bill. Prominent people in the Republican Party and prominent people in the Democratic Party from the K Street corridor have been hired to detract and derail and stop this bill.

This bill is going to pass today by an overwhelming vote. There literally is very, very little opposition because it is a fair study that the American people want to see. What is the impact with regard to economic cannibalization, what impact does it have, and what is the impact with regard to corruption and political contributions? What is the impact to social aspects with regard to Gamblers Anonymous and things like this?

So we are going to watch it, and I appreciate the efforts in the House. It is bipartisan. We have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. I remember one day I was giving a 1-minute speech and the gentleman from Michigan got up and said, ''I want to be on that bill.'' We have come together in the best interest of this body.

In closing, I appreciate the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], making this a priority item to bring up, and also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] in not allowing some of these people that are—and I am reluctant to get into their names—who have been hired by the gambling interests to derail this bill.

My closing comment is, I personally care about this almost as much as I care about a lot of things that we are taking. I am going to watch what happens on this bill. I am going to watch and see what takes place over in the Senate.

What I would ask is those who have some problem with this bill, this bill ought to be allowed to pass, whereby we can set up a national commission, whether it be for 18 months or 2 years, whereby 9 men and women of decency and honesty who are not tied into any particular community can look at and examine this issue.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and his staff very, very much from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. Speaker, as the original sponsor of the pending legislation, I rise in ardent support of H.R. 497, the Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act and appreciate your scheduling this important legislation for floor consideration. Also, I would like to take a moment to recognize the diligent efforts of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and his able staff in guiding this legislation through the committee process. It was a pleasure working with Chairman HYDE in bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 497 is complicated. It would charge the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission with the duty of making an objective, comprehensive, and impartial legal and factual assessment of gambling. Let me be clear. This legislation does not outlaw gambling. It does not tax gambling. It does not regulate gambling. It merely recognizes that gambling is spreading throughout the country like wildfire and it needs a hard look. This is our responsibility as Federal legislators to create a commission to bring together all the relevant data so that Governors, State legislators, and citizens can have the facts they need to make informed decisions.

In the early 1970's Congress was concerned about problems related to gambling, and it established a commission similar to the one pending before the House today. Since the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling issued its 1976 report, gambling has greatly expanded, and it has grown in many ways that are contrary to the recommendations of that early report. In 1976 only two States had casino gambling. Today, every State but two have some form of legal gambling. According to U.S. News & World Report, people wagered $482 billion in 1994 on all forms of gambling, 85 percent of which took place in casinos in 27 States, most of them built in the past 5 years. As gambling proliferates in casinos, on riverboats, on Indian reservations and elsewhere, problems such as crime, political corruption, cannibalization of existing businesses, gambling addiction, family breakups, and suicide appear to be a growing and unfortunate consequence. It is time for Congress to take a comprehensive look at gambling and its associated problems.

The gambling industry and its proponents argue that this study is not needed because this issue should be left up to the States. Well, Governors Lowry, Washington; Bush, Texas; Dean, Vermont; Carper, Delaware; Sundquist, Tennessee; Merrill, New Hampshire; Cayetano, Hawaii; Voinovich, Ohio; and Racicot, Montana disagree and support H.R. 497. I have heard from many State attorneys general and legislators who also support a national study of gambling. H.R. 497 has received wide editorial support as well from papers such as the Washington Post, Dallas Morning News, Los Angeles Times, Cincinnati Enquirer, Philadelphia Inquirer, Richmond-Times Dispatch, Capital Times, Madison, WS, Sacramento Bee, Chicago-Sun Times, Sun-Sentinel, Fort Lauderdale, FL. Also, this legislation is supported by the Christian Coalition, Traditional Values Coalition, Concerned Women for America, American Family Association, Focus on the Family, Family Research Council, and others. Recently, a coalition of 16 churches in America wrote the House and Senate leadership in support of this important legislation.

Why do so many Governors, State attorneys general, State legislators, and citizens support H.R. 497? The reason is that there exists little credible or reliable information about gambling, and much of the information that does exist is produced by the gambling industry itself. Joseph Tydings and Peter Reuter, chairman and executive director respectively of Maryland's Joint Executive Legislative Task Force to Study Commercial Gambling, in an opinion article which ran in the Washington Post, wrote:

> The problem of legal casino gambling is a national one. . . . The problem cries out for attention from the President and Congress. Unfortunately, the casino industry has mobilized cash and lobbyists to prevent Federal action on the issue.

Mr. Speaker, Congress can no longer turn a blind eye to the stories of poor mothers playing the slots with their children's lunch money or the Northeast Mississippi Daily Journal article that indicated that more money was bet in casinos, $29.7 billion, in 1994 than was spent on all taxable sales, $27.6 billion, in the State. No longer can we ignore reports of teenagers so addicted to gambling that they prostitute their girlfriends to pay off their mob debts. And Congress will no longer be able to disregard accounts of Americans so distraught over their mounting gambling debts that their only perceived recourse is suicide.

Mr. Speaker, America has begun to focus on the issue of gambling and its related problems. By passing H.R. 497 today, Congress will take a meaningful step toward bringing together all the relevant data so that Governors, State legislators, and citizens can have the facts they need to make informed decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD four editorials in support of this legislation, as follows:

[From the Saturday Oklahoman, Oct. 28, 1995]

STUDY COULD HELP

The battle over legalizing casino gambling in Oklahoma apparently will be fought at the polls instead of in the courtroom.

Casino proponents have gathered 202,993 signatures on petitions to place the proposal on the ballot, the secretary of state says. A leading opponent says his group believes it would be useless to challenge the petition, based on past Supreme Court rulings. Instead, foes will focus on defeating the proposal, possibly at the time of the presidential primary on March 12. Casino boosters want to question on the November 1996 general election ballot.

In either case, Oklahomans will have time to study the issue and should try to get all the information they can to help them make their decision.

Of interest in this respect is an editorial in The News Journal of Wilmington, Del. It raises concerns about casinos due to open this year at Delaware racetracks.

News stories in the paper estimate perhaps $400 million will be poured into 1,200 slot machines the first year. But the profit to the state would be only $8 million, about 2 percent of the wagering. The slot machines would return 90 percent or more to the bettors, with the rest going to track owners, purses for the horses, slot machine leases and state administrative costs, according to the paper.

The editorial worries about the potential for abuse existing in all aspects: gambling contractors, casino employees, bettors, owners and operators. It notes that smaller operations like Delaware's are considered more susceptible to corruption than the big gambling meccas, like Atlantic City and Nevada.

''While much is said about the possible benefits from slots to racing and new jobs, businesses and revenue, how much is really known about the influence of organized crime, the potential for political corruption and the social toll on individuals and families?'' the paper asks.

The editorial supports legislation pending in Congress to establish a National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission to help states evaluate the effects of legalized gambling. Such a study could also prove useful also for Oklahoma as it is confronted by efforts to expand gambling activities in the state.

[From the Indianapolis News, Feb. 29, 1996]

LOOKING AT THE FACTS

Since it's only a study commission, it might be pertinent to wonder why the gambling industry wants to delay or water down House Resolution 497.

This proposal, by Rep. Frank Wolf, R-Va., would establish a national commission to study the economic and social impact of legalized gambling.

The problem for the gambling industry is the fact that such studies tend to hurt their cause. Researchers who study this business keep finding unpleasant facts and information that make it harder for the industry to make its case to local and state governments.

University of Illinois economist Earl Grinols, for example, keeps coming up with studies showing that the economic development claims offered by the industry are exaggerated or false. He finds that off-track betting outlets, for example, do not generally bring new economic development to a community but transfer discretionary spending from retail businesses such as restaurants to gambling establishments.

Additionally, the facts on gambling addiction are devastating to legalized gambling promoters. The financial costs are difficult to pinpoint precisely, but they run into the billions of dollars when all factors are weighed. Families wind up on welfare when fathers or mothers get addicted. Crime increases as the addicted turn to theft, forgery and other such practices to feed this habit. But the human cost is harder to weigh. Some people have committed suicide. Others wind up all but abandoning their children in favor of this form of entertainment.

Wolf's proposal is timely. Critics claim the issue is a state or local matter. But the federal government allows Indian gambling initiatives to circumvent state or local government jurisdiction, and there are other national implications of legalized gambling's proliferation in recent years.

Sen. Richard Lugar, R-Ind., has made a proposal similar to Wolf's, offering it in his presidential campaign. Lugar and Wolf have been joined by many other members of Congress. In Indiana, newspaper publisher George Witwer, as a candidate for governor, has called for a state study commission, and legislation in the General Assembly may be adopted to provide for a legislative study committee on the subject.

The Washington Post warns that the gambling industry will be trying to stop or delay the national proposal in Congress. A recent editorial noted: ''The gambling industry has a great deal of money, has been making large campaign contributions and recently hired some of Washington's most influential lobbyists. We have no doubt that the industry can bring a lot of pressure against this bill and construct some ingenious strategies to weaken it.''

Congress ought to listen to Wolf, Lugar and others calling for a study commission on this issue. There is much at stake, as such a commission would point out.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 5, 1996]

TAKING A HARD LOOK AT GAMBLING

Rocked to attention by the explosion of legal gambling across the country in the past two decades, Congress is belatedly, but sensibly, considering legislation calling for a comprehensive national study on the social and economic effects of gambling. Lobbyists accuse government of trying to stack the deck to expand its regulatory reach. But without a study and reliable data, what conclusions can be drawn?

The bipartisan legislation, endorsed by 143 cosponsors in the House and 16 in the Senate, calls for the creation of a commission to conduct a two-year national study of the effects of gambling. Its recommendations are expected to provide guideposts for states and localities in dealing with legal gambling's transformation from sleepy enterprise to a national economic force.

As recently as 1984, just two states, Nevada and New Jersey, allowed casino gambling. Today nearly half the states have casinos on land, water or Indian reservations. Only Utah and Hawaii have no state-sanctioned gambling.

The increase in the number of gambling outlets clearly seems to have changed the public's betting habits. According to the General Accounting Office, between 1984 and 1994 the annual amount bet on legalized gaming—including casinos, lotteries, parimutual betting and sports books—jumped by 137%, from $147 billion in 1984 to $482 billion in 1994, more than twice the current annual budget deficit that consumes so much congressional attention.

Rapid-fire expansion of legal wagering has meant new jobs and tax revenues to state and local governments, but it has also resulted in serious problems. Though most of the evidence is anecdotal, signs of the social and economic downside are proliferating, from housewives blowing monthly household budgets to sharp-suited toughs showing up in town.

What is the extent of gambling addiction? Has its expansion increased criminal activity? Has political corruption become a problem? Is there a multiplier effect on jobs from gaming? Or does legal betting drain money away from other businesses and drive them into the ground?

As it now stands, there are no clear answers to these questions. Opponents, including the American Gaming Assn., argue that by involving itself in an expansive gaming study, the federal government is potentially interfering in local matters. But this is only a study. If gambling is the sure-fire winner that proponents say it is, there ought to be nothing to worry about.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1995]

GAMBLING NATION?

On the opposite page, Rep. Frank Wolf (R-Va.) makes a strong case for his bill to set up a National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission. His point is hard to refute: If the United States' headlong rush into becoming Gambling Nation is a great idea—good for business, for the social order, for government revenues—surely a fair-minded commission would discover such a thing. And please, no talk about ''undue government interference with free enterprise.'' As Mr. Wolf points out, there is absolutely nothing in his bill that involves taxing or regulating gambling. He simply suggests that states and localities that get inundated with pro-gambling propaganda—and politicians who get inundated with political contributions from gambling interests—get a chance to see how all the arguments for gambling pan out in reality.

What needs to be understood in this debate is that the central issue is *not* the end to all legalized gambling in America—this is not a replay of the arguments over Prohibition. For better or worse, most Americans seemed to accept the situation that existed some years ago in which large-scale casino operations were confined to the states of Nevada and New Jersey. This sent powerful messages: that casino gambling was not a routine activity and that communities had good reason not to turn themselves over to gambling. The nation effectively accepted that many people liked to gamble, but it also accepted that organized commercial gambling was not the sort of activity that ought to become a routine part of life. Implicit in this national compact was an understanding that the potential for crime and political corruption ought to be contained. Call it the enclave theory of gambling.

Several things have happened since. One is that popular resistance to taxes has moved governments all over the country to sponsor their own forms of gambling through lotteries and other games. The idea was that a portion of the public treasury would be filled with money ''voluntarily'' handed over in bets. Once Atlantic City got going, many economically strapped communities that saw no other way to support themselves figured they too should get a piece of the action. Jobs in casinos look mighty attractive to the unemployed and underemployed, and local officials staring at huge local budget problems tend to look kindly on any new revenue sources. Finally, there was the 1987 Supreme Court ruling legalizing gambling on Indian reservations, which opened up whole new areas of the country to gambling—and gave a new moral justification to casinos as Native American leaders argued that their people were at last getting their due.

This is how large social changes happen—in small increments that no one notices much until a big transformation has taken place. Mr. Wolf and his allies are suggesting that on gambling, the country look ahead before it is too late, or too complicated, to turn back.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the distinguished chairman of the committee in a brief colloquy.

Was it the intent of the Committee on the Judiciary to include the U.S. Territories, Commonwealths, and possessions within the meaning of the terms ''United States,'' ''States,'' and ''political subdivisions of States'' as used in section 4 of this legislation?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our intent that the U.S. Territories, Commonwealths, and possessions be included in H.R. 497, as the gentleman has stated.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, while having some reservations which I will note later, I rise today in support of H.R. 497.

Mr. Speaker, the amount of gambling has increased considerably in the United States over the last two decades. While before many Americans were confined to gambling in the States of Nevada and New Jersey, or to parimutuel betting, today fully 48 of the States of the United States participate in some form of gambling. This has provided a new stream of revenue for State and municipal treasuries, which has in turn provided additional services to the residents of those States.

The issues this legislation tries to address are very comprehensive, and I commend the chairman and members of the Judiciary Committee for trying to address these issues. For most Americans, gambling provides leisure-time entertainment. For a small minority, however, many of whom are those who least can afford to lose their limited earnings or savings, gambling is an addictive, destructive habit. The question is, as a matter of public policy, Are the drawbacks to permitting

gambling so destructive that legal gambling should be restricted or eliminated?

While I am not a gambler, as I noted earlier, gaming activities are being used by almost all States for public purposes. Gaming operations are also now being used by American Indians throughout our country to raise money for improvements to schools, hospitals, and roads on their Indian reservations. As a member of the Committee on Resources, I am especially concerned that Indian gaming not be unfairly targeted should this legislation become law.

My concern is that there may be individuals who want to use this bill in an attempt to stop or curtail gaming throughout the United States, and that this opposition is centered on moral grounds but more particularly, that this is an attack on the successes which have been achieved by American Indians through gaming.

If this were truly a moral concern, why is the Commission being empowered to study only gaming? Why not also include the study of alcohol consumption, the use of cigarettes and tobacco among teenagers and adults, and abortion, too? Are those activities any more or less moral than gaming?

Again, for those who may be determined to eliminate Indian gaming, I find it very unfair to target only gaming in this Commission. Those of us on the Committee on Resources are familiar with the long-standing problems within Indian country. By most, if not all measures, our American Indians are at the bottom of the ladder when it. comes to housing, income, education, or any other measure of economic development. Here are a few facts which portray the dismal conditions in which many of our first Americans live.

I ask my colleagues to keep in mind that the locations of the reservations on which many American Indians now live, are not locations of their choosing. Many tribes were forcibly moved to these reservations from much more desirable locations at which they could and did provide for themselves.

Fact: the life expectancy of an American Indian is 47 years; the life expectancy of all Americans is 78 years.

Fact: the 1990 census determined that 30.9 percent of our Nation's Indians live in poverty; the poverty rate for the U.S. population was 13.1 percent.

Fact: in 1991, the unemployment rate on Indian reservations was 45 percent; for the United States, when that number goes above 7 percent we take significant action to reduce it.

I could go on, but I think my point is clear: the Indians are in trouble, and they can use whatever assistance is available.

Mr. Speaker, through the judicious use of gaming operations, Indian country is slowly pulling itself up the ladder of life. Indian gaming is a well-regulated system that is serving its purpose remarkably well. No one is forced to gamble and all the profits received by the tribes go directly to tribal uses. The U.S. Government does not have the money to make all the capital improvements needed on the reservations, and through the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, Congress has established a system to pay for improvements in Indian country through voluntary, private contributions. After 500 years of mistreatment, this is one Indian program I feel good about—it is voluntary, efficient, and privately funded.

I have heard accusations that Indian gaming is fraught with criminal activity including Mafia and other syndicate-type operations, but the truth is these allegations have been investigated by Federal authorities and they are unfounded. In fact, at hearings I helped organize, the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified before the House Subcommittee on Indian Affairs during the 104th Congress that there is no truth to these allegations. Indian gaming is a well-managed, highly regulated activity providing widely disbursed public benefit.

I appreciate the willingness of the Committee on Judiciary to remove some of the most egregious anti-Indian-gaming provisions contained in H.R. 497, as it was introduced. Given Congress' efforts over the years to monitor and regulate this activity, I am concerned that other amendments offered by the Committee on Resources were not included in the legislation to ensure Indian gaming received fair consideration. For example, given the extent to which Indian gaming is federally regulated, and the complexity of those regulations, I believe it would be beneficial to include on the Commission persons with an expertise in this area.

I also want to express my concern with the limited time in which the Committee on Resources was afforded to consider this bill. H.R. 497 was referred to the Committee on Resources for the period beginning December 21, 1995, through February 28, 1996, most of which time the House was adjourned or in pro forma session.

Finally, I want to express my appreciation to Chairman HYDE for his willingness to include the territories in this legislation.

□ 1200

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

(Mr. RIGGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage the gentleman in a brief colloquy.

Is it the intent of the Committee on the Judiciary that the Commission be free to study the public safety costs that gambling operations, including those operations on Indian reservations, impose on local government and local law enforcement agencies?

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is our intent the commission would be free to study the public safety cost that gambling operations, including those operations on Indian reservations, impose on local law enforcement agencies. I believe that is implicit in subparagraphs A, D, G, H, and M of subsection 4(a)(2).

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentleman. I strongly support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to Members' attention a matter of importance brought about from the proliferation of gaming operations in northern California.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter of the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act. I believe, however that it is important to clarify one aspect of the legislation.

Like many other regions of hte Nation, the Indian tribes in northern California are establishing gaming operations in order to provide a much needed source of revenue for depressed rural areas.

While, I support the efforts of native American communities to establish a self-sufficient form of revenue, the residual impacts of the gaming operations on local communities are having unanticipated consequences.

Not long ago, the Elem Indian colony, in Lake County, CA, erupted in 5 days of shooting over control of two casinos where video poker and pool are played. On more than one occasion, the county swat team and law enforcement officials have been called to the scene to prevent the continuation of hostilities between the two competing factions. Tensions on the reservation are high and are directly attributable to the operation of the gaming facilities.

The resulting hostilities have been a drain on local law enforcement. The county government is not recompensed for its services relating to the reservation.

I would hope that the Commission would study the financial and public safety costs of Indian gaming operations on county and municipal law enforcement.

Although the legislation does not directly address this topic, I have noticed that section 4, subsections D, G, and H, include reviews relating to crime and the effectiveness of law enforcement and regulatory polity as it relates to Indian Gambling. It would seem to me that the Commission should address the impact and cost of native American gaming operations on county law enforcement.

It is my hope that the Commission will address the concerns of northern California communities, and communities across the Nation that reside near native American gaming facilities?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, I rise in support of H.R. 497, for it covers an area that provides information for all of us to move forward and to ensure that gambling is not hurtful.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to cosponsor this important legislation, which establishes a nine-

member Commission to study gambling in the United States—including gambling on Indian reservations, State-sponsored lotteries, casino gambling and sports betting.

Gambling has become an important part of American life. Americans are betting and losing more money each year than it spends on all spectator sports combined. Gambling has also become a major source of revenue for many State governments. I am concerned, however, that we do not completely understand the impact of gambling on our society.

Just yesterday, the Washington Post reported the story of a Louisiana woman who became addicted to video poker. She described it as an addiction as powerful as any drug. This woman squandered her entire savings, including a trust reserved for her grandson's education, on the video poker games which are in many of the State's bars and restaurants. Do State governments that push gambling have any responsibility for people who become hooked was just one question that the article asked.

The Commission established by this bill would be required to conduct a comprehensive, legal and factual study of the impact of gambling on Federal, State, and Tribal governments in an attempt to answer some of the questions that have arisen from the Nation's new obsession.

The Commission would also study the influence of political contributions on the development of public policy regulating gambling, as well as the relationship between gambling and crime. The bill requires the Commission to review the effectiveness of existing practices in law enforcement, judicial administration, and corrections to combat and deter illegal gambling and illegal activities related to gambling. The bill also directs the Commission to study the effects of advertising and whether it increases participation in gambling activities.

America has become a gambling nation. This bill will study the effects, both positive and negative, of our new favorite pastime and I believe it is important to do so.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I do not come at this issue as a Pollyanna. I mean, I have on rare occasions bought a lottery ticket and played the ponies in my day.

I must be very frank with you, Mr. Speaker, I watch this gambling explosion now in the last two decades since 1974. It really has become something we as a country really need to look at and study.

Two decades ago we spent $17 billion on gambling in this country; in 1994, $482 billion. Americans lost $40 billion of what they bet, more than 6 times what they spent on all spectator sports combined, and while 70 million people attend professional baseball games each year, 125 million go to government-sanctioned casinos. Adults spend more money gambling than they spend on children's durable toys. Lottery ticket sales have increased 829 percent since 1982.

Something is going on, and you can relate it to a lot of different things; the stagnant wages of 80 percent of the population who have not seen an increase in wages basically, real increase, since 1979, may attribute to that. I mean, are we really to the point the American dream means pinning your hopes on a weekly basis on the lottery?

We have got to look at this. There are serious social implications with respect to gambling. Gamblers Anonymous, in Illinois, did a study. A third of the people said they lost or quit their jobs because of gambling. Seventy-six percent said they missed time from work because of gambling. Forty-four percent had stolen from work to pay for gambling debts. It goes on and on and on.

I am conflicted by this issue, because of how the native Americans in our country have been become resourceful and done well economically because of this, and I understand that concern, and it is a legitimate concern that we have to face.

But it seems to me, with all of this proliferation of gambling in the country, we need to really have a serious, rational look at it, and I support the efforts on the part of my colleagues bringing this up, and commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. WALDHOLTZ].

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 497, the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] for their leadership on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we dearly need a commission to study effects of gambling in the United States. One only needs to read the front page of last Sunday's Washington Post to understand why. Legalized gambling in the United States has exploded 2,800 percent in the last two decades, from $17 billion in 1974 to $482 billion in 1994.

As has been earlier stated, Americans lost $40 billion of what they bet, more than 6 times what Americans spent on all spectator sports combined. We need to ask ourselves what this explosive growth is doing to our economy, our communities and to our families.

There is disturbing evidence of urban decay, public corruption, despair and suicide among addicted gamblers. We must know for certain what the net effects of legalized gambling are.

The stakes are too high to let these questions go unanswered, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation so that we can have the facts as we make decisions about what role gambling should play in our country.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE].

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the question we face today is not whether one is for or against gaming. The fact is that gambling has been part of our society for a long, long time—and it probably will continue to be that way. The question we face today is what role should the Federal Government play in regulating gambling. I am not sure what that role should be. I am not convinced that today's system of checks and balances is broken. Today, the States have been used as the primary regulatory body that oversees commercial gaming. Like my friend from Massachusetts, I thought the Republicans would be happy knowing that the States are regulating gaming operations—much like the Republicans want the States to regulate WIC, school lunch programs, welfare, and Medicaid.

But if this study is going to happen, it should not be used as a vehicle to attack Indian gaming and the sovereignty of tribal governments. Mr. Speaker, if one was reading the Washington Post this morning, they may be led to believe that Indian tribes who engage in gaming are basically unregulated entities operating casinos across the country. But as we know, nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that Indian gaming is the most heavily regulated gaming industry in America. The tribes have three layers of regulatory bodies they have to deal with. The tribes themselves have their own law enforcement and court systems to provide oversight on the reservations. And tribal regulatory and control standards are generally equal or greater than State or industry standards. The tribes must also deal with a host of Federal regulators—including the Department of Justice, the FBI, the IRS, and the Department of Interior. And as a result of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988, the States have also been given a role to limit Indian gaming during the compact process.

Mr. Speaker, another fact is that in Indian country, the money generated from gaming must, by law, be used for purposes to benefit the tribes. Today, the tribes employ 140,000 people nationwide, with about 85 percent being held by non-Indians. The tribes have used their gaming dollars to build schools, homes, and health clinics to better serve their members. But I have some real concerns about this bill. I am concerned that while this Commission will focus a great deal of its time on Indian gaming, there is no guarantee that a person from Indian country will even be a member of the Commission. I hope any Senate bill will include a provision requiring two members of the Commission be from federally recognized tribes who engage in gaming. Finally, Mr.

Speaker, I remain deeply concerned that there are some people in the House who would like to use this bill as a vehicle to attach amendments that would be detrimental to Indian gaming. If this bill passes the House and moves over to the Senate, I would hope that body would reject any attempt to add such amendments to this bill. Such a move would be unwise and counterproductive. It would lead many people who support this bill, to actively oppose it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

I rise in support of H.R. 497, which would establish a national commission to study the impact of gambling in America.

Numerous studies have been conducted on the impact of gambling, studies which have generated a variety of conclusions, largely dependent on who funds them.

This commission will be unique in that it will hopefully provide an objective and dispassionate view of the economic and social effects of gambling. This kind of information is vital if we are to make responsible decisions about commercial and governmental gambling.

If gambling continues to generate popularity as a revenue-generating mechanism, we will need accurate information in order to help State, territorial, local governments, and Indian tribes make decisions about gambling.

Earlier in this debate, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], entered into a colloquy to clarify the roll of territories in this legislation. I support the effort of my friend in that regard.

I am especially interested in what the commission's findings will reveal about the affects of gambling on our local economies. My home of Guam is considering legalizing casino gambling as a way to attract more tourists to our island. I do not think it is necessary, but we need information in order to make that decision better and more effective for our local community.

Support H.R. 497.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise against the bill because of its negative impact on native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, a National Gambling Commission is in many ways an unnecessary intrusion by the Federal Government into the business of State and local and tribal governments. It will cost millions of dollars to fund the Commission and its study, which can surely be put to better use.

There is no evidence that such a study is even necessary. The gambling operations of the native American tribes, which would be one of the subjects of this study, have shown no evidence of any connection with organized criminal activity. The bill does not provide a requirement that there be native American members of the Commission.

The bill's study does not cover all forms of gambling.

Indian gambling has produced hundreds of thousands of jobs, both directly and indirectly, and has been of tremendous economic benefit. This is the first time that the tribes have been able to bring in a significant amount of revenue, and they have used it for hospitals, schools, and other improvements to their communities.

Creating this Commission will create another Federal bureaucracy which will have subpoena power.

Regardless of one's position on whether gambling is a positive or negative force, the States and localities must decide for themselves, and they are already doing so.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOBIONDO].

(Mr. LOBIONDO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I proudly represent the Second District of New Jersey, which includes Atlantic City and the casino industry in Atlantic City. New Jersey also has a State lottery and racing and other types of legalized betting.

In turn, New Jersey is able to provide programs for senior citizens, programs for the disabled and programs for schoolchildren that would not be there if it were not for this source of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an area for the Federal Government to get involved in. It is an area that has been run by the States. It is an area that has been based on the approval by the people of those States.

Gaming includes a wide variety of activities in States. It involves racing, lottery, sports betting, charitable gaming, and the casino industry.

I would like to at least suggest that this study be completed by those involved in the industry at the State and local level, those who know it best, and that its results be shared with States and local governments, and that if Federal issues are to be examined, that the agenda should focus on Indian gaming and gaming on the Internet.

I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, what this study is going to find. It is going to find that there were a lot of jobs that were created because of the industry, good-paying jobs, with good benefits. It is going to find that has been a reduction in the welfare roles because people have been put to work. It is going to find a highly regulated industry that is extremely well run. It is going to find that services provided to the elderly and disabled would not have been there if this industry would not be allowed to flourish, and it is also going to find that educational funds for our children have been enhanced because of the revenues that they receive from the gaming industry.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on this bill.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

(Mr. ROEMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would like to begin by saluting the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for his hard work on this particular bill.

We are hearing a lot about what this bill is and what it is not. I think one of our former Presidents once said, ''Education is expensive, but ignorance is even more expensive.'' This bill is about educating the American people. It is not about mandating the States. It is about getting information out to the people about what the gaming industry and the gambling is doing to our small businesses and our families and our wages. That is what this is about.

I recommend the ''Luck Business'', by Robert Goodman, to see some of the devastating consequences that gaming is having in our small communities.

Second, this is about values. Our values in American society are not to say to our children, ''Go out and win the lottery. We are going to go out to 7–Eleven and buy enough tickets and go gaming and gambling, and that is the way to make the American dream.'' It is about hard work and sacrifice and commitment.

So let us study and see what this proliferation of gambling is having on American families and American small businesses. That is all this bill does.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member of the Committee on Resources, which should have had jurisdiction over this bill.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] for bringing it to our attention and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the Committee on the Judiciary for reporting it.

I wish that our committee would have spent more time on it because of its significant impact on Indian gaming in this country.

But I think with the proliferation of gambling in the United States, we have got to ask these questions. We have got to start to have some answers as to the real impacts of gambling. There is a lot of impact that appears at first, and a lot of it appears positive, but there are obviously some ongoing studies, anecdotal evidence from communities that

some of it that is so positive in the beginning maybe turns out not to be the case later.

□ 1215

I must also say that I am concerned that this resolution starts to get into a number of areas that are beyond those generic questions as to the impact of gaming on our families and our communities and our social structure. Many of the areas where States have made decisions, the people have voted to engage in this activity, and we do not get back into trying to create some type of Federal regulatory body.

But I think the resolution on balance is a good one. I would hope that the members of the Commission will remain sensitive to the unique status of the Indian tribes and the laws and the treaties governing those tribes and the laws that govern their ability to conduct gambling as a result of State activities in which those tribal lands reside.

So I hope that this Commission will be productive, and I hope that it will be able to report back to us, so that decisions can be made by us, I think individually, because I think we are going to find out most of these decisions reside with the States, as they have properly in the past. But maybe this national Commission will have enough status so that local communities and States can make informed decisions before plunging into the further expansion of gambling before they know the results and whatever the downside may be.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

(Mrs. ROUKEMA asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I might remark, as one from New Jersey, which has a strong gambling casino industry, nevertheless I believe this is a study that is long overdue. I rise in strong support.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation which would set up a commission to study the impact of gambling on our Nation. I also do this as one from New Jersey a State that has a casino industry that is nationally prominent. This study is long overdue and I commend my good friend from Virginia for his hard work on this important issue. In doing so, he has recognized what many of us have also grown aware of—that the moral, social, economic, and political ramifications of gambling are far too great to go unaddressed any longer. We must carefully evaluate what has become an uncontrollable epidemic that has destroyed peoples lives and families.

All we need to do is look at the staggering statistics on gambling. The amount of money legally gambled has skyrocketed by 2,800 percent since 1974—from $17 to $482 billion in 1994. Moreover, the $40 billion in revenue raised in 1994 from all gambling related activities is more than all of the combined revenue raised from movie theaters, sporting events, theme parks, cruises, and music concerts.

The economic impact of gambling on community businesses can be devastating. Money that would normally be invested into local economies is instead being thrown away at the nearby casino. Local merchants, retailers, and restaurantuers are seeing business dry up because the money that people used to spend on their goods and services is being gambled at the card table, the slot machine, the scratch off lotto cards.

The reality of individual and family owned businesses going out of business is exacerbated by the corporate structure of casinos. Casinos provide cheap food and entertainment on site in order to keep gamblers near the action, and to keep spending money. So, in order for restaurants to remain competitive and attract business, or just to take advantage of a State's liberal gambling regulations, many restaurants generate more money from their video poker machines than they do from selling food.

And, as individual dependency on gambling grows, so too do the loss of homes and jobs. Families are faced with bankruptcy and unpaid bills. Divorces increase, families break up, and chronic gamblers contemplate suicide. Theft and crime increase. Crime rates are twice as high in places with gambling. In 1994, towns with casinos saw a 5.8-percent jump in crime while the national average fell 2 percent. And, a 7.7-percent increase was seen at places with casinos in operation for less than a year.

People such as Betty Yakey, a 65-year-old woman from Louisiana, lose $190,000 to the lures of gambling. In doing so, she used up her grandson's college savings. Other people in Betty Yakey's position sell off possessions and file false theft reports to collect insurance to feed their habit. This habit not only destroys the life of the gambler, but also the lives of spouses and children, and in Betty Yakey's case, grandchildren. Gambling is not just an individual problem, but one that a whole family must face together. And, it is an issue that must be recognized and addressed by gambling interests.

However, the irony in all of this is that those responsible for making sure that gambling habits like Betty Yakey's continue to be fed are the same people who are responsible for writing gambling regulations and issuing casino licenses. These are our State legislators, many of whom have been corrupted by the gambling lobby.

State legislators facing sagging economies justify gambling with the argument that, without the revenue generated by gambling, they would be forced to either increase taxes or cut programs. But, they set gambling policy having already received huge amounts of money from gambling interests within the State. In Illinois in 1995, gambling PAC's contributed $1.2 million to State legislators, including almost $100,000 each to the Governor and the House Republican and Democratic leaders. In Louisiana, gambling put more money into campaigns than the next four industries combined. In 1994, gambling interests gave $3.1 million to parties and candidates, making them one of the top five special interest contributors.

Gambling is a drug, an addiction just like alcohol or cocaine. The bottom line is that the gambling industry and State legislatures do nothing to stop the promotion of gambling as family entertainment. They are willing to watch small businesses fail, crime spread, and families fall apart—all to raise revenue, precious revenue. See, gambling is a State tourist attraction, as are theme parks and ski resorts. Mississippi generates two-thirds of its gambling revenue from out of State, mainly from Florida and Tennessee. People flood into Mississippi and spend their money, then they leave and take their problems home with them.

It is estimated that Gamblers Anonymous groups have almost doubled to over 1,000 since 1990. Is this what we want to perpetuate in the United States? State-supported addiction? Is it worth destroying peoples lives, families, the moral backbone of our Nation, just to make some money? I certainly think not.

We must move forward and scrutinize the impact of gambling on all levels. Support Congressman WOLF's legislation. Our Nation can't afford to do without it.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I appreciate the chairman for bringing this bill to the floor, and I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular interest in one section of this that the committee was gracious enough to accept as part of this. I am on the committee and was glad to be able to add this.

It has to do with the effects of advertising concerning gambling. Because my concern with respect to gambling advertising, as with the advertising of other vices, such as alcohol and tobacco, is that what happens is something that is essentially negative and bad, for a person gets glamorized and misleads the public into thinking that there is something very positive and fulfilling and wonderful and glamorous about partaking in this.

What happens with our legislation is that it calls for a review, particularly, and an assessment of the effects of advertising concerning gambling, including whether the advertising has increased participation in gambling activity, the effects of various types of advertising, including the sponsorship of sporting events, the relationship between advertising and the amount of the prize that is going to be awarded, and an examination of State lottery advertising practices, including the process by which States award lottery advertising contracts.

I think it is terribly important, because what it strikes me is happening

is we are undermining and misleading the public with respect to creating the false impression that gambling is a legitimate, bona fide, way to get rich quick. That is really what is behind so much of the advertising.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, and I am very happy about this, there was an attempt in the telecom bill to make casino gambling advertising legal on television. That had been brought in from the other body. When in conference, and I was a conferee on that committee, I was able, with the help of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], and a number of other people, to make sure that that specific section was knocked out.

Mr. Speaker, we need this to find out exactly what the impact is of advertising on gambling.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI].

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, when the 104th Congress began, it was our mandate, it was alleged, to enhance the role of State government, to reduce the role of Federal regulations, to ease the burdens on industry. And now here we are, a year later, creating a new Federal commission to review an industry that has always been the province of the State government, an industry about which the Federal Government has never been involved and has no expertise. And, to compound the problem, this new Commission will all be named by elements of the Federal Government. No involvement by the attorneys general, who have enforced the laws for 200 years, no role by the State Governors, who have had this responsibility, and no role by tribal leaders, who now have the fastest growing element of this industry. We have managed to ask a recommendation uniquely from the one element of government in the entire country with no expertise, no knowledge, and no involvement.

Mr. Speaker, I see the realities that the Commission may carry the day. Let me at least suggest this: The other body has a chance to improve it, get the Governors involved, get the industry involved, get the tribal leaders involved, to make it a better report.

While I may still believe that it is the role of the Federal Government that is not appropriate and I oppose the commission, let us at least for the record make this clear: The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] in his statement earlier made clear, this Commission does not have a mandate for new Federal taxes. It is my belief it does not have a role in new Federal regulations. I have heard no Member come to this floor talking about new Federal taxes on this industry.

Let the record at least be clear on this: this is the most taxed, most regulated, most inspected industry in the United States today. In New Jersey alone we have 1,000 inspectors for 12 casinos. The petroleum industry, the chemical industry, the drug industry, none of them have that level of involvement. If you own any part of any company involved in casino gaming in New Jersey, you, your family, your finances, your holdings, are inspected.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the other body we can make this a commission that really involves the industry and our States in what is a State industry.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight with reference to this legislation.

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1996.

Hon. HENRY HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HYDE: On Tuesday, March 5, the House will consider on the suspension calendar, H.R. 497, to establish a Commission to study the impact of gambling in the United States.

A portion of this legislation directs the Commission to study the impact of campaign contributions on public policy related to gambling.

Under House Rule 10(h) 12 and 15 the Committee on House Oversight has jurisdiction over matters pertaining to ''corrupt practices'' and ''the raising, reporting, and use of campaign contributions for office of Representative. . . .''

The parliamentarian has indicated in consultations with the Committee that the consideration of this bill on suspension does not constitute any precedent for avoidance of this Committee's jurisdiction in future matters that relate to campaign finance as a matter of Federal public policy.

I would appreciate your entering this letter as part of the record during the floor consideration of H.R. 497.

Thank you very much for your cooperation on this matter.

Sincerely,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN].

(Mr. ENSIGN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I have several contentions with this bill. First of all, I have heard testimony over the last year about that this bill is just a study, and what is wrong with a study? One of the reasons for this study is just to give States the information so that they can make the decision about whether they should have gambling legalized or not, because there is the assertion made that the States do not have the proper information to make that decision at this point.

The sponsor of this bill, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], his own State defeated a State measure that would have legalized gaming in Virginia, even though they were outspent, I think it was something like 16 to 1, by the casino industry to try to legalize it in that State.

State after State after State is defeating legalized casino gaming. It seems that they do have the information to make the decision that is proper for their own State. And that is my biggest contention with this bill. Where in the Constitution can anyone point out to me that this body has oversight over legalized casinos that are regulated by a State? Nowhere in the Constitution.

Now, if one wants to regulate Indian gaming or regulate Internet gaming, that is interstate commerce, we certainly have the constitutional jurisdiction to do that. But we do not have the jurisdiction in this body over regular casinos.

Second, this legislation should require that the study commission make recommendations regarding purely State gaming policy issues, and that those recommendations be directed to the States, not to this body. Because our biggest fear is that people will take this information into this body and make either taxes, which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], referred to, or more regulations. We feel that this is a thinly veiled disguise for future regulation of the gaming industry. This is purely a State issue that should stay at the State and local level.

Last, let me conclude by saying that to improve this bill we should at least have local and State input. People on the gaming commission should at least be local mayors, legislators, and State Governors.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, even though the gentleman is bitterly hostile to what we are trying to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. ROGERS]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of this venture into the inquiry on gambling is going to be about $4 million. It occurred to me that this Congress, and I approve of its measures to a large extent, is seeking ways to cut spending, so the $4 million you might say means nothing. We can gamble that away in 2 minutes.

But this same Congress, which is now about to vote $4 million for this gambling commission, has eliminated the Administrative Conference of the United States, a little, small bureau that was very useful, which only cost $1.5 million. We zeroed it out to save $1.5 million. And now, in a double or nothing mode, we are doubling the expenditure for the purpose of this commission. That is a little odd, and it gives me a great discomfort about the priorities that my own leadership is trying to set in cutting the budget. That is No. 1.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to make one other observation. When the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] was at the well, he very properly

enumerated a lot of different statistics about what others had learned and other studies have created about the evils of gambling. That is the point.

We all know what the evils of gambling are. We can call the Library of Congress and in 6 minutes get every single report and analysis ever made on gambling and have it on this floor for final consideration of what evil gambling poses to the American public, and we need no commission at all. We have the information at hand. We know it is bad when gambling becomes a vice, not just a play thing.

So I am eager, if at all, to defeat this resolution and go about the business of cutting the budget.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this has been the month of self-repudiation by the Republican majority. Last week, the Party of Free Enterprise brought forward a bill which said that while the free enterprise system can handle telecommunications and computers and automobiles, it is not quite up to peanuts or sugar. So peanuts and sugar remain exempt from the free enterprise system in this Republican bill.

Now the party that talks about States' rights is planning to spend millions of Federal dollars on a study that will, among other things, look into the enormous national question of, and I quote from page 6, ''an examination of State lottery advertising practices, including the process by which States award lottery advertising contracts.''

Apparently the States, now we are going to test them. We are going to let them experiment with easier issues like Medicaid, welfare, a few things like that. Once they have shown that they can handle Medicaid and welfare, then maybe we will let them handle the tough issue of lottery advertising contracts.

Now, how do people who purport to be advocates of States' rights tell us we are going to spend millions of Federal dollars to investigate the way the States issue lottery contracts, and tell the States how to do it better? Because on page 5 it says this commission shall look into gambling and make such changes, it says, existing Federal, State, and local policy and practices with respect to legalization and propose such changes in those policies and practices as the commission shall deem appropriate.

Here come big brother and sister, not out of the goodness of the heart, by the way, under this fiscally responsible Congress. These people will be paid at an annual rate of $115,000 a year for 2 years, depending on how many meetings they have. They can self-pay. They can generate meetings for themselves until they myth the $115,000. And they will be investigating the States and proposing recommendations and changes in what the States do.

This confirms my view that there is not on the other side any consistent belief in States' rights. The people on the other side believe that the issue should be decided at that level of government where they will like the outcome.

□ 1230

There are many over there who do not think that people should gamble. The States have, from their standpoint, been lax. So forget about the States rights stuff. We will stick Thomas Jefferson back on the shelf. We will spend millions of dollars to make these recommendations of what the States are doing. I presume we will probably be then asked to act on these things.

By the way, whatever happened to the notion of government not interfering with individuals? How dare these adults earn money and go out and gamble. How dare they offend the morality of some of our friends on the other side who do not think it is right.

I read the Washington Post series. Do my colleagues know what it sounded like yesterday? Prohibition of alcohol. Sure, we can find in any human endeavor people who abuse it. There are people who smoke too much and drink too much and gamble too much and they buy more expensive cars than they ought to buy, and there are people who watch too much C–SPAN and become adversely affected.

But in a free society, in a free society, particularly people who purport to distrust government do not answer that by saying, The government will tell you what to do with your money; you are not doing it wisely. That is obviously the premise behind this.

Then, of course, we have the Indians, who have been running casinos quite successfully. And they listen to these kinds of assaults on them and, as I have said before, I believe that this kind of legislation further convinces native Americans that the only mistake in Pat Buchanan's immigration policies is that they come 300 years too late, because the native Americans have been running the gambling quite successfully and they have been benefiting from it. And here comes big brother and sister, millions of dollars, forget about the States, forget about the Indians, forget about individuals rights. We know better and we will tell you what to do. It is wholly inconsistent.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

(Mr. HYDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to quote Shakespeare, and probably inartfully, but me thinks ''thou doth protest too much'' seems to hang over this Chamber today.

I have never heard so many Members defending States rights. This is virgin territory for them, and I welcome them to the ranks of States rights defenders, but I almost began to imagine the Stars and Bars were being waved over there with some vigor because, God forbid, the Federal Government cross into a State to examine its gaming industry.

First of all, there is no proposal to regulate here. There is no proposal to tax. The only proposal is to recommend changes. We do that every day in the thousands. We are great change recommenders. But that would be based on a study made of an industry that is indeed an interstate industry. It is a national phenomenon, and it deals with big, big money. It has an impact on commerce.

Money that is spent in a casino is not money that is spent in a local store or retail outlet, and that is fine. Let people spend the money the way they want. Let them gamble up a storm. I once heard about a slot machine that took wristwatches when you ran out of money. That is all right. Let it happen. But let us know about it. Let us study it. Let us find out what the impact is on our society, on our commerce, and on the people engaged in this activity.

It is a legitimate activity. I would never want to declare it illegal. But what is wrong with learning something about it? I do not think there is anything wrong with it.

All this bill does is set up a commission. We assume and hope and expect that it will be fairly constituted by people of intelligence and integrity, and at the end of the 2 years we will know something about a major industry dealing with important money in this country. I do not see anything wrong with that.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member is pleased to support H.R. 497, legislation to establish a National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission to study gambling in the United States and recommend any appropriate changes in public policy in light of the Commission's findings. The results will provide an objective body of data about the gambling industry which does not currently exist.

This issue is certainly worthy of examination and H.R. 497 is a reasonable step on which to proceed. Over the past 10 years various types of gambling have spread to most every State. The expanded availability of gambling has greatly increased the number of people participating in and the amount of money spent on gambling on a regular basis. Such a large increase over such a short period of time certainly warrants a study of the issue.

It should be noted that this legislation in no way targets one type of gambling over another. Nor, for example, is it intended to concentrate on Indian gaming more than charitable gambling or keno more than video poker.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges support for H.R. 497.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H.R. 497, The National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission Act, I would like

to encourage all of my colleagues, both Democrat and Republican to support the establishment of such a commission.

With the recent explosion in the number of casinos across the country, concerns have been raised about the effects of expanded gambling Advocates of legalizing gambling promise economic growth, jobs, and windfall of tax revenues. However, we must also consider the negative impacts which include regulatory costs, lost productivity and more importantly, the social costs.

This legislation would create a blue ribbon panel charged with the duty of conducting a comprehensive and objective study of gambling in the United States. Negative impacts of gambling on State and local economies, small businesses and families can no longer be ignored. Crime and social problems related to gambling could add to already overburdened criminal justice and social welfare systems. This issue is of particular concern to myself and my district because of largely unrestricted Indian gaming and its impact on the community. But this is more than a local issue. It is an issue of National social and economic importance.

Mr. Speaker, the States, local governments and citizens need unbiased and factual information about gambling. Gambling must be carefully studied to provide citizens with all the information they need when deciding whether to allow legalized gambling in their communities. I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 497.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 497, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 497, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT OF INTERAGENCY ARCTIC RESEARCH POLICY COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 Science:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 108(b) of Public Law 98–373 (15 U.S.C. 4701(b)), I transmit herewith the Sixth Biennial Report of the Interagency Arctic Research Policy Committee (February 1, 1994 to January 31, 1996).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1996.*

REPORT ON DEFERRAL AND PROPOSED RESCISSIONS OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–182)

The SPEAKER pro tempore 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 Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I herewith report one revised deferral, totaling $91 million, and two proposed rescissions of budgetary resources, totaling $15 million.

The deferral affects the Department of State U.S. emergency refugee and migration assistance fund. The rescission proposals affect the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Administration.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1996.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 1 p.m.

□ 1301

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore. [Mr. ROGERS] at 1 p.m.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1996

(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, last year the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights subpoenaed members of the Florida proposition 187 committee, a grassroots organization interested in curbing illegal immigration. The Commission went so for as to subpoena all of the group's internal documents, including reports, memos, and computer-generated printouts. In the words of one housewife who was paid a visit by a U.S. marshal, she felt intimidated and harassed by the Commission and felt like she was living in the land of the Gestapo.

By statute, the Commission is granted subpoena power to conduct fact-finding hearings on discrimination and racial tensions. But whose civil rights are they protecting? It certainly does not appear to be the rights of those Floridians who were exercising their constitutional rights of free speech and free association.

Regardless of any individual's personal beliefs or political associations, no one should be subjected to this type of intimidation by Federal agencies. It is for this reason that I am introducing the Civil Rights Commission Amendments Act of 1996 to prevent further fishing expeditions at the expense of law-abiding citizens. The bill would allow the Commission to subpoena only government officials, or in cases where a person's right to vote has been violated.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROMOTING GREATER EDUCATIONAL CHOICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to focus on a very serious debate that has been going on back here in Washington over the last several weeks. In fact, it is a debate that reminds me, the longer I serve in Congress, the more convinced I become that Washington just does not get it.

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the fact that the District of Columbia appropriations spending bill is now held up in the other body under the threat of a filibuster, and for one simple reason. That is because Senate Democrats are opposed to the notion of giving low-income students, those students who come from low-income families here in the District of Columbia, educational choice.

The House version of the District of Columbia appropriations bill contains language that appropriates funds for a

demonstration program, the idea being to grant scholarships or educational vouchers to these particular students.

Bear in mind a couple of facts: One, the District of Columbia schools have the worst performance record of any inner-city school district in the country in terms of test scores and graduation rate. Only 56 percent of the students in the District of Columbia public schools graduate from those particular schools. Yet, our political opponents here in the Congress remain vehemently opposed to the notion of even trying or experimenting with school choice right here in our backyard in the District of Columbia public schools through the partnership that we are trying to create between the Congress and the District of Columbia public schools.

Despite their adamant opposition, we have a message, those of us who believe in real educational reform, we have a message for those in the other body and here in the House who have been fighting our plans to try to reform and improve the District of Columbia public schools, and for that matter, public education across the lands.

That is that voucher programs, the idea of promoting educational competition through a greater choice and the idea of giving parents the full range of choice across all competing institutions, that is an idea whose time has come. Voucher programs are moving ahead around the country, certainly in Wisconsin, where Milwaukee public schools have now expanded their particular educational choice or voucher program to include 15,000 inner-city students, and in my home State of California, which will have a statewide initiative on the November ballot providing for educational choice through a voucher system.

This is a terribly important debate going on back here in Washington. Let me tell the Members what is at stake here is nothing less than the success of the U.S. economy. According to a James Glassman article in last Tuesdays Washington Post, languishing wages, which is obviously an issue that keeps cropping up in the Republican Presidential primary, languishing wages, this idea of income stagnation in America, can be linked directly to a poor education and training system.

That deficiency begins in our primary and secondary schools, especially in our high schools, where high school test scores and a high school diploma have been watered down to the point of almost becoming meaningless in terms of predicting a student's ability to go on to a higher education institution, or to obtain a good-paying job in the workplace.

Therefore, we are trying to promote greater educational choice. We realize private schools cannot replace public schools, but we believe that the model for U.S. secondary education should be the U.S. higher education system, which is the best in the world. One of the reasons it is the best in the world is because we have robust competition between private and public universities, and that has raised the quality of both. How ironic that we have educational choice in preschool and in higher education. The only place we do not have it is in our primary and secondary schools.

Why is that? Really, U.S. News & World Report last week, I think, points up the reason why we do not have greater educational choice in this country. That is the militant opposition of the teachers unions, which have become the campaign arm of the national Democratic Party, and which are still operating based on an old-fashioned 1940's and 1950's industrial union model.

The largest union is the National Education Association, the NEA. The other union is the American Federation of Teachers. Both of these unions, according to U.S. News & World Report, are ''driving out good teachers, coddling bad ones, and putting bureaucracy in the way of quality education.'' Both of these unions are fiercely opposed to the idea of educational choice and promoting greater competition in education.

They also, of course, donate millions of dollars to the Democratic Party and their candidates. In fact, a second article in the Washington Post last week pointed out that the NEA, the National Education Association, is the largest union in the country, with 2.2 million members. They are the richest, with a nearly $800 million budget. They are also intertwined in Democratic politics, really the campaign arm of the National Democratic Party.

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker. I want to talk more about this in later special orders. I just want to conclude by quoting Stephen Jobs, the founder of Apple Computers, who said he has probably spearheaded giving away more computer equipment to the schools than anybody on the planet, but he has come to the inevitable conclusion that the problem is not one technology can solve, it is a political problem. The problems are unions. You plot the growth of the NEA and the dropping of test scores, and they are inversely proportional. He concludes: ''I am one of those people who believe the best thing we could ever do is go to the full voucher system.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DEUTSCH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION FOR CONGRESSIONAL SUPPORT FOR EVERGLADES PRESERVATION LEGISLATION, AND ADDRESSING TOPICS WHICH CREATE HAVOC IN THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the Congress for their excellent efforts on behalf of the Everglades in Florida, with their resounding 299 vote of support for the $210 million appropriation for our National Park, the Everglades.

Particularly I would like to thank the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia, NEWT GINGRICH, for appearing in the well and debating this issue with me for the preservation of our endangered Everglades. I think Congress sent a message across America that this is a bipartisan effort to preserve and protect our environment, and I again applaud the Speaker and the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. ARMEY], and others who valiantly supported our efforts, as well as the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. DEUTSCH], and members of the Florida delegation, for their strong, steadfast belief that in order to preserve the quality of life of Florida, we must protect our natural resources, including our water supply.

I would also like to take a moment to commend the Caring Foundation in West Palm Beach, FL, headed by Larry and Betty Brown, who are dear friends of mine. They put on a performance

called We the Living, which was produced by the School of the Arts and the South Area High School. It is a play reflecting the problems faced by our youth today regarding drugs and violence.

The young people put on this performance to display the concerns that are expressed in the school environment: the peer pressure, the degradation of life, and all the tragedies that result in the abuse of narcotics. It is important today, as we have many closeup students in the gallery, to understand how destructive drugs are and how destructive violence is in our school system.

''We the Living,'' the play, exemplified why students are fighting, fighting for survival in the classroom, fighting for survival in the streets of our communities, all recognizing that the one fundamental problem that is so difficult for them to overcome is the influence of drugs in our society and the influence peer pressure has in the first attempt to use drugs.

Again, I applaud the Caring Foundation, and I urge all of our schools and all of our youth to do what they can to not make it cool to be involved in narcotics or illegal activities, but in fact, that it would be cool to say no. As in the DARE Program and the Just Say No Program, stand up and be counted against the destruction of human life, the destruction and aggravation of human suffering which drugs provide.

I would also like to speak about child abuse today, because that is another topic that is creating tremendous havoc in our Nation. Our children are abused daily. We are reading about more shocking details of abuse and abandonment, both sexually and otherwise, and it just has to stop. As a nation, we have to lead the charge against child abuse, most strictly penalize those that would bring about child abuse, especially sexual abuse, and fight for the rights of our children, because once they are abused, it is a very difficult and tragic way to come back into society. Palm Beach County is starting a Home Safe project, which will give children a chance to be in an environment safe from the dangerous opportunities they experienced in their homes.

I would also like to take a moment and look at the headlines ''Hamas Bomb Kills 13 at Mall in Tel Aviv; Bomb Ravages Israel.'' The war in Israel is a tragedy. The New York Times did a wonderful editorial today, basically outlining the problems: The suicide bombings, the difficulties that are being experienced by the people of Israel. We in America, and I know my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JON FOX, joins in a strong condemnation of these attacks, a strong condemnation against violence, not only in Israel, but in London and in other places around the globe.

□ 1315

But the one thing they stress in the editorial, the war in Israel, the war between a small group of fanatics who want to destroy the chances for peace and the millions of Israelis and Palestinians who want to live side-by-side in peace, prosperity, and security, the fanatics must not be allowed to prevail.

Both sides, the Israelis and the Palestinians, want peace. There are a few radical groups that are trying to dislodge that peace. We must remain calm and committed to peace in Israel. We must remain calm and keep the PLO and others at the table to ensure the survival of the Middle East. We cannot condone or tolerate terrorism, and we certainly cannot condone it in Israel or, as I mentioned, in London. It simply must stop.

The hatred, the violence, the antisemitics in this country must stop. The campaigns that are being waged for the Presidency, the dialog needs to change and we need to focus on the future of America, not dividing people by color, race or ethnicity, not dividing people by differences of opinion, but thinking of what unites this country together in a spirit of independence and democracy.

This is the greatest Nation in the world. We have so much to be proud of, and at the same time we seem to be destroying everything we have worked for for 200-plus years by divisive, nasty, mean-spirited debate. It needs to stop, and it needs to stop by arguments by both sides of the aisle that for democracy to prevail, men need to think with their heads clearly, committed to compassion and to people's rights.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The gentleman is reminded that Members are not to make reference to visitors in the gallery of the House.

THE 104TH CONGRESS PROMISES BRIGHT ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman FOLEY in his astute remarks regarding our need for prayer for the families of those who were killed and those who were injured senselessly in Israel in recent days and weeks at the hands of the Hamas. We certainly cannot tolerate this kind of violence in this country or any other country, including Israel, one of our greatest allies in this world.

I do hope, as Congressman FOLEY pointed out, our work will continue with this country and with Israel to make sure the peace process moves forward, and the senseless acts of a few fanatics will not deter us from our mission to restore peace to the Middle East. And whatever we can do as a country, working together with the White House and our President, there is a resolve within this House and within this Congress that we do everything and anything we can to make sure that peace is brought to that region of the world and that we support Prime Minister Peres in his efforts to continue the peace process.

I have today the opportunity also to introduce legislation which goes to much of what the 104th Congress on a bipartisan fashion has been working on, and that is to create jobs, have a pro-growth Congress which will sustain not only the economic future of America but make sure there are better chances for more jobs. That is why I have introduced today legislation dealing with creating and providing tax credits for investment and research and experimentation. These are pro-business, pro-people measures which I think will help create the jobs and the investment that is important.

Specifically H.R. 2984 will extend the research tax credit through December 1997, expand the definition of start-up firms, allow taxpayers to elect an alternative incremental credit process, and treat 80 percent of research as qualified instead of the 65 percent limit we now have. In addition, the 10 percent investment tax credit will be reinstated and have the effect of reducing the tax burden on new investment, speeding up the growth of the economy, improving competitiveness of the U.S. business firms, and laying the foundation for a future rise in the United States' standard of living.

I would ask that the Congressman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], and the Congressman from California [Mr. RIGGS], join me in this special order with regard to the kinds of things that we have been trying to do in this Congress, in this historic 104th House, to get our fiscal house in order.

I am speaking of balancing the budget, having a line-item veto passed, my legislation to sunset review Federal agencies that have outlived their usefulness or should be privatized, downsized or consolidated, the kinds of things we have done to help businesses by having deductibility for health insurance, regulatory review so it is easier for businesses to operate. And also our legislation has already brought $190 billion in spending reductions and $190 billion in deficit reduction.

So I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], to tell us with regard to the interaction you have had with your constituents in Florida, have they discussed with you the benefits they see of having a balanced budget, one that would be bipartisan and one that would embrace collectively what the White House and the Congress wants with regard to our children's future and the country's future and a balanced budget.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] yielding. One of the things

that I hear from my constituents when I return home is the fact that the balanced budget is first and foremost in their minds. They are not necessarily interested in what party gets credit, but they want this Government to learn to live by the same standards our society imposes on the average citizen. Balancing your checkbook, that is normal. I mean if you do not, as you know, Mr. FOX, if somebody issues a worthless check, it is rejected by the bank.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Right.

Mr. FOLEY. If you overcharge on your credit card, they will cancel your card. If you do not pay your home mortgage, they will foreclose your home. But the Federal Government somehow spends $200 plus billion a year that they do not have and they call that compassionate and good Government.

Well, they are telling me, ''MARK, seek out a solution. The rhetoric needs to stop. We don't want to hear anymore about during the Reagan years and the Bush years, those Presidents ran up the budget because you know the that Congress is the one with the checkbook, not the Presidents.''

So it is our incumbent responsibility as legislators to focus on where the spending is occurring and how we alleviate the spending, and I think we have done a yeoman's job of attempting to portray that. You know, the other outside influences try to paint us as noncaring, wanting to destroy the fiber and safety net of this Nation. But to the contrary, when you read some great editorials, I think Mr. RIGGS referred to one earlier, Mr. Glassman has been great in portraying the fact that Republicans are not cutting near what is being accused, 7 percent growth rate in Medicare, 7.5. All of the programs grow in excess of CPI.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, to expand on that, people might be listening and saying, some of my colleagues, what is the advantage of a balanced budget?

Well, the advantage, according to Alan Greenspan with the Federal Reserve, is by having reduced interest costs it will be easier to afford a mortgage, easier to pay for a college loan, easier to pay for a car expense. Those kinds of things are in real dollars going to be decreased in cost if we can in fact pass a balanced budget, and also create about 300,000 new jobs a year. So the overall boost to our economy will be terrific.

Mr. FOLEY. People do not realize the nexus. The Government is out bidding for dollars like a private consumer. So while the Government drives up interest costs with its ever-excessive appetite for credit, it is driving up comparable mortgage costs.

A plain example by Mr. Greenspan is the fact that with current rates at about 7¼ to 7⅝ on a 30-year fixed home mortgage, we could see those rates decline to 6 percent, maybe below. A 2-percent difference in a $100,000 mortgage is $200 in savings in the consumer's pockets from interest savings alone, $2,000 per annum, which is about $180 per month in the homeowners' pockets to spend on their families, vacations, children's savings account, and what have you. So clearly, clearly the balanced budget will provide an economic windfall, not only for the taxpayers of having to pay fewer dollars into the public treasury, but more yield back home in their individual accounts.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think it is also important to note that frankly this can be done easily if we put our heads and minds and hearts into working together. We have seen since the beginning of this balanced budget debate that the majority side of the aisle has added $440 billion more funding for Medicare, for Medicaid, for the environment, for education, and for the earned income tax credit.

So those kinds of cooperative ventures by the Republican side certainly have gone without notice in some quarters, but are certainly not lost on those of us who are still speaking today in the well of the House, because we believe that there can be, in fact in the not too distant future, an actual agreement on the balanced budget. The President has actually said, under different year points he has talked about, we can have a balanced budget in any number of years. I think if we can just get to the table and talk about removing gridlock, getting away from finger pointing and not worrying about who gets the credit, it is amazing how much we can get done.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FOLEY. That is the sad part of the political debate, people need credit for everything. We were sent here from around the country, 435 individuals, 100 Members in the Senate, and the President, Vice President, elected by the people of America to lead, not to take unnecessary advantage but to solve the people's problems.

So again, I think we have got to put beyond our debate who eventually gets credit for the legislation. It is more important that the American public sense a victory here, that the consumer senses a victory.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I agree.

Mr. FOLEY. That the public at large senses that Congress is acting responsibly, that they are no longer going to send or return Members of Congress to this great body just simply because they said, ''Look at all that I have done for you, and look at all the bacon and pork that I have brought home to our district. Isn't that reason enough to reelect me?''

It is about saying, ''What have you done to reduce the burden on the American consumer, reduce the burden on business? What have you done to make it easier for us to educate our children?'' I think these are the questions in the debate that is going to rage in November, not about whose party is right or whose party is wrong. It is about what did you personally do as an individual that we sent here to represent our great district, to make a difference in America.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] would join us in this discussion regarding the balanced budget and its benefit to the country. From California, as a favorite son, he might want to give us a little bit of his insights into what his district believes and what he thinks is appropriate as we move forward in this debate.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding, and taking the leadership initiative in organizing this special order.

What I would really like to do is compare the Clinton crunch with the balanced budget bonus; that is to say, the benefits to the average American family that will result from putting our fiscal house in order back here, eliminating deficit spending and balancing the Federal budget, versus the present economic predicament that we as a nation find ourselves in.

As both gentlemen will very well remember, the President back on January 23 visited our Chamber and stood at this podium right behind me to deliver his annual State of the Union Message, and in that speech just less than 2 months ago he told us that our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades and he proclaimed the era of big government over.

We have all learned to expect, particularly from this President, some fairly outrageous statements. In fact, I think it was Jay Leno that pointed that out the other night. I guess we can sort of plagiarize from Jay Leno, because once he says it on The Tonight Show, it is out there in the public realm.

Jay Leno said the other night, ''Republicans have the choice of eight presidential candidates.'' But then he went on to say, ''But you know, the Democrats have much more than eight when you think about it. They have got the old Clinton, the new Clinton, the big-government-is-over Clinton, the highest-tax-increase-in-history Clinton, and so on.''

Well, I think when we scrutinize the President's comments, we realize that, No. 1, the economy is not by any stretch of the imagination the healthiest it has been in three decades. And second, we realize that if the President really ended or would join us in ending the era of big government, and if he really helped us in turning over Washington power to individuals and communities, the American people would not now be experiencing the Clinton crunch: higher taxes and stagnant wages.

The reality behind the President's rhetoric is that in each and every year of his presidency, the typical American family has had less income than when

President Clinton took office. Last year alone, the typical family earned $790 less than in 1992, according to the Census Bureau. But while family incomes have fallen, the family tax burden has risen in America and, that is a result obviously of policies adopted by this body prior to the Republican Party becoming the majority in Congress, and policies that were signed into law by the President during the first 2 years of his administration.

So we have had this Clinton crunch, this double whammy of stagnant wages and rising taxation, including payroll taxes rising on the backs of American workers. We all remember that back in 1993 the President and the liberal House Democrats or liberal congressional Democrats enacted the largest tax increase in history, and the result is that the typical family now spends 24.5 percent of its income in Federal taxes, a greater share of its income than at any other time in America's peacetime history. And we will remember, of course, that that Clinton democratic tax increase passed the Congress without a single Republican vote.

□ 1330

When you add up Federal, State, and local taxes, families today are paying more than 38 percent of their income in taxes, according to the Tax Foundation, and in many families that ultimately means one spouse has to work, not to support the family but simply to support the government and the burden of taxation.

So I want to talk a little bit about here over the next few minutes again those two factors, falling incomes and rising taxes, and how that has created the Clinton crunch versus the bonus that every single American family would receive from balancing the Federal budget.

I appreciate, again, the gentleman organizing this special order.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I think that you have been one of the leaders, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], in moving ahead in a fiscally responsible balanced budget debate and one that embraces, I think, what most Americans want, and that is more money in their pocket and less money in the Government's pocket, and that makes a big difference.

In addition to having a balanced budget and removing, you know, fraud, waste, and abuse from the Government, we are talking about tax reform, and that it is what the President campaigned on. He said he wanted to give us three things in 1992; he wanted to have a middle-class tax reform, balanced budget, and he wanted to end welfare as we know it. We have sent him three bills, and he has vetoed three of them. Hope springs eternal. I still believe in the long run he is going to sign bills we in a bipartisan fashion can agree on.

Mr. RIGGS. There is a certain irony in a new Republican congressional majority trying to help a Democratic President make good on his fundamental campaign promises. That is exactly the case.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It shows the cooperation we are giving.

Mr. RIGGS. That is right. Yet, as the gentleman points out, the President campaigned on promises of balancing the Federal budget, ending welfare as we know it, as you pointed out, cutting middle-class taxes. The middle-class tax cut was the centerpiece of his economic plan, which he called Putting People First. He certainly did not make good on any of those promises during the first 2 years of his administration, when he had a Democratic majority in the Congress to work with.

He has turned around, of course, in this session of Congress, vetoed legislation that would accomplish all three of those fundamental promises to the American people that we, the Republican majority here in the Congress, enacted with very little support from the other side of the aisle. There is a certain irony, again, in a Republican majority of Congress trying to help a Democratic President make good on his fundamental campaign promises.

Mr. FOLEY. I am anxious if somebody can tell me what is right with our welfare system today. For a President to veto what I believe is a bipartisan effort to reform a tragic situation that perhaps people in a welfare system, with no means of exit, how anybody can defend the current status quo and not be seriously concerned about not only the future of this Nation but those we pretend to care for is beyond me. I go home to the district. I would be interested if the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] have any other indications. When I go home to the district, my constituents resoundingly say, ''MARK, help people with the Association for Retarded Citizens, help those mentally or physically challenged who have not been given the full tools to do what they need to do to function in society. But, by God, get healthy, capable, able-bodied people out of the welfare rolls and out in the workplace.'' What is good about the proposed legislation, not adopted by the President, but certainly, hopefully, in the near future will be, under that legislation you spoke of, there are some or many good points with it, the able-bodied people to be in a job within 5 years, with the Federal Government assisting with job training, job counseling, job placement, day care, if necessary. That is certainly, in a sense, moving ahead, still leaving a safety net for those who are unable to work, or have to take care of a child, and increased enforcement by Governors to collect child support.

I always love the example about the State of Maine, where they threatened to take away the drivers licenses of those deadbeat dads who have not paid child support, but all but 50 out of 21,000 paid within a record period of time. This is legislation that is going to make sure child support is paid, to make sure food, nutrition programs, frankly, we feed more children, we also do so with quality standards that the Federal Government is going to enumerate, so I think that, you know, the welfare reform we discussed and proposed and passed in the House in a bipartisan fashion certainly will, hopefully, come to life again in this second session of the 104th Congress.

Perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] could shed some light on why he feels this bill, the revitalized bill, would be beneficial, what your take is from California.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. He just described a version of welfare reform that received the unanimous bipartisan endorsement of 45 of the 50 Governors, or Nation's Governors, meeting back here in Washington in February.

You know, I think the President has revealed his true colors on the question of welfare reform. Not only has he twice vetoed the welfare reform legislation sent to him by the House and the Senate, but he is now saying, after initially encouraging this bipartisan group of Governors to help us craft a bipartisan compromise, he is now pulling the rug out from underneath them. He has indicated through his Cabinet Secretary, Secretary of Health and Human Services Shalala, last week the administration's disapproval of the unanimous Governors' agreement. I just want to again stress how rare unanimity is in American politics today. We had 45 of the 50 Nation's Governors meeting back here in February. Again, they unanimously supported and endorsed these welfare reforms which the President is indicating that he opposes and will veto.

So it is very clear to me that this President, who as a candidate promised to end welfare as we know, is not sincere in that promise. He would, furthermore, have a real political problem with the far left wing of his party if he were to meet us somewhere in the middle in trying to craft bipartisan welfare reform legislation.

So it is very disappointing again to see the President fail to make good on one of his fundamental campaign promises from 1992.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I wanted to reclaim the time because one of the other items I thought was very sensitive in the legislation dealing with welfare reform, that is, making sure teenage moms who need health care, formulas for their children, clothing, under the present program they would get cash assistance. Unfortunately, some of those teenage mothers frankly do not have the wherewithal to understand we cannot use those funds for drugs or alcohol and have been doing so. Under our legislation they would get vouchers instead, not for drugs or alcohol but vouchers for formula, health care, clothing for the child and the baby or child, and frankly this is a

much more humane way of making sure we take care of those truly in need and not waste the money for what it was not intended.

So, while some may cast that this Congress is being tough, we are not being fair in making sure the benefits that those who are in the safety net must be saved, and we are going to save them. We do not want people milking the system and taking the money, using it for purposes other than what was intended.

Mr. RIGGS. Very clearly we have to reform the welfare system that fails too many of our fellow citizens and too often subsidizes illegitimacy, really, with our current welfare system, and this political constituency of dependency that has been created back here in Washington over the last three to four decades created a welfare state, if you will, where too many families now find themselves also dependent on welfare over several generations, and again that has led to soaring rates of illegitimacy and family disintegration in America.

I think the American people know the welfare system is broke. They certainly have every right to expect of us that we will acknowledge the problem and attempt to fix it in a bipartisan manner. Again, that is exactly what we have done. That is the legislation the President vetoed. That is the legislation that is heartily recommended and endorsed by 45 of the Governors meeting back here in February.

Mr. FOLEY. It is not just the public that is upset. I met with a young girl, 22 years old, in Belle Glade, FL, in a course sponsored by the Private Industry Council to learn to be a nurse. She came up to me at a graduation reception, where she had gotten her degree for nursing all on her own. She said, ''Mr. Foley, I am 22. I have five children. I am not married. The welfare system has encouraged me to stay in the welfare system and have babies.'' This is not a made-up story. This is an absolute occurrence that happened in my district.

She said, ''For the first time, the Private Industry Council is giving me some hope for my future and for my children. But I am telling you it is a tragedy what we do as a Nation to encourage people to have additional babies out of wedlock, that they will get additional food stamps, AFDC and housing allowances if they simply add another child to the roster.'' She said, ''This has got to stop.'' She said, ''I am a sad example of what is wrong with the system. I am 22 years old, with five kids.'' I was amazed. She said, ''You have got to do everything you can to not hurt children, to make sure I or others like me are not encouraged to proliferate additional children to the society, knowing more money is coming your way.''

Mr. RIGGS. I think our fellow citizens know the American welfare system today too often discourages the very things that we want to promote as societal ideals. It is a system that is riddled with perverse incentives that discourage working, marriage, savings, investment, and that is why it is so important that we reform the welfare system.

If the gentleman would just yield further, because unfortunately I am going to have to leave and I want to kind of complete this idea of the Clinton crunch versus the balanced budget bonus.

I want to stress, because I think the gentleman from Florida alluded earlier, there is really nothing to be gained, going back and revisiting the 1980's. I think if we look at economic policy, fiscal policy in the 1980's, there is plenty of blame to go around. We have no intention here, as the new Republican majority in Congress, of repeating those same mistakes, and that again the perverse notion that we could cut taxes and increase spending, which gave us these enormous deficits that have ultimately left us with a staggering national debt which our kids and grandkids are going to inherit.

Instead, when we passed the balanced budget, the balanced budget, the first balanced budgets in 26 years, the balanced budget the President vetoed, we had tax cuts for working families. We believe that it is possible to cut Federal spending and cut taxes, and that the combination of the two will give the American people a tremendous economic dividend, what we call the balanced budget bonus.

So let me just tell you what every American family would have realized had the President signed our balanced budget bill into law, the same bill that he instead vetoed. Again, remember that we want incomes to go up while taxes go down so that every American family can earn more and keep more of what they earn. So here is the balanced budget bonus, because I do not think that you will get much disagreement here in Washington or across the land. Most economists, and I recognize that economists can often be wrong, but I believe this is one case where, as Mary Chapin Carpenter said, the stars might lie, but the numbers never do, the economists widely agreed the balanced budget would have led to a drop in interest rates by as much as 2 percentage points. That would save the typical American family between $1,600 and $1,800 annually on an average home mortgage. It would save the typical American family $174 on an average car loan, $216 on the average student loan, and if you add to that the $500 per child tax credit, a typical family of four, that is, two adult parents and two children, that typical family of four would have received a balanced budget bonus of $2,990, so let us call it $3,000.

If I ask you, my colleagues, when was the last time that an American family got a $3,000 average bonus, 29 million American families would have benefited from our $500 per child tax credit, and nearly 4 million American families would have had their entire Federal tax burden eliminated? And that is real relief from the Clinton crunch.

But the President stood in the way of this balanced budget bonus for families. He vetoed the balanced budget and tax cuts for families and economic growth. Far from feeling our pain, as again he promised back in 1992, the President has become the cause of it.

So I wanted to just remind my colleagues that while President Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut when he ran for President, again he made that the centerpiece of his economic plan, Putting People First, he raised taxes instead.

So, again, as I said earlier, there is a certain juxtaposition or irony in the fact that President Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut and Republicans want to deliver one.

What we got from President Clinton and congressional Democrats, we all know now, was the largest tax increase in history. As I mentioned earlier, it passed without a single Republican vote.

Later President Clinton himself admitted that tax increase was a big mistake. He actually told an audience of major Democratic Party donors in Houston that he realized in hindsight that he had made a mistake by raising taxes so high, but then he went on to infer that somehow the Republican minority in Congress had forced him to raise taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth, because again not a single Republican voted for that Clinton Democratic tax increase back in 1993.

□ 1345

His tax increase not only raises taxes on the rich, but on the middle class, the poor, senior citizens, and American small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy. These are the very businesses which create most new jobs in America. These are the small and very small companies that give us most of our new job creation, most of our economic growth in the private sector. These are companies typically with 10 or fewer employees accounting for 70 percent of all American businesses.

The President and congressional Democrats like to claim they only raised taxes on the rich. But according to the Internal Revenue Service, nearly 87 percent of tax returns showing $200,000 or more in annual income were filed by small businesses and family businesses. These are business owners. Many times these are family businesses, but these are business owners who are organized as a partnership or sole proprietorship or sole corporation. So when the President talks about raising taxes on the rich, he is not talking about General Motors. These business taxes most impact that hardware store owner on Main Street.

Second, the President's tax and spend policies have turned a healthy economy into an economy that is on the

verge of recession. More jobs were created in the last 6 months of the Bush administration than in the last 6 months of the Clinton administration. The economy was growing 3 times faster in President Bush's last year in office than it did under President Clinton last year. In fact, for the last quarter of 1995, the most recent economic statistics, the economy grew barely at all, a growth rate of 0.9 percent annually, according to the Commerce Department.

So I go back to my original premise. The failing Clinton economy, with its income stagnation and economic insecurity, is the direct result of the Clinton-Democratic high tax, big-government policies. We have record high taxes, record high spending, excessive regulatory costs, and 25 consecutive years of deficit spending that have sucked trillions of dollars out of the economy.

So it is really little wonder that wages are stagnant, because the Government got your pay raise. So I believe that unless we reverse these policies, the policies that President Clinton and the congressional Democrats put in place, there will be no relief from the Clinton crunch. They believe, the President and the liberal congressional Democrats, believe higher taxes, increased Federal spending, and more Federal programs will lead to more and better jobs and higher pay.

We Republicans, on the other hand, believe that lower taxes, less government, and a balanced budget are the surest way to more jobs and more take-home pay for the average working American.

So we are working hard back here in Washington, and that is why we wanted to take this time to present a special order on the House floor, to emphasize we are working hard to reverse the economic effects of the Clinton crunch on the average American family and the average American worker. We believe again that the right approach is tax cuts for families and for economic growth, an end to the excessive regulations that stifle wages and increase prices and create a constant drag on economic growth and job creation, and a balanced budget, which is just terribly important, to make it easier ultimately for American families to balance their own budgets.

So again I thank the gentleman for organizing the special order and yielding the time to me.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. RIGGS, the gentleman from California. Your comments were right on when it comes to the fact that most citizens want to make sure the raise they get stays in their pocket so they can spend it for their family, their community, in the ways they have to, and not have big brother, so to speak, take their funds and use it and waste it. We have seen a lot of waste.

Under your proposals, the probusiness, projobs legislation you have filed, I am hopeful that Congress will pass it, and not only will your district benefit in California, but the whole country will. We appreciate your leadership on continuing the dialog and getting the legislation adopted.

I go back to the gentleman from Florida with regard to some issues dealing with keeping jobs and making sure that Government is decreased in responsible ways. We discussed jointly our interest in having sunset review of Federal regulations, which has been introduced in the House, and also sunset review of Federal agencies.

I know that in Pennsylvania we had legislation like that adopted, and we were able to sunset agencies that were not doing their job, or consolidate them, privatize them, eliminate them, because they were not meeting their original mission from 50 to 100 years ago.

I wanted your thoughts on what you have heard from your Florida constituents with regard to properly downsizing those programs which have outlived their usefulness.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, I think it is important in every level, every walk of life, for a review. When you create an agency or commission or a study or a rule, I do not think it was ever meant to be perfected in its entirety throughout its lifetime. I think in Florida we always would call back a commission or authority or issue for a 5-year review, to find out if it is doing what it was established to do. Is it operating within the guidelines? Is it spending appropriately the public's funds? Obviously that is the No. 1 component. Are they spending the public resources correctly?

These are the things I think a sunset review would provide for us. Think about it: the Department of Energy established in 1978 under the Carter administration because of the fuel crisis, and we were to set our thermostats to 78.

Look at what that agency has become. Now, are we indeed saving energy in America? Consumption is up almost in every category. Has it fulfilled its usefulness? I do not think there is anything wrong with analyzing agency-by-agency on a frequent basis its need, its necessity, and cost effectiveness for the consumer.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman would yield, that is exactly what we do in private industry. When companies look each year or each 5 years to where they are going and where they have been, they analyze every department, every single activity, to see whether the cost benefit is there, whether they have achieved their original goal, and whether there is a way to change.

Frankly, we can take a page out of business and make Government more responsive, giving the people their money's worth, and making sure that tax dollars are being spent wisely. Because frankly, some programs are best handled by of the private sector.

You only have to look at Habitat for Humanity and other good organizations like that that are community-driven and people-driven that do not depend on taxpayer dollars, but rather on sweat equity, and the involvement and caring of clergy and community and citizens, in making sure that they take abandoned houses and turn them into homes, and they really make a difference.

So we need to be reaching out, applauding, supporting, and buttressing the private sector everywhere we can, and making sure we realize that not every need is answered by a Federal program, but maybe sometimes through a private sector initiative.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, you mentioned Habitat for Humanity. That is a prime example. People say, when we go looking into HUD, that we, the Republicans, are evil, mean-spirited, we do not want to provide housing.

You just mentioned Habitat. In Okeechobee County, the McArthur Dairy Foundation deeded over 35 former housing units, single-family homes, to the Habitat for Humanity. About 2 weeks ago I went to the dedication of a home that a woman and her four children were about to move into. Through sweat equity, determination, perseverance, she was now in a single-family home, the girls and boys had their own bedrooms, and they had a home to call their own, pride of ownership. They worked on it. It was their home. It was in the neighborhood. It was not something HUD did for them.

It was not something they were trapped in. Here, this is your rental quota and this is what you get every month and you can't move, and this is not really your home, it is a rental home and subsidized. You feel these constant strings attached by government.

Habitat has given people the willingness to succeed, to own, to be proud of, and to prosper. That is the difference in what our philosophies are when we start talking about where we want our Nation to go.

Privatization in Florida: The Department of Commerce is becoming the ''Enterprise Florida,'' which is made up of large corporations. If corporations think it is great to promote the State and its opportunities, that is a role for corporations. Not the State or Federal treasury to prop up organizations that do not really promote.

The Commerce Department, you are only lucky enough to get on a Commerce trip if you have donated significantly to either a Democratic or Republican President. You do not get to go because of a novel or unique opportunity or invention.

So when we talk about downsizing, Mr. FOX, I think we have to be very, very aggressive and outline what we hope for the outcomes, that we are in fact liberating companies, businesses, individuals, to seek their own opportunities, rather than stifling them.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think that will come with our legislation to have sunset review and also working with Congressman MICA in regulatory review, because many times I have seen where we have had Federal regulations introduced, there are already State agencies that do that. So there is no reason to have duplicative legislation, which puts a further burden on business, and we put a further burden on business that is already being covered, the safety hazard has been addressed. Why should we put the further burden on business to do more forms that do not help safety, but add to the cost of a product and therefore make it more difficult to hire.

Mr. FOLEY. Think with about your own family. When you are planning something for your future, I am certain you and Judy sit down and go over the pros and cons of a situation, you review where you are currently, where you hope to be, but you do it through a deliberative fashion. In Government it is we who have set it up, we have done our job, let us leave it alone and forget it. And that I think is a significant problem, because there is no oversight, no checking up on the kind of initiatives that were proposed and whether they yield any benefits.

So sunset review, your initiative to push and pursue this legislation, it is vitally important for Congress to become more efficient and effective.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I want to change gears if I could to go back to something I heard you speak about on the House floor recently, and I helped vote and work for the bill that you introduced to save the Everglades. While the Everglades are not in my part of the country in the sense it is not in Pennsylvania, we, who have to be stewards of the environment and conservation for future generations, have to look at the country as a totality and try to help and make sure we preserve natural areas. So I have to applaud you for your leadership in having your legislation adopted, which will in fact make sure the Everglades are maintained in their present form.

You might tell me further illustratively what was due to happen with regard to the Everglades for which we had the legislation come up to begin with?

Mr. FOLEY. As everyone knows that follows the environment and particularly the Everglades, because of growth, 5 million population in south Florida, 41 million visitors to our State last year from Pennsylvania, New York, and all throughout the great 50 States and throughout the entire continent and the globe, visited our State, and obviously that impact has greatly affected the water quantity and quality going into the Everglades.

The Everglades is one of the motion unique National Forest Park water systems, and one we are all immensely proud of. What we are doing with the $210 million appropriated last week is acquiring additional lands to buffer the Everglades, almost acting like a kidney in a body, to filter the water as it comes through these areas, and then taking the nutrients or phosphorus contents away and allowing cleaner water to flow into the Everglades and the Florida Bay.

It is vitally important for the sustaining of life. No human life, no plant life, no animal, can survive without water. So basically this is a step in the right direction of helping the Everglades.

But what I wanted to fundamentally point out, and you mentioned Mr. MICA from Florida. Mr. MICA stated very clearly in a press account that the Republicans are not against the environment. Clearly by their vote for this $210 million, we have stepped up to the plate of committing Federal resources to a vital, national interest park.

But what we are tired of spending our money on is study after study, report after report, consultants, lawyers and others, giving us ideas that are never carried out. Here we have for the first time dollars allocated to the project for actual construction and work, for something we can go back and talk about tangibly, as a result of Federal action rather than inaction.

So one of the things that I want to stress when we talk about the environment is that we are not antienvironment. The Speaker of the House came to the floor and spoke of the Everglades, announced we had to do this, the time had arrived for us to work together collectively for the Everglades. It is about making certain that the monies we are appropriating actually end up in the critical areas that need our attention.

So that is why I was proud. You marshalled the troops from Pennsylvania and your northeast corridor, because, again, as you clearly stated, this is not a Pennsylvania issue, but it is a national issue. It proves for all that enjoy the vast wonders of our continent, the Grand Canyon, you name the desert, the parks, the Allegheny Forests, all of the things we enjoy together as a nation, our pursuit of the preservation of those national resources should be first and foremost on our minds. Not whether we are getting rated on a vote, this is a good environmental vote or what have you. It is about are the dollars we are spending as a nation being applied effectively to solving problems.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. With regard to Florida generally, is there a conservation board within the State with which you work?

Mr. FOLEY. Actually there are a number of things. We have a number of initiatives. We have the Preservation 2,000 fund, the Carl Land programs, we have obviously the Audubon, Everglades National Park, a number of different groups that are very intricately involved in the process. South Florida Water Management, Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife, all are looking for solutions.

That is another thing that I think is important, is to look at the broad opportunities we have as a nation to solicit input from a variety of groups. Not any one individual or group has the right answer for any given question of the day. It is seeking compromise, seeking consensus, and getting the agencies all together in the same room and saying we have a common mission, we have a common problem. Let us solve it with a common solution, rather than 100 different solutions that end up not getting the problem addressed.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I am sure your colleagues would want to have updates on a regular basis of what is happening with the Everglades, and it will be important to the body.

Mr. FOLEY. It is essential they be forthcoming, because after I have asked for that commitment of resources, that is the largest single appropriation ever in our Federal history toward the Everglades, the dollar amount. Two hundred was allocated by the Senate, Mr. DOLE specifically, and Senators MACK and GRAHAM, both Florida members Democrat and Republican, led the initiative in the Senate. Of course, we had a bipartisan coalition in the House. I think they deserve the followup to that expenditure, to see that the dollars they spend in fact are working. I know they will.

□ 1400

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. You know when we talk about the environment; you know Earth Day is coming up in April; it occurs to me that for us to continue the environmental movement started some years ago and to carry on the issues that Major Carson, an environmental leader, started in the years before that by other conservationists, I am wondering whether we are doing enough to inform, educate, and inspire youth to go into fields that deal with conservation, that deal with community participation, even if it is not going to be a profession, in those areas of environmental preservation, and whether you had thought about programs in your district and for the country which would accentuate that and would promote it.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I spoke to Forestdale High School yesterday, and they have a class, an actual magnet program, on environmental studies. It is the youth of the community working in a classroom setting, learning about the environment.

Again, one of the things that I want to stress, too, is the fact that one of my concerns with the government is the fact that we do have so many agencies doing similar functions with different agendas and different mandates. I think the young people need to get involved and look at the practical applications of environmental sciences because there is a cause and effect. I have always suggested that farming and the environment can coexist with the right guidelines and the right tools. I think it is important that we train our young people to understand, yes, recycling is a viable method of

preserving our Earth and also to consider all of the other aspects of how can a business coexist with an environmental movement and not look at them as enemies. And ofttimes you try to draw lines, if you are for business, you are against the environment; if you are for the environment, you are against business; and I think we have clearly indicated with our cooperation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and others to try and make that connection that we can make it happen.

The EPA has a tremendous program in Louisiana, which is a fast-track approach to permitting. They are doing a good job, and I will commend them for that. It is a leadership environmental movement within the EPA, but they actually work hand and hand with business, they get together with them and get their executives on board early so they can streamline the permitting process and in fact encourage that dialog so, No. 1, the company's resources are not expended unnecessarily. It is a cooperative effort, so you got both sides working for harmonious relationships, and the reports from both the corporation and from the EPA were a resounding success.

There are things in our Government that I think we need to work on to exemplify and highlight so the public says, you know, these people are serious about helping the environment, but they are not just going to sit there and throw billions of dollars at it and say now we feel good in our conscience because we have spent money and that should solve everyone's problems.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman would yield, what you say about fast tracking we see in Pennsylvania under the leadership of our new Governor, Tom Ridge, who was a former member of this body, where he has taken a leadership role on restructuring our State Department of Environmental Resources such that fast tracking for permitting and working with industry and the environmentalists is taking place. That cooperative role where government is becoming user friendly is what Governor Ridge of Pennsylvania is all about, and I think that is going to go a long way, hopefully, toward getting government more responsive to people's needs.

Speaking of being responsive, I wanted to highlight one of the legislative initiatives that you and the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, have worked on, and that is the lockbox for savings deficit reduction, and remember there is an interesting story you had in committee where you were able to reduce a budget item that you felt was wasteful only to find that the funds taken from one wasteful item was given to another pet project for someone else's district, and I believe that your lockbox legislation with Congressman CRAPO will in fact ameliorate that problem, and if you can outline that further for our colleagues, I would appreciate it.

Mr. FOLEY. Just a quick summary for those listening:

I went to an authorizing committee of the Committee on Science and withdrew an amendment for 25 million of spending. I had not a unanimous, but a majority support for the cancellation of this wasteful spending, 25 million. It turns out a day later one of my colleagues found the 25 million that I cut and immediately inserted it into another program.

Now, I would work very, very hard in order to save the taxpayers 25 million. In this process everybody says, ''Oh, MARK, 25 million, that's no money. You're not talking serious dollars. That's a nickel and dime.'' And I thought to myself never let me think that 25 million is not significant money. But they went and put the 25 million on another project.

Well, at that time I heard about Mr. CRAPO's lockbox, which is a phenomenal technique meaning I could cut that 25 million, but before it goes anywhere I designate it to the lockbox. That means just like a Christmas club account, or a savings account, or a travel account that a family sets up. That money is earmarked for deficit reduction only. So basically the mechanism would take the 25 million, put it in the expense account but, more importantly reduce the appropriations authorized for that committee by a like amount so no longer would they have the wherewithal to bump up other projects since you save money, and that is critical in order to bring the deficit down.

If we do not establish some mechanism for savings where a Member can actually not only take credit for wasteful spending, but can take credit for deficit reduction, then all of our work and efforts is for naught because you start competing against regions and areas.

The 25 million was important to certain districts, they were upset, but bottom line: everybody recognized it for what it was, a wasteful spending. But if we do not have a mechanism by which to save those dollars, to put them aside and to reduce the Federal deficit, this Nation will never achieve any fiscal sanity.

So the lockbox is critical. We are working to get it into House legislation overall and to get the Senate to adopt it, and thereby, if a Fox amendment is offered to reduce spending in a unwarranted project, if it reaches the majority consensus that the spending is unwarranted and that it should be in a lockbox, we can achieve those victories one at a time. With a $1.6 trillion budget we have got a long way to go based on $1.4 trillion of income and the rest excess spending, we have got a long way to go to reduce our Federal dependency on dollars and to wean us off of a natural addiction toward spending.

Lockbox is the only answer that I have found in all of my budgetary pursuits that works, and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] is to be commended, as are other Members, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], yourself, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK], a number of people that stood up and fought for this initiative, and we do not want to see that initiative lost in this Congress.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate your leadership in that and others in moving forward on it. I know that we can achieve, as far as I am concerned, the balanced budget that we talked about at the top of this hour if we continue making sure that we find the common ground, that we work overtime in making sure that the issues that we hold so dear, whether it be Medicare, Medicaid, environment, education; those are not just one party's issues or one branch of the Government's issues. They are everyone's issues, and we are working on them as well as anyone else is, and on Medicare I might say I think we have made some real progress. When the original debate started out on Medicare, we only learned this past April that in fact the President's trustees told us there was going to be a shortfall, Medicare would be out of business in 7 years.

So I think we have done the bipartisan, correct thing in advancing legislation which will in fact make sure that Medicare is preserved, protected, and extended, but doing it; the way we take care of the problem I think is legislation that is going to eliminate the fraud, abuse and waste. I was amazed to find; I do not know if you were; that there is $30 billion a year now wasted in fraudulent, inflated claims and billing for services not rendered by providers, and I do not know if you have researched that as well and found that to be the case.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, that is what we know about. I mean the problem with Medicare, the fraud and abuse that is being perpetrated on the taxpayers is so pervasive and so difficult to track that I think in my heart if we merely went after that with the full force and weight of the Federal Government and put the resources behind it we would probably save enough to hopefully balance not only Medicare, but lead us to a balanced budget in our Nation. There is a lot of waste and fraud. But I will tell you one thing about Medicare because there is a hue and a cry by the other side of shame on you, and GOP stands for get old people, and you are destroying Medicare.

When I went to the district, and I am the first among freshmen Congressmen with the largest number of Medicare recipients I am No. 7 in the Nation of all Members of Congress with the most Medicare recipients, we would have often 150 to 200 people attend the hearings, and when I explain the program, stay in traditional Medicare, do not change premiums, stay the same, no different than they would have been, they become more comfortable, they find that they can go to a managed care physician, care network or a medical savings account more and more comforted. The fact is if they choose a

product that they do not like, the following year they can disenroll in that and reenroll in something else or go back to traditional Medicare, and the options and ranges of options created in the plan do not deny benefits, in fact encourage opportunities for seniors.

One person at a town hall meeting said, ''You know, I like chiropractic care and it is not covered under Medicare; why not?'' I said, well, in the medical savings account you could make that discretionary choice with the moneys we provide in your account to spend on the health care you think best suits your appropriate condition, 7.5-percent increase. I mean, everything, when I finished the hearings I did not get but one or two persons still disapproving, and often that was more of a partisan than it was a practical disagreement.

What they were saying was you know you have comforted me knowing, first of all, it is not going out of business if you get your bill enacted. Second, choices. Third, competition. Fourth, we are not creating a new commission for fraud, waste and abuse; it stays with Donna Shalala, it stays with HHS. We are getting a hotline and increased enforcement in penalties, but the Medicare bill for the first time provides a road map for our system to make certain that seniors, ourselves included some day when we make that golden year, are in fact provided for, not a Band-aid, not a political let us ignore it until it really becomes a crisis. Let us look at it now strategically and make certain Medicare is something we can all be proud of in the year 2010, 2020, and beyond.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What is interesting is the President and the First Lady a couple a years ago said the way to solve the Medicare crisis is to make sure we control the rate of growth, and that is exactly what the majority proposal was and is, so hopefully we can work together with the White House, and both sides of the aisle and both Chambers, the House and Senate, to make sure we save Medicare for our seniors. We want that quality health care to be there for them and to make sure it is a system that is not just going to stop in the year 2002.

Mr. FOLEY. One other item, line-item veto. That seems to be a significant legislative initiative passed by this body. I hope we are going to be able to flush that out and get it passed by the Senate and onto the President for his signature.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Well, we passed a version early on in the 104th Congress, first session. The Senate passed a slightly different version. But I am hopeful that this bill will get to the President and a compromise version after the conferees have met because line-item veto like 43 Governors have in the country, the chance to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse, that exists. My own Governor, Governor Ridge, has a chance in Pennsylvania to eliminate those programs that are just pork barrel, just in there for one Representative or Senator and not really there to have permanent, long-term value for our Nation. And the line-item veto is an idea whose time has certainly arrived.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, if you think about the debate that can occur, and when people say line-item veto, what power does that give the President? Well, just like you mentioned with your Governor, they can strike through the appropriation as wasteful pork spending without having to veto an entire bill. But the safeguard for Congress is if a President, and a lot of people say, well, they can take retribution against a Member. If the President does not like Congressman FOLEY, he can strike out all of his projects. Well, if my projects are so good, I can go back to the floor after the veto and defend them among my colleagues and get an override within the next couple of days to restore the project.

So I do not sense this disastrous consequence of a line-item veto. In fact, I sense that there could be a bigger opportunity for us to really tighten the rein of Government, and give the President an active hand in budgetary negotiations, and in fact strike through some of these things you read about, these studies, asparagus studies, or, you know, this and that study, none of which lead to any better prosperity for anyone that has a response to the study. It is just another give-back to communities, a little pork barrel spending that I think has to stop. Line-item veto is the only mechanism in which to do that.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. And with two other programs which have been adopted, that one is soon to be signed by the President hopefully, as soon as the compromise version is agreed to, but two other bills I think of note that this 104th Congress has passed and the President has signed, one would be the accountability law which says all the laws we pass are now also applied to the Congress. Prior Congresses said, well, the fair labor standards, civil rights law, family leave does not apply to our employees.

Now, how can we in heavens understand the bills if they do not affect us too? Well, now those laws do apply to us, and we, as well, passed legislation dealing with unfunded mandates, local government, State government. We are all told by prior Congresses, well, look, we are going to send you this bill, you are going to have to do it. If it costs money? That is too bad, we are not sending you any.

Well, this new Congress has said, and the President agreed and signed the bill, saying no more unfunded mandates. If we think it is such a good idea, then we are going to send the money back to local districts so we do not bankrupt townships and towns and burroughs and villages just because we think here in Congress it is such a good idea.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman would yield, if you can imagine how in name the process is that allows the memberships to pass bills onto other people and not have them impact their own lives or their own offices.

When I first toured the Capitol complex after being elected, I go to many offices looking for which one I may potentially select in the draw, and in front of every door that had, you know, the exits out into the hallways were books and computers and desks blocking the exists. There was generally in most offices one exit remaining open.

Now in a business, OSHA, the fire marshall, everyone would have cited that facility for not having a proper escape for an employee.

□ 1415

Here in Congress they can do whatever they want, clog up the offices, junk everywhere, and they consider that fair.

Civil rights laws, fair labor standards, all the things that we impose on small businesses, Members of Congress sat back and said, ''Oh, no, but I am holier than thou. I do not need to enforce those laws on ourselves, because we are in fact the Congress. We are the superior body of mankind.'' I think it was that attitude that got this Congress into such trouble.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] would be glad to know that we will now have a change in that, as the person who started the firefighters' caucus in the Capitol. I am sure he will take the initiative to work with the appropriate authority to change that.

It is also interesting to note that we have taken not only reform measures when it comes to fiscal responsibility, but we have changed how we run the institution. We have one-third less committee staff. We have in fact also made sure that the pensions that Members receive are now not special, they are the same as any other Federal employee. We have eliminated the right of lobbyists to give us gifts. Our constituents do not get gifts, except at holiday time and birthdays. Why should we have anything special as well? We also have passed lobbying disclosure, and campaign reform is in the offing, very shortly to be passed. There are several good bills out there, I think, to make campaign reform a reality.

So this Congress is different. We are getting our fiscal house in order with a line item veto, with a balanced budget, stopping the unfunded mandates. But the reforms of the Congress itself have also come about when it comes to how we operate the institution. Hopefully that will continue as we move forward.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield a final moment, I want to thank him very much. I thank him for this excellent opportunity to portray the things we are trying to do, to balance the budget, and for his leadership on a number of issues.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and my colleagues.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ROGERS). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 3 p.m.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on approval of the Journal and then on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which the motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal; de novo;

H.R. 2778, de novo; and

H.R. 2853, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2778, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2778, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—416

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie
Brown (FL)
Chenoweth
Collins (MI)
DeFazio
Durbin
Ehrlich
Kaptur
LaTourette
Lipinski
McCarthy
Morella
Ortiz
Stokes
Wynn

□ 1523

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House considered on the suspension calendar, H.R. 2778, a bill to give special tax treatment to United States troops in Bosnia. As a strong supporter of the members of our Armed Forces I strongly support this measure. Had I been present on roll No. 44 I would have noted ''aye.''

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR BULGARIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2853.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

CRANE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2853.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAMING OF THE HONORABLE JIM BUNNING TO BASEBALL'S HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I have a very special announcement to make. One of our colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], was just named to the Baseball Hall of Fame.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues all know that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] is the only major league pitcher ever to pitch a no-hit game in both the National League and the American League and that his selection to the Hall of Fame was not by baseball writers, but by the veterans themselves, which makes it, it seems to me, a little loftier in stature.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I might trespass upon my friendship with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] to tell the Members a true story. I think I have the year right. 1958. Maybe it was 1968, but I am going to say 1958. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] was pitching for the Detroit Tigers against the New York Yankees. The New York Yankees had a first base coach named Bob Turley, a former pitcher who was very skilled at stealing signs. Every time JIM would throw a fastball, Turley would whistle, and the batters knew what the pitch was.

Now, the first batter up was Bobby Richardson, and JIM got him out. The second batter up was Tony Kubek, the shortstop. JIM got him out. The third batter stepped in, Mickey Mantle, and JIM walked over to the first base coach, Turley, and he said, ''If you whistle, I am going to hit him right in the back with a pitch.'' JIM took the mound. He got his sign and he was at the top of his windup when Turley whistled. JIM decided to cross everybody up. He threw a slider. It got away from him, and hit Mantle right in the back. Mantle headed toward the mound with his bat, but decided better of it, and trotted down to first base.

The next batter was Yogi Berra. Yogi stepped in, pounded the plate, looked at JIM BUNNING and said, ''Hey, JIM, if Turley whistles, I ain't listening.''

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to top what our good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, has said about the wonderful gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING. But I know that our friends in Philadelphia, like the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, CURT WELDON and JIM GREENWOOD, and many others, BOB BORSKI, TOM FOGLIETTA, all the other Members, know that the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING, is a hero not only on the field of baseball, but JIM BUNNING has been a hero as a congressional leader and as someone who has held the great family principles of life, someone who is fair dealing, someone who cares about others, and someone who, in his lifetime, has really made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to stand and rise to this great American hero, the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker if I might yield very briefly to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, CURT WELDON, who formerly was the Congressman of JIM BUNNING.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that there is no one that the members of the Pennsylvania delegation would fear more in coming back to our State and running for elective office than JIM BUNNING, because he is adored by all of our constituents, whether they be in the district of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, TOM FOGLIETTA, CHAKA FATTAH, or BOB BORSKI's district, or whether they be over in the district of the gentleman from New Jersey, ROB ANDREWS, or the district of the gentleman from Delaware, MIKE CASTLE, or in our suburban districts around Philadelphia.

JIM is adored because the gentleman from Kentucky, years ago, and I will not say how long ago, was my boyhood idle when I was a Phillies fan growing up in the suburbs. I have told him that many times. But JIM BUNNING, years ago, represented the same ideals that Cal Ripken stands for today.

Mr. Speaker, while we acknowledge JIM BUNNING's leadership as a professional baseball player, let us also acknowledge his stature as a human being and as a father and as a husband and a man. As the proud parent of nine children, and who knows how many grandchildren, JIM BUNNING really epitomizes what is right with this country. I am proud to call him not just a colleague, but someone that all of us can look up to in this country as a true role model for America.

Congratulations, JIM. The people of Philadelphia are real proud to call you their own.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleagues, as the Congressperson who was privileged to represent Cooperstown, NY, I would like to welcome the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING, to my constituency. I would like to point out to my colleagues that his election came from his peers, people like Ted Williams and Stan Musial and Yogi Berra and Pee Wee Reese and Bill White. The greats of baseball recognized another great.

For those of you who have dreams of coming to Cooperstown, NY, I would like to welcome you all to come up to that magnificent community to see the induction of the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING, this year.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a brief comment.

Mr. FOGLIETTA. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this an honor for Pennsylvania and for the city of Philadelphia, but the fact is that the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING, achieved his greatness in the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, that I now represent. JIM, it is a good, solid Democratic district.

The heritage in south Philadelphia was from Joe DiMaggio, and most of the kids in south Philadelphia were Yankee rooters, so we were thrilled when JIM finally came to Philadelphia with the Phillies, rather than with the A's, so he would not have to pitch against the Yankees anymore. But when he came to Philadelphia, all Philadelphia became fans of JIM BUNNING's.

Only last week in the article, letters to the editor, young people were writing praising the exploits of JIM BUNNING, and urging those who were going to vote to elect him to the Baseball Hall of Fame. I am so happy that they did. We admire you, JIM. You are a great, great, great Philadelphian.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] for a few comments.

Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to speak after 25 years. I have been retired from baseball for 25 years. None of the numbers that were on the back of my card have changed in that time. They are all the same numbers that I retired with, so it has been a long waiting process. Thank God it happened while I was still on my feet. Sometimes it happens posthumously, and I really deeply appreciate the veterans committee. As the gentleman from Illinois, HENRY HYDE, said, ''Those are some of your peers that voted you in.''

Particularly I talked with Yogi Berra, who was on the committee, and I talked with Peewee Reese, who was on the committee. I talked to Bill White, one of my teammates from Philadelphia, after the vote was taken today. So it is deeply appreciated. I would be remiss if I did not mention Alan Lewis, who happened to be a writer, a beat writer in Philadelphia, when

I was playing. It was through his efforts that this happened, nobody else's. Thank you very much.

Mr. HYDE. It was through your efforts, JIM, not anybody else's.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, Michigan would be remiss if it did not add its words of congratulations. I have the privilege of sitting on the Committee on Ways and Means with the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING. I just want to say to you, to JIM, he is still throwing strikes, and now and then a curve ball. I am sometimes the recipient, and all I can say is I am glad I am receiving them in the Committee on Ways and Means, rather than on a baseball team.

JIM was a terrific person and a terrific pitcher for the Tigers, and brought moments of great glory to our State of Michigan. JIM, if I might speak on behalf of a lot of people, I think, from the State of Michigan to congratulate you on an award long in coming and more than richly deserved: Congratulations.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to have the gentleman from Kentucky, JIM BUNNING, in my congressional district. I represented Ted Williams. Ted Williams being a constituent of mine, he wanted to meet with JIM BUNNING, so the two of them met in my congressional district at a dinner, and we had a wonderful time. I would point out to my colleagues here that JIM BUNNING struck out the greatest hitter of all time, Ted Williams, three times in one afternoon. He has that kind of staying power and that kind of pitching power.

But one thing that Ted Williams did say to me confidentially is that ''JIM BUNNING should be in the Hall of Fame, and God willing, JIM BUNNING some day will be in the Hall of Fame,'' so I think Ted Williams was forecasting what has occurred. I congratulate him, and I think, on behalf of Ted Williams and others, we wish JIM BUNNING the best. We are glad that he was finally recognized.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1963 AND H.R. 1972

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1963 and H.R. 1972.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for a number of resent rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall No. 20, ''no''; rollcall No. 21, ''yes''; rollcall No. 22, ''yes''; rollcall No. 23, ''no''; rollcall No. 24, ''yes''; rollcall No. 25, ''yes''; rollcall No. 26, ''no''; rollcall No. 27, ''no''; rollcall No. 28, ''no''; rollcall No. 29, ''no''; rollcall No. 30, ''yes''; and rollcall No. 43, ''yes''.

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR BULGARIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title of H.R. 2778, to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for the peacekeeping effort in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be entitled to certain tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone, passed earlier today, is amended.

There was no objection.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to provide that members of the Armed Forces performing services for the peacekeeping efforts in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, and Macedonia shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone, and for other purposes.''.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
March 5, 1996.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign from the Committee on Small Business.

Very truly yours,

CHAKA FATTAH,
Member of Congress.

CALLING FOR REFORM OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CHRISTENSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I also serve on the Subcommittee on Social Security, and I am honored to call the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] my chairman, and it is indeed with honor that I serve on his committee.

Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about another issue. If I have learned anything over the past year in Congress, it is that there are two opposing views on crime in our country. There are those who believe that crime is not necessarily an issue of personal responsibility, but of environment. They tend to believe that the slick criminal trial lawyers, the liberal jurists, and endless death penalty appeals have been a good development for our criminal justice system. They advocate rehabilitation, lenient sentences, and legal loopholes, often in the name of compassion.

Then there are those like myself, those who are sick and tired of criminals preying on our families and children. We are tired of our kids being afraid to walk to school alone, we are tired of illegal drugs that are poisoning our youth, eating away at their futures. We are tired of slick criminal defense lawyers pushing criminals to freedom through legal loopholes. We are tired of seeing our prisoners treated better than the working men and women of this country.

I would like to give you just one recent example of what those of us in the silent majority are tired of. A recent decision by Federal Judge Herald Baer illustrates what is wrong with the liberals' view on crime, and why it is so important that we put justice back into our criminal justice system.

Judge Baer was appointed by President Clinton, due to, in President Clinton's own words, ''his outstanding record of achievement.'' One wonders if President Clinton would stand by those words today, after reading Judge Baer's recent opinion.

□ 1545

This is an account of his recent opinion.

During the early morning hours of April 21, 1995, police officer Richard Carroll and his partner, Sergeant Bentley, were assigned to plainclothes duty patrol on the north end of Manhattan, an area well known for being a hub for the drug trade. At about 5 in the morning, these veteran officers observed a woman slowly driving a car with out-of-State license plates. The woman stopped the car, double-parked, and waited.

Soon four men approached the car, walking single file. Without saying so much as one word to the female driver, the men lifted open the trunk of the car and placed several duffle bags into the car.

For obvious reasons becoming a little suspicious, Officers Carroll and Bentley drove up to the four males. Immediately the four males began running. Unable to apprehend the fleeing men, the officers immediately pulled over the woman's car.

Upon opening the trunk of the car, the officers discovered more than 80 pounds of cocaine and heroin in the trunk with a street value of over $4 million. The woman admitted that she was purchasing drugs, even stating that she had expected to be paid $20,000 for the trip and that she had made 20 similar trips in the past.

Now, where I come from in Nebraska, common sense tells us that people like that should go to jail. These trained officers clearly had a reason to pull over

the car. You had an out-of-State car, it was moving slowly, in a drug-dealing neighborhood, in the wee hours of the morning, four men put duffle bags in the trunk without speaking to the driver. The four men took off running when approached by the police.

Well, unfortunately, that did not happen. After the slick criminal trial lawyers and liberal Judge Baer got through with the case, the court ruled that the officers did not have a reasonable suspicion that the woman was involved in criminal activity. Judge Baer, in his infinite wisdom, suppressed all of the evidence, and now it appears that yet another drug dealer will go free.

Why? Because Judge Baer decided that it was normal for people to run from the police in this drug-ridden neighborhood. According to this Clinton appointee, quote, had the men not run when the cops began to stare at them, it would have been unusual, end of quote. Well, maybe our men in blue should start arresting everyone who does not run, then.

The bottom line, I believe, is this: It is high time judges stopped looking for ways to protect criminals, and it is high time our leaders started looking for ways to protect families. We can and we must restore safety to our streets and sanity to our justice system.

We are fighting hard here in the 104th Congress to protect the American dream, but an essential part of that dream is restoring freedom from fear in our streets in America. We must have safe streets and secure schools, and I believe we can achieve this on a bipartisan fashion here in the 104th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRUTH IN ADVERTISING FOR STATE-RUN LOTTERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore Mr. (FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce legislation requiring State lotteries to inform consumers of the statistical probability of winning the lottery prize as a part of all radio and television advertising.

As a general principle, the Federal Government has been quite aggressive in requiring truth in advertising from those who use our Nation's airwaves. However, it has neglected to act in one of the Nation's fastest growing industries, that is, State-run lotteries.

In 1994, nationwide, consumers spent $34.4 billion on lottery tickets. In Texas alone we spent almost $3 billion. These billions were spent in spite of the fact that the chance of winning the lottery grand prize is less likely than getting struck by lightning.

Mr. Speaker, there were 1.178 billion lottery tickets bought for the Lotto Texas grand prize last year. There were 74 grand prize winners. Statistically, the chance of winning the Lotto Texas grand prize is 1 in 15,890,700.

Mr. Speaker, if a medical product offered one person in 15,890,700 a chance of growing hair on a bald head, the FDA would not approve it and the FTC would not allow it to be advertised on TV as a cure for baldness. Unfortunately. If a stock broker, price indexer, advertised an investment where 1 person gets rich and 15 million get nothing in TV ads showing only the person who got rich, the SEC would shut him down.

The duty of a State to its people is higher than I would ask of private citizens or a business. If a State is going to be in the numbers business and use the Nation's airwaves to market the chance of living the life style of the rich and famous, it has the duty to tell those people their chances of winning that life style.

For most of our Nation's history lotteries and other numbers games were illegal. They were illegal because they were deceptive and tricked people out of their hard-earned money. Times have changed, and today lotteries are an accepted fact of life. We have a duty to ensure our Nation's airwaves; we have a duty to ensure that the people get the facts.

In Texas, every ad that brings the smiling face of our State's newest millionaire in the living room should conclude with the tag line, ''The chances of winning are 1 in 15,890,700.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

FARRAKHAN'S MIDDLE EAST TRIP CHALLENGES NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, recently a gentleman named Louis Farrakhan toured over a dozen African and Middle Eastern countries, including Libya, Nigeria, Iraq, and Iran. During Mr. Farrakhan's trips abroad, and specifically during his trip to Libya, Libyan strong man and known terrorist Mu'ammar Qadhafi pledged $1 billion to Mr. Farrakhan's Nation of Islam to be used here in this country to, I believe, improperly influence the American political system.

By the pledges and statements made by strong man Qadhafi, the following laws may have been broken, and further may have been broken by Mr. Farrakhan himself: the Foreign Agents Registration Act; the Libyan sanctions regulations; restrictions on campaign contributions and expenditures by foreign nationals; passport travel restrictions; and the Logan Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a direct challenge to the national security and national interest of the United States of America and her people. Mr. Qadhafi has himself stated that this is one way to infiltrate America. Moslems from abroad, through these various political organizations, are calling to unite with those in this country in subversion of the U.S. Government and its governmental systems.

Mr. Speaker, further, Iranian Prime Minister Rafsanjani has stated regarding Mr. Farrakhan's visit to his country, also on the list of terrorist nations, ''Let our enemies call this export of revolution. We do not fear this.''

Congress must hold hearings and the appropriate law enforcement agencies in the executive branch must investigate these matters. We cannot turn a blind eye to blatant disregard of our Nation's laws and national interests.

Questions must be answered as to the legality of Mr. Farrakhan's actions, and this administration's apparent unwillingness to pursue Mr. Farrakhan for an explanation of his actions must not be allowed to lie.

Did this administration send a letter to Farrakhan stating it was illegal to travel to certain of these nations? What steps has this administration taken, if any, to investigate possible violations of U.S. law? Why did this administration allow Mr. Farrakhan to reenter the United States, knowing of his activities and statements abroad, without even checking his passport for a Libyan stamp?

Mr. Speaker, I have called for hearings, as have others. I have written to Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Attorney General Janet Reno calling for an immediate and in-depth review of these matters.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following correspondence for the RECORD:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 14, 1996.

Hon. WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
U.S. Department of State,
Washington, DC.

Re Louis Farrakhan's Trip to Iran and Libya

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I write to urge you as the Secretary of State to investigate Louis Farrakhan's recent trips to Libya and Iran, which are listed on the United States' terrorist list for their roles in state sponsored terrorism. By engaging in such travel, it is my understanding that Mr. Farrakhan may have violated several federal statutes, including the Foreign Agents Registration Act, various passport travel restrictions, sanctions regulations and the Logan Act.

An investigation by your department is critical to determine the means by which Mr. Farrakhan traveled to Libya and Iran, what economic contributions he may have made to these countries, whether there exists any financial relationship between these terrorist governments and Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam, and answers to other relevant questions.

It is unconscionable and unacceptable for our government to stand idly by, while federal laws may have been disregarded with impunity by this man.

I respectfully urge your department to take whatever action is necessary, including comprehensive investigations to fully disclose Louis Farrakhan's travels and interaction with the terrorist regimes in Libya and Iran.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation in this matter, and I look forward to working with you in this regard.

With kind regards, I am,
Very truly yours,

BOB BARR,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 14, 1996.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

Re Louis Farrakhan's trip to Iran and Libya.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL RENO: I write to urge you as Attorney General of the United States to, as soon as possible, investigate Louis Farrakhan's recently trips to Libya and Iran, which are listed on the United States' terrorist list for their roles in state-sponsored terrorism. By engaging in such travel, it is my understanding that Mr. Farrakhan may have violated several federal statutes, including the Foreign Agents Registration Act, various passport travel restrictions, sanctions regulations, and the Logan Act.

An investigation by your department is critical to determine the means by which Mr. Farrakhan traveled to Libya and Iran, what economic contributions he may have made to these countries, whether there exists any financial relationship between these terrorist governments and Louis Farrakhan's Nation of Islam, and answers to other relevant questions.

It is unconscionable and unacceptable for our government to stand idly by, while federal laws may have been disregarded with impunity by this man.

I respectfully urge your office to take whatever action is necessary, including comprehensive investigations to fully disclose Louis Farrakhan's travels and interaction with the terrorist regimes in Libya and Iran.

Thank you for your consideration and cooperation in this matter, and I look forward to working with you in this regard.

With kind regards, I am,
Very truly yours,

BOB BARR,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to say that Mr. Farrakhan is, quote, cavorting with dictators, close quote, as one presidential spokesman initially said, is not enough. Our laws should be the rule of the land, not political interests of the moment.

Even beyond, Mr. Speaker, the immediate questions about whether Mr. Farrakhan has violated U.S. laws, looms the broader issue of whether U.S. laws purporting to guard against U.S. citizens conspiring to work against U.S. national security interests have any meaning whatsoever. Do our laws, which prevent U.S. citizens from serving as conduits for foreign money being interjected into the U.S. political system, have any meaning or not?

These fundamental and basic questions about the scope and strength and rule of U.S. laws guarding our national security and guarding the integrity of our political system must be addressed. We must have the backbone to ask these questions through appropriate congressional hearings and through appropriate law enforcement review by the Department of Justice.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 927, CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY (LIBERTAD) ACT OF 1996

Mr. DIAZ–BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–470) on the resolution (H. Res. 370) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEUTSCH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CONDEMNING VIOLENCE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the fourth time in 9 days, a savage suicide bomber has attacked the people and the state of Israel, seeking to terrorize its people and destabilize the Middle East peace process. The latest bombing, outside Tel Aviv's largest shopping mall, struck a crowded center filled with families and many children dressed in costume for the Jewish holiday festival of Purim. At least 12 were killed and 120 wounded in yesterday's bombing, only 1 day after a bus bombing in Jerusalem killed 18 people. The latest terrorist attacks bring the death toll of this 9-day siege to 59.

The United States and the world must stand with Israel in this time of crisis. The actions of Hamas, the militant Moslem group which has claimed responsibility for these bombings, should not be tolerated. We cannot allow these terrorists to undermine the peace process and reverse the tremendous progress that has been made. More importantly, we must do all we can to stop these terrorist attacks and all who would support them militarily and financially.

Israeli President Shimon Peres reiterated yesterday that Israel would not surrender to terrorists, and I have no doubt he will bring the nation's full weight to bear on Hamas and their allies who would threaten the very existence of Israel.

I am pleased that President Clinton has moved swiftly to assist Israel in its efforts to battle this deadly wave of terrorism. The highly sophisticated bomb detection equipment and technical experts the United States sent to Israel today will support Israel's efforts to bring the killers to justice and to prevent future bombings.

While these attacks have been portrayed as acts of revenge for Israel's killing of a Hamas terrorist leader, there can be no doubt today that these attacks are designed to undermine the peace process between Israel and the Palestinian authority led by Yasser Arafat. The actions of Hamas should not be tolerated nor should they be allowed to sway our commitment to peace.

We here in the U.S. Congress must not waiver on our own commitment to this effort. Domestically, we must do everything within the law to ensure that Hamas and other terrorist groups do not receive financial support from within the United States. Internationally, we must lead the world in taking strong action against any nation that harbors or supports terrorists.

We must also demand that Chairman Arafat and Palestinian Authority use the police powers granted under the peace process to bring these terrorists to justice. Finally, we must endorse the Israeli Cabinet's position of troop deployment as an allowable exception to the Peace accords to address an inexcusable action on the part of a terrorist organization.

Today, all Israel mourns the loss of its friends and family, and the entire world grieves with them. We can best honor the victims of these bombings by recommitting ourselves to a comprehensive peace for Israel and the entire Middle East. But we must also recognize there can be no true peace until the terrorists behind these attacks are

brought to justice. They must not succeed.

I urge my colleagues to join me in condemning this senseless campaign of terror against the people of Israel and in sending our condolences to the families of the victims of these horrible attacks. America stands with you and will support you throughout your fight against terrorism and for peace.

□ 1600

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

A TERRIBLY SAD DAY FOR HUMANITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the eloquent comments of my colleague from Texas who just spoke. This is for all who care about the best instincts of humanity, a terribly sad day.

The people of Israel, a democratic society represented by a democratically elected government, have been in the process for the past couple of years of taking risks for peace, of reaching out in ways that societies do not always do. The Israelis have shown a willingness to cede control of territory that was hard-earned in wartime and in a war forced on them by the intransigence and hostility of its enemies, and the effort by the Government of Israel to bring about this peace has tragically been responded to by a minority, but unfortunately a significant minority, within the Arab world, by a campaign of vicious murder.

No society, and certainly no democratic society where the people rule as they do in Israel, can tolerate this sort of assault on the citizenry. We should make very clear from the outset that the Government of the United States is fully supportive of the decisions that have been made and will be made by the government of Prime Minister Peres. No one has done more to show his dedication to true peace and by that very fact, as well as by the right of self-defense inherent in any state, and particularly for a democratic society, Prime Minister Peres and his colleagues have earned the right to take the steps that they need to in self-defense with our full support, and that will include sending Israeli security forces anywhere in the area where they are required to go, because you cannot sit back and let dozens and dozens of your people be slaughtered defenselessly. You have the absolute, not just right, but obligation to defend them, and the United States should make very clear that it will be supportive of this.

Arguments that somehow this is incompatible with the peace process cannot be given any weight, because what could be less compatible with the peace process than the systematic brutal murder of dozens of innocent people by the Hamas terrorists.

People should understand that, again, Israel being a democratic society, it cannot go forward with a peace process until and unless its security can be provided.

I thought the chance for genuine peace in the Middle East was one of the finest hours we have seen. I still hope that we will get the benefits of that. But people must understand that protecting the innocent citizens of Israel against this sort of butchery is an absolute precondition to any further progress in the peace process.

No democratically elected government would try, and it would not succeed if it did try, and it would not deserve to succeed if it did try, to go forward with a peace process without securing the defense of its citizens. And an especially important burden lies with the leadership of the Arab world, of Yasser Arafat, who has clearly done far too little, we now learn, to enforce the law and true peace. The Palestinian leadership cannot at the same time profit from the steps towards peace and then fail to use the authority they are getting to put an end to this murder.

If the Palestinian authority cannot put an end to this systematic, organized murder that comes from within their ranks, they will not have a moral claim and they will not have a legal claim and they will not have a claim anyone will recognize to control the territory.

But it is also important for us to talk to our Arab friends, the Saudi Arabians and others. It is not enough simply to dissociate themselves from these murderers, it is simply not enough to look the other way unless there is a sustained willingness on the part of the Arab leadership to cut off funds. These are not people who are earning a living by some honorable means. They cannot go forward with this terrorism without substantial subsidies in which governments are complicit.

The President of Syria, a great defender of terrorism, must be told any dream he has of regaining control of the Golan Heights totally evaporates now and for the foreseeable future until he begins a reversal and says, ''We will crack down on terrorism.''

I believe the peace process was one of the finest hours of mankind. I believe the Israeli government was distinguishing itself. I was hopeful there was within the Arab world the kind of responsible leadership that would reach out and meet that. Today that is in question. It is not enough to condemn and wink and look the other way. It is important that we get a full commitment from the Arab leadership to cooperate fully with the Israeli leadership in putting an end to these murderers' ability to murder. Otherwise, one of the things they will have murdered will be the peace process.

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND SECRETARY OF ENERGY MUST ACCOUNT FOR WASTED MONEY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, this country and this legislative body and the administration have been struggling to achieve a balanced budget. The people really do not understand this problem, and, frankly, I do not either.

The working Americans balance their checking accounts monthly. I cannot think of a business in Kansas, where I am the Fourth District Congressman, or a nonprofit organization or an individual that has not balanced their budget over the last 26 years, nowhere except right here in the Federal Government.

This Congress has also been striving to be a House of the people, bringing common sense from the common people back to Government. But we have had many obstacles in achieving that.

The administration has submitted multiple budgets that did not balance. The President personally lobbied against the balanced budget amendment, which passed in the House and failed by only one vote in the U.S. Senate, and the President, in his last budget, which was scored as a balanced budget by the CBO, has 95 percent of the savings in the last 2 years, which would be after his administration, assuming that he would be successful next November.

Perhaps the most confusing, though, is how the President condones actions that are directly in opposition to achieving a balanced budget. I am speaking of the waste and the abuse and the potentially fraudulent activity that have been occurring in the Department of Commerce and the Department of Energy. The President's Secretary of Commerce, Secretary Ron Brown, has allowed the excessive issuance of Government credit cards; for example, half of the employees at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, NOAA, as it is called, have been issued Government credit cards. Even nongovernment employees have been issued Government credit cards. Reportedly, there have been 600 instances where they have taken Government credit cards and used an automatic teller to receive cash, cash benefits, unaccountable for. I wonder how long do people like Tim Schwilling, who works at the Boeing Co. delivering parts, or Craig Faroh, who works for Sedgwick County, how long do they have to work to pay in tax to the Federal Government to just have it taken out in cash benefits, unaccounted for?

There is Mr. Clinton's Secretary of Energy, Secretary O'Leary, who has been known for her excessive travel. Some call her a congenital flyer, over

100 domestic trips, 16 overseas trips. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and myself asked for a General Accounting Office audit of two overseas trips, South Africa and India, and the GAO found out Secretary O'Leary could not account for $255,000 of taxpayers' money, a quarter of a million dollars. We have called for her resignation.

This Congress has wanted accountability from the administration, accountability to the people, because it is the people's money.

It is known that the President has opposed a balanced budget during his administration. You cannot balance the budget when the presidential appointees, like Secretary Brown and Secretary O'Leary, waste taxpayers' dollars and remain unaccountable for their actions.

I ask for the President to ask them to account for the money that has been wasted and resign from their office.

KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OPEN ACT OF 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, for 3 weeks part of the Federal Government was shut down. I do not want to dwell in the past and worry about who was to blame for this shutdown. I want to look to the future and try to prevent another shutdown.

On February 6 I introduced a bipartisan bill to prevent another shutdown if there should be another lapse in appropriations. H.R. 2963, the Keep the Government Open Act of 1996, amends the Anti-Deficiency Act to permit Federal employees to continue to work and to be paid during a lapse in appropriations, if the President determines that a sufficient appropriation is likely to be made before the end of the fiscal year.

The recent shutdown of the Federal Government wasted one billion taxpayer dollars. We ended up paying 285,000 Federal employees who were ordered not to work for 3 weeks. This shutdown also imposed a serious financial hardship on many of the 476,000 Federal workers who were not paid during this period even though they were ordered to work.

The shutdown of the Federal Government hurt many private firms, both those that normally sell to Federal employees and those that have Federal contracts. They were unable to recoup the business they lost during the shutdown.

The other cosponsors of this bipartisan bill are Mr. DAVIS, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. WYNN.

I urge all my colleagues to support this insurance against another failure to enact funding bills.

SUPPORT ADEQUATE FUNDING LEVELS FOR EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of maintaining adequate funding levels for education, because as we end, as we near the end of another continuing resolution, I think we all agree that the improvement of public education is one of the greatest challenges facing our entire Nation on every level of government and in every locality.

Investment in the learning capacity of this and future generations is crucial to both our long-term economic strength and our continued cultural growth. It is at the heart of what many families mean when they talk about personal economic security and the stability of their families themselves.

I think we all recognize that education has traditionally been, and should remain, a local function and a State responsibility, but Federal support for education as an overarching national concern can make a crucial difference, especially where local resources are strained or where a coordinated effort can help achieve national objectives; in short, where we can begin to unify our Nation in common purpose.

□ 1615

Poll after poll today shows education as the highest economic priority for voters, more than crime or the budget deficit, Medicare, moral issues, Federal taxes, and welfare reform. Education stands at the top of the list for 82 percent of the Americans who oppose cutting education.

To that end, Mr. Speaker, on February 1 of this year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 144, a sense of Congress resolution that demonstrates support for education funding at this critical time. The bill calls for an appropriation for education programs by March 15 that is no less than the amount spent on those programs in 1995. I am pleased to tell you as of today 192 bipartisan colleagues of ours have joined me in cosponsoring this resolution, and I am confident that more will join.

I am hopeful this showing of unity, of purpose, will send a message to the people of this Nation and the leadership of this Congress that America is serious about protecting our children's education. School districts that do not receive notification by March 15 that they will have adequate funds for the upcoming school year will have to start planning which teachers to lay off, which programs to cut, which classes to eliminate. These kinds of choices will be grim reality in many school districts around the country.

But March 15 is only the deadline for the schools most immediate needs. A commitment to education funding in the future is necessary to satisfy longer term needs, funding for things that include the basic tools of learning as well as technology adaptation, to professional development, and an elevated curriculum for all kids. All of this comes at a time when we really need to talk about investing in education.

In the fall of 1996 we will have more students enrolled in K through 12, elementary and secondary education, than at any other time in our Nation's history. This will surpass the previous record of the baby-boom years. It is going to come at a time that will necessitate the hiring of about 50,000 new teachers, at the very same time that the cuts proposed through the continuing resolution, if extended throughout the year, would cause the loss of between 40,000 and 50,000 teachers and teachers' aides throughout the United States.

This increase is not a 1-year anomaly. It is expected to continue. These demographic changes are no one's fault. This is not a matter of throwing bombs from one side of the aisle to another. They really come at a time when we all need to recognize that the force of demographic change is at the heart of what is driving policy imperatives throughout the Nation. We need to recognize that this investment is an investment in the security of all of us, and I would urge all Members to consider the consequences of our decisions over the next several weeks. They will undoubtedly reverberate through our population for decades to come.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated for the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. QUINN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ALL NATIONS MUST JOIN IN QUEST FOR MIDDLE EAST PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the tragic events in Israel in the last several days, the bombings by Hamas, are not simply actions taken by a handful of extremists. These extremists function because they have economic support that comes from countries and individuals around the globe.

It is time that the efforts to attain peace be broadened beyond the United States, Israel, and the PLO. It is time for our Western Allies to join the American effort to isolate forces in the world that support terrorism.

Our Western European Allies continue to do business as usual with the Government of Iran, that is probably the most central supporter of Hamas

and its terrorism. Our Western European Allies, like England, France, and Germany, continue to buy oil and provide technical assistance to that Government that provides the economic support and often the direction for these terrorist movements. Countries that Americans have bled for, like Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, also send a large portion of the funds that go to Hamas. Several months ago when Yasser Arafat was here in this Capitol, he complained it was easier for Hamas to get funding from some of these groups than it was for Yasser Arafat trying to lead the Palestinians toward a lasting peace with the Israelis.

United States leadership has existed historically around the globe. That is why much of the world turns to us when there is a crisis. In Yugoslavia it was clear the world could not deal with that crisis unless America played a central role. The United States led the effort to end the apartheid in South Africa.

It is now time for the Europeans to join the Americans and for Americans to take the lead in isolating the Government of Iran, that continues to be the single most destructive force of the peace process in the Middle East. The extremism that they breed, that they teach, that they finance, continues to threaten not only the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians, but governments that have been supportive of the peace process, like the Government of Egypt, led by Mr. Mubarak.

American efforts will not succeed if we are isolated from our Western friends. Business as usual with the government of Iran continues to provide the billions of dollars of revenue that they can divert for terrorism. The blood that lays on the streets of Jerusalem and Tel Aviv is simply not the fault of those who actually built the bomb. It is not simply the fault of those who brought the bomb in. It is the fault of those who provide the financing to buy the chemicals, to fly the materials, to energize these deadly destructions and this attempt to bring the peace process to an end.

The world has paid a heavy price for these conflicts. Both the government of Israel and the government of Egypt have paid prices that most countries are shaken to their roots by, losing their leaders, seeing their citizens on a daily basis being the victims of terrorism.

The Palestinian leadership of Yasser Arafat may not be perfect, may not have total control of the West Bank, but it is the only hope for peace at this point. They need to do a better job, but the rest of us need to provide them the support they need.

Western Europe sits back with its continental coolness thinking that somehow it is above the fray. Let me tell the governments in England and France and Germany and others, if you do business with the terrorists in Iran, if you do business with the government of Iran, then the blood of those on the street of Tel Aviv and Jerusalem is on your hands. If the peace process fails, it is on your hands. You cannot simply go on and do business as usual with the single worst government in the Middle East.

For Syria, if it wants to enter the peace process, it has to renounce its support of Hamas and terrorism as well. Before we take you into the family of nations that operates on the legal and respected basis, we need to know that the Syrian leadership is ready to reject its support for terrorism.

War has a terrible price. The cost of peace has been dear as well. We dare not turn away from it. The alternative is so much worse and so much more devastating. But the Israelis and the Palestinians cannot do it alone. They alone cannot succeed in this effort if the richest of all of Western Europe go to Iran and then a portion of that is transferred to terrorists to take their toll on the peace process.

The governments of Israel and Egypt, the leadership of the PLO have made their effort. It is now our turn to support that effort more seriously.

PROPOSED CUTS WILL HURT EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], during this special order to really call some attention to an issue that I think is near and dear to the hearts of every American family, everyone in this country, and that is the whole issue of education and educating our children and providing for our children that opportunity, that first start, if you will, on the road to what their lives will be about in terms of opportunity, of economic ability, their ability to compete, to succeed in this great Nation of ours, something that, in fact, has been part of the American dream.

What we want to try to call attention to in this time period is the fact that there are, as proposed by the congressional majority, devastating cuts to education. In fact,there are cuts that have been passed into law by our Republican colleagues.

Congressional Republicans are on the brink of making the largest education cuts in our Nation's history, and thereby are on the brink of harming, truly harming, our Nation's children. At a time when Americans are rightly anxious about their job security, at a time when we all know that a good education is the key to a good job, we have congressional Republicans who are launching an assault on American education.

Last week, Secretary of Education William Riley delivered his annual state of American education address. In those remarks he said, ''American schools are where the future of America is being created each and every single day.'' That, in fact, is so true about what goes on and is supposed to go on in our American schools.

In fact, public education is the great equalizer in this country. It allows children, all children, regardless of their economic status, to be able to go as far as their God-given talents will allow them.

That is what we are here to talk about, the fact that public education is under attack in this Congress. Ensuring a bright future is a basic part of the job that we have here, Mr. PALLONE's job, my job, each and every Member of the Congress who is given that public trust, to come here. What we need to try to do is to ensure, in fact, a bright future for our children.

Part of our sacred trust as elected officials is to honor those who have come before us, for example, by ensuring that our seniors have a dignified retirement and making the investments in our future so that the generation that comes after us can live a full and a prosperous and a secure life.

Despite this obligation, we have congressional Republicans today who are making times tougher for kids who are trying to get a good education and for their parents, hard-working parents, I might add, who want to see their kids get ahead in life. They are making the largest cuts in the history of Federal aid to education.

The temporary spending measure that they have passed that funds education, what is known as the continuing resolution, cuts basic skills training, which is known as title I, by 17 percent. Funding to keep our schools safe and free of drugs is being cut by 25 percent. Before we can expect our kids to do all of the great things that we wish them to do and they are anxious and excited to do, we need to provide them with some essentials, training in the basic skills, a safe place in which they can learn. But it is in these areas where my Republican colleagues have made the most crippling cuts.

This temporary spending measure expires on March 15 so that Congress will soon have to face a choice. Will my Republican colleagues extend these cuts through the end of the fiscal year, or will they restore the funds that they have taken from America's classrooms?

Let me tell my colleagues about what happens in my State of Connecticut. These cuts spell disaster. Yesterday, I met with parents and educators at a school in my congressional District, and we had represented there both urban schools and suburban schools.

I will tell my colleagues what the parents and the educators are concerned about. They are concerned that these cuts will hurt school kids who are trying to build their basic skills, stay off the streets, and stay away from drugs. Under the Republican proposals for basic skill training, funding

would be cut by $8.6 million in Connecticut, affecting 9,200 needy students. Schools in my district will lose $1.5 million. Under the Safe and Drug Free School Program, $729,000 would be cut in Connecticut.

Let me read a quote from one of the parents who was there yesterday. Carolyn Jackson, who met with me, said the proposed cuts would eliminate students' chances of being competitive. This is her quote.

''They won't make it, they won't be trained, they won't be able to go on to a trade school or to college,'' she said. These after school programs that would be cut keep kids off the streets. It keeps them occupied, it gives them something positive to do. If they cut that out, the only place that they have left to go is to the streets.

□ 1630

The teachers, the administrators, both again from urban and suburban schools, talked about having to cut math and reading programs, remedial programs, programs that provide our young people with being able to be ready to learn when they go to school. If these cuts go through, how, in fact, will we be able to deal with these issues?

Mr. Speaker, what makes these cuts so wrong headed is that our Nation now stands at a crossroads, and I know my colleague, Mr. PALLONE, understands that. We have been listening to and talking to people about if our people in this country do not have the basic skills to compete to win in the global workplace, how can we allow our people, our kids and their futures, to fall further and further behind as they try to compete with low skilled workers around the world for low skilled jobs? That is not what we want to do. We want our young people to have all of the advantages that they need and all of the tools that they need to be able to compete in a world order, in a New World order, to be able to compete right here in the United States so that they can have highly skilled, high paying jobs so that they can make their way for the future.

Getting a good education has always been a big part of what enabled the people of this country to stake their claim in the American dream. My parents, other parents, have worked hard to see that their kids get the opportunities that they need so that they can serve, that they can have good paying jobs. We are taking away this American dream for parents today, but also for youngsters. These cuts will dash that dream for too many of our children.

For generations, as I have said, public education has allowed children, regardless of their economic status, to go as far as their God-given talents will allow, but despite that public education is under attack today in this Congress. This week, as Congress considers a new spending measure for the rest of the year, I urge my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans and Independents, to remember the children in classrooms all over America and their hard-working parents, parents who have bright hopes for their kids' future. Please remember these people. We need to restore the Federal funds that enable our children to make those dreams a reality.

And what I would like to do is to ask my colleague from New Jersey, FRANK PALLONE, to talk about his concerns about this issue and what effect it has in his own community and for us to have a conversation and a dialog about this issue.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleague from Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, for raising this issue again this evening on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I guess you know I approach the education issue from two perspectives in the House.

First of all, I think most people realize that maybe it needs to be stated again that the amount of money that the Federal Government contributes for education is really very minuscule. I think if you look at your local school budget, for example, in the municipalities that any of us represents, you will find maybe 7 or 8 percent of their budget is Federal dollars.

So we are not really talking about a tremendous amount of money that the Federal Government actually does contribute, particularly on the local level, and if that is cut significantly, as is being proposed by the Republicans, then the Federal role, the Federal commitment to education, will even be more minuscule.

The other thing, I think, is a lot of people believe that because of this budget battle that we have had between Democrats and Republicans over the last year and because it is not resolved at this point, perhaps that the status quo continues and that the money continues to flow to local districts for various educational functions, and that is simply not true. As you pointed out, the level of funding under this continuing resolution, if that level of funding were to continue through the rest of this year, would be about a 20-percent cut overall in Federal education funding on every level. That is a significant cut from 1 year to the next, and the impact on local school districts, on colleges and universities will be severe.

Already I know that in my own area State and local officials have told me that they are unable to plan for the coming year in terms of their education budget. They do not know whether or not they can keep as many teachers as they have. They do not know whether or not they can offer certain courses, you know, whether their curriculum is going to change. So this uncertainty, if you will, that exists out there because we are operating under these continuing resolutions, where we have to keep extending the funding every 2 weeks or every month or so, really is having a terribly negative impact on the ability for local and State officials to plan for educational purposes over the next year.

The other thing that I guess disappoints me a great deal is that if you think about the effort that President Clinton has made in trying to highlight education, when he was first elected and in the first few years of his administration he established a number of initiatives on the Federal level that really have already started to make a difference in terms of improving education at every level, and those initiatives are right now very much in limbo because of the Republican leadership budget.

I just wanted to mention a couple of them because, for example, the National Service Program, which allows students to work in the community when they are in college and then use the money that they earn to pay for their college tuition or their college education. He actually came to Rutgers University, which is in my district, and announced that program a couple of years ago, and Rutgers and students in my district have taken advantage of that to the hilt. I mean basically it was a supplemental program where right now you can get some grants for scholarships, you can get some student loans from the Federal Government. But this now allows a whole other area where I think you can earn up to about $4,000 a year, which is a significant amount of money, you know, given the cost of tuition and the cost of higher education today, and the community benefits because the students are back in the community working either in hospitals or on environmental projects or in schools, whatever it happens to be. And this is the program, this National Service or AmeriCorps, which the Republican leadership wants to eliminate outright. Their budget actually just kills the program completely.

The other thing is if goal 2000——

Ms. DELAURO. Let me just interrupt my colleague for a second because I think the AmeriCorps Program is a perfect example of how we have, how they have, our values backward, what AmeriCorps is all about, and just to say that about 691 young people in Connecticut would be denied the opportunity to participate in the National Service Program if the funding is eliminated.

But this says to young people you have an obligation to give back to your community. You need to participate in the life of your community, get involved with helping, whether it is in education, or in health, or in some other area, because if we are going to provide you with some help, you have got to do something for that. This is not, you know, just without any kind of responsibility. This is a way in which we try to instill responsibility in our people.

And so many times today you hear from people about we do have, in whatever segment, if it is for young people,

with adults or so forth, that people just do not have the responsibility that they had in the past, they do not take on areas where they need to demonstrate that they are willing to put their heart and soul into something, but they only want to grab a handout and not give something in return.

This program epitomizes the values of work, responsibility, and community, and if you engage in those ways, then, yes, we will give you a tool, if you will, to help you meet your goals. But it is a two-way street. This is not just one way, and this is what is so incomprehensible, that on one side of their mouth they want to talk about how we want to stop this handout for people, which is right. But they also want to take away the opportunity for young people to contribute as well as to be able to engage and to move forward with their own objectives, and that is wrong.

We need to have people be responsible and take on a direction or an acton and get involved before we are willing to do something for them.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely, and I think you are pointing it out, and again this is not pie in the sky. I have talked to students, as I know you have, college students who were involved in these various national service programs, and they are working, and they are in the schools, out in the community, they are in hospials. They are doing all kinds of things.

The other thing that the President established was the direct loan program. Now again maybe it sounds a little bureaucratic, but it is important because again Rutgers University in my district has taken advantage of it where traditionally student loans, when I was in college and until recently, you had to go to the bank, and the Government would guarantee the loan. Well, some of the universities, including Rutgers, went to the administration and to the Congress and said, look, if we administer this program directly, if the money comes directly to us and the students apply directly for the student loans from us, then we eliminate the middle person, if you will, and we can expand opportunities and give out a lot more direct loans.

Ms. DELAURO. Costs you less money.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly, and they started it on an experimental basis at certain colleges and universities, Rutgers being one of the first, and at Rutgers it expanded the number of student loans that they can give out. Now all of a sudden we are hearing as a part of this budget that they want to cap the direct loan program, I think it is at 10 percent, and not allow it to be expanded to other colleges and universities.

In my district, my college, for example, which was a 4-year institution, would not be able to establish a direct loan program under this Republican budget or proposal, and again it makes no sense. I mean it is essentially nothing but a special interest effort to say let us go back to the old way where the middleman, the banker, or financial institution, makes the money and no one is proposing that this makes any sense. It is certainly going to make it harder to get a loan for individual college students and obviously eliminate a lot of opportunities that students would have to be able to go to college. It makes no sense.

Ms. DELAURO. Let me just comment on that one because I think that there is—you made a very, very good point, which is that they are willing to do harm to young people who want to again further their education and go to college, hurt working families who are struggling to get their kids to school. I could not have gone to school without student loans. My folks could not have afforded it. This was, you know, they killed themselves to, you know, to see me through college and to utilize the student loan program to do that. But it is doing harm. But at the same time, and particularly with this one, is to cater to a special interest because the banks are up in arms about the direct lending program.

Mr. PALLONE. They are not——

Ms. DELAURO. Because they are not going to make their percentage. That is what this is about. This is not saying to hard-working middle class families you get the advantage, you get the incentive. Banks are doing OK. They can live without this. We want to give you a break, Mr. and Mrs. America. You want to have your kids get ahead. Do not take it away from hard-working families to cater to special interests and wind up hurting the family and the youngster.

In that program in the State of Connecticut we will see 14 schools forced out of the direct lending program, losing over 14,000 loans.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly.

Ms. DELAURO. And an opportunity for people and young people.

Mr. PALLONE. And again what we are really talking about here is the recognition of the fact that today, unlike maybe 10 or 20 years ago, it takes a lot more money to go to college, and so if you do not have a national service program, if you do not have direct loans, if you do not have innovative ways of trying to pay for college tuition, you are not going to be able to make it.

Now, the President in his State of the Union Address talked about families, parents, being able to pay up to $10,000 in tuition for their students and that that would be tax deductible. As you know, in the process of this budget debate the Republicans and the Democrats have talked about some sort of tax cuts or tax breaks. But again I would suggest that if you look at the tax breaks suggested by the Republican leadership, they are mostly for large corporations and for the well-to-do, whereas the President now is saying here again education is a major issue. If we allow that kind of tax deductibility, it expands the ability of parents to help pay their kids' education, and if we are going to do any kind of tax cut or tax break, that should be the kind of tax cut or break that we should institute because it is an investment in the future of the country.

□ 1645

Ms. DELAURO. That makes enormous sense, Mr. Speaker, because it is probably one of the areas that most parents are worried about, after a job or the increase in their wages, because they have not seen a raise for a number of years. But if you could target the tax cut to working families, to take the education costs as a deduction, it makes enormous sense.

What you are seeking in that tax break package at the moment is that the richest corporations are winding up with the elimination of the alternate minimum tax getting a windfall again. You are seeing that special interest effort do very, very well. That is a $17 billion windfall for the richest corporations, if you will eliminate the alternate minimum tax.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, to try to make it a little easier for working families to be able to see some realization of their dreams and their aspirations for themselves and for their children, this is the direction that we ought to go in. On that score, it is my hope that we will have an agenda over the next several months where we will introduce legislation in this body here, and that we can get it on the floor for a vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Again, I do not want to prolong this, but we talked about higher education. If you talk about primary and second, as I pointed out before, the Federal contribution to local education is not very much in dollars. It is about 7 percent or 8 percent of the budget. But the Federal Government has traditionally, and again, President Clinton has talked about trying to create incentive programs that will basically try to improve the quality of education, with the few Federal dollars that go to the local districts.

One of the areas that he has been a champion of is Goals 2000. Basically, this is where you set standards, if you will, for the quality of education, for curricula, whatever, within the school, and then you give the schools, on a competitive basis, a certain amount of Federal dollars to try to implement some changes, some innovations, that would improve the standards of the curriculum or the education. That, again, is something that is significantly cut back, almost eliminated in the Republican leadership budget.

The other thing is that traditionally the Federal Government, I guess for at least 10 years or more now, has been involved in providing new equipment or high-technology type things, whether it is computers or ways of trying to improve the sciences; things that, as you know, many schools simply cannot afford to buy that kind of high-technology equipment or whatever, because

they do not have the budget for it. Again, that is another area where there are significant cuts that are being proposed, and the President is talking about trying to come up with some innovations.

Ms. DELAURO. Yesterday when I went to visit the school I was in three kindergarten classes. You just see these little bits of kids, it was just astounding; there they are, in terms of the equipment, and they have these computers in front of them, and they are there with their earphones or their listening program, where they are listening to the story in order to prepare them to move on.

But these kids with the computers, it is just really mind-boggling. There they are with the mouse going back and forth, and several of them were showing people how they were learning the alphabet, and they had the letter D, and then they were using the computer to point to a deer or a duck, and so forth, or using a C and pointing to a cake and so forth.

Here they are, again, these little bits of kids, getting proficient in a technology which is our future, but it is their future more than it is ours. Why are we trying to be in the business of taking away these tools from them?

One program that I wanted to mention was something called School-to-Work. The heart and soul is being cut out of the School-to-Work Program. This is a program that says to young people who are seniors in high school, who do not want to, cannot afford to, or maybe do not have the skills to go on to a 4-year liberal arts college, and God knows, we probably have enough history and English majors to last us a lifetime, but these young people want to go on from school to work. They want to be gainfully employed, they want to get some skills.

This program has allowed that bridge from school to work, really, the first piece of legislation that in so many years has recognized the aspirations of these young people, and their dreams of moving from school to work, without having a 4-year college education. That is truly the fate of most of our young people in this country. The largest percentage do not go on to a 4-year college.

But this program is going to be cut and decimated, and we just say one more time to these young people, ''Sorry, you really do not make any difference. Do it on your own.'' Why are we not in the business of trying to provide a bridge from school to work; again, responsibility? ''We will give you some tools so you can carry out what you need to make your way.''

We cannot do it for you. That is not what anybody is saying here, nor should we. We do not have the resources to do that. But how do we enable young people to move ahead? This is a program that works, it is gaining all kinds of endorsements from the academic communities, from the business community, because they are seeing the fruits of the labor here, because they are getting these kids who are well-trained, who have the skills, who can make it in their jobs. Now we are saying, ''Sorry, we are just going to close the door on this effort.'' It is wrongheaded. It really is wrongheaded.

Mr. PALLONE. You talked about programs that work. Just the last one that I wanted to mention, of course, even earlier is the Head Start Program, preschool Head Start Program, because from 1992 to 1995, which is, of course, the span of the current administration, we have had an increase of 130,000 children that were able to participate in the Head Start Program over the last 3 years, because we were expanding a very successful program, which is enjoying—it really had support under President Bush, President Reagan, as well as President Clinton and President Carter. It has always been very bipartisan. Now all of a sudden this Republican leadership budget would deny Head Start benefits to 180,000 children over the next few years. So again, we are talking about misplaced priorities here.

When I go out of my district, when I am in the State of New Jersey and I talk to people, they all tell me that education is paramount. Everyone understands that. I really for the life of me do not understand why the Republican leadership in this House does not get it. Education is crucial. If we are going to start talking about cutting education 20 percent here over the next fiscal year, it just makes no sense. It is totally out of sync with what the American people want.

Ms. DELAURO. Just in terms of translating that 20 percent, and I think you have made the excellent point that there is a minuscule amount of Federal aid in education—sometimes people do not realize that or understand that—from this minuscule amount of money, we are looking at, roughly, if things continue the way they are with this, at this level, we are looking at about a $3.1 billion cut from those funds. We are looking overall, in terms of the college loan programs, you know, at almost $5 billion over the next few years in terms of cutbacks in college loans, to say nothing of what is going on in the Pell Grant Program. In the Pell Grant Program, what they did, the bill eliminates assistance to students who qualify for grants of less than $600; about 250,000 students in this Nation are going to be eliminated from the program.

Perkins loans. Again, these are not great amounts of money that are being put in play at the moment, but the removing of that kind of money has an unbelievable effect on how many young people can look to a brighter future.

I think you would agree with me that we are at a crossroads. We truly are at a crossroads, because we have never seen the level of cuts in education that we are seeing today. Education has always been the way for people to expand their horizons, move forward, and have a brighter future. That has been true with succeeding generations.

This is the first time in the history of this country that if you talk to American families, working families, that today they do not see a bright future for their kids. They do not believe that their kids will have the same kinds of advantages that they had. That is a sad commentary on what our values are in this Nation and what our priorities are.

So that there is a full-scale assault, whether it is on Head Start and you are looking at preschool programs, readiness; whether it is in a school lunch program that they would like to away with; whether it is in a summer jobs program that is being cut out so kids can make some money, go back to school, and then, again, demonstrate some responsibility; whether it is in education, skills training, and school-to-work, or whether it is in moving kids forward in terms of higher education.

I do not understand it. I think it is outrageous. My hope will be in the next 2 weeks, as we discuss what is going to happen before March 15, that when it comes to the issue of education, that we are not about the business of doing harm, and doing harm for the special interests of this Nation, but that we are in the business of doing what people sent us here to do. That is to do something for the public good and particularly for the kids and for the future of the youngsters in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for joining with me this evening. I am sure that we will be engaged in this conversation over the next few weeks.

Mr. PALLONE. Absolutely.

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

[Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereinafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1823

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. MCINNIS) at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION VITAL TO RESPOND TO TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we are now in our second week following the recess, a recess where every Member had an opportunity to consult with his constituents, and I think that most of the Members had the same kind of experience that I had. That was an experience of talking with constituents who displayed in their commonsense reasoning far greater wisdom than is often displayed here in this institution.

This body seems to have lost touch with common sense. Common sense of the people says clearly that education is a No. 1 priority. They have been telling us this in many ways for the last 5 years. For the last 5 years, education as a spending priority has ranked in the top five priorities as designated by the American people in public opinion polls. They clearly have shown that education is very important.

Seventy-two percent of the people recently interviewed said that if there are going to be cuts made in the Federal Government, then the cuts should not be in education. Education should not be one of the areas where you streamline or downsize. They clearly stated that this was not desirable.

We have common sense repeating over and over again what ought to be clear to everybody that is in a decisionmaking position in Government. We have a crisis.

We have a situation that ought to be clear by now, where technological change is escalating. Technological change, the telecommunications revolution, the information age revolution are all upon us. As they take hold, it is quite clear that we need more and more educated people. It is quite clear that the people who are educated now need to have an upgrading and different changes in their education.

In order to meet the present upheaval, in order to be able to deal with it, the minimum need is a massive education and job training program. Common sense tells us we need a massive education and job training program. Without any further research, that is quite clear.

Nobody knows where this technological information is going, this age of information, the age of telecommunications. Nobody can really predict where it is going to go and what we should do. Nobody can lay out a detailed plan as to exactly where we are going to be able to take hold of the situation and not have it wreck our economy.

It is a revolution that is displacing large numbers of workers. We have seen large numbers of blue collar workers displaced over the last 20 years, but now we have the middle-management workers, clerical workers. Large numbers of them are being displaced, certainly temporarily dislocated, and there is no solution in sight to this.

Large amounts of money are being made in a booming economy. The economy is booming if we look at it in general. These are very prosperous times. So if in very prosperous times we are losing large numbers of jobs and there is a great deal of dislocation and upheaval in the job market, then what is going to happen if we fall into a recession and the boom is no longer there? We have a boom which is unprecedented, in that profits are higher than ever on Wall Street, and yet at the same time people are less secure than ever before. More jobs are being lost than ever before.

I would certainly call to the attention of all the Members of this House an article which is must reading. It is a series of articles that started in the Sunday New York Times, March 3 New York Times. It is called, ''On the Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties.'' That is the title for this particular article which is the beginning of the series: ''On The Battlefields of Business, Millions of Casualties.''

This is a series which is called ''The Downsizing of America'' and this is the first of 7 articles. It is must reading for all Americans, must reading for decisionmakers in Washington, and must reading for Members of the House, because it talks about mostly middle-class people, mostly people who were employed as of 2 or 3 years ago in very good jobs, and the kind of suffering they are going through and have gone through as a result of this technological escalation, the age of computers and telecommunications displacing large numbers of people.

It has not yet moved to the point where they are offering remedies, but I think previous editorials in the New York Times and a few other of our leading newspapers have quite clearly come down on the side of more education. Nobody understands all that has to be done, as I said before, but everybody who is thinking about the problem clearly understands that there will have to be a greater amount of investment in education, a greater amount of investment in job training. It is self-evident. If the experts cannot see what is self-evident, then certainly the common sense of the American people has repeatedly reinforced and underlined the fact that it is self-evident to them that we need a greater investment in education and a greater investment in job training.

National security now must be defined not in terms of our military strength and not in terms of our economic prowess, but the things that support that military strength, economic prowess, leadership in the world. Underneath it is an educated populace. Nothing is more important than an educated populace. Nothing is more important for the security of the country.

□ 1830

Nothing is more important to the quality of life in the country. Nothing is more important in terms of maintaining our central humanity than a massive investment in education.

Instead of a massive investment in education which is going forward, this present Congress is proposing that we disinvest, that we deescalate, that we downsize the commitment in education. Part of that disinvestment argument is that the Federal Government should get out of the business of education.

We have had the Republican majority propose that the Education Department be totally dismantled, that we get rid of the Department of Education. They put zero in one of the budgets for the Department of Education.

You know, no sane industrialized nation walks away from its commitment to education to that extent. Every industrialized nation, on the other hand, really has a far greater commitment to education at the central government level. There is not a single industrialized nation that does not have a substantial commitment to education, and it is reflected in some kind of single government coordinating body at the top, whether they basically are highly centralized, as they are in Japan and Germany, France, or whether they are moving away from a centralized model and having more flexibility and greater innovation at the local level, as they are in Great Britain, and they still have very strong centralized departments of education to give some kind of guidance and direction.

In this country, traditionally we have had a strong central department of education. I am certainly not advocating that we have one now. I am not advocating that we go to the other extreme, that we have zero, nothing, because our involvement at the central government level in education is minimal. At its very height, when the Department of Education was even funded at a higher level than it is funded at now, we had a very minimal commitment to education at the central level, and the operation of education in this Nation remains in the hands of local education agencies and local school boards. It still does.

Our commitment to education at this point at the Federal level is less than 8 percent of the total amount spent on education, 8 percent of the total. You know, more than $360 billion was spent on education last year, and of that $360 billion, most of it was spent by State governments and local governments.

Only 7 percent, between 7 and 8 percent, was provided by the Federal Government. A large part of that 7 to 8 percent provided by the Federal Government comes in the form of commitments to higher education through the loan programs and grant programs at the higher education level. So, when you are talking about Federal commitment to education at the elementary and secondary level to the schools across America, you know, at the local school boards and local school districts, you are talking about a very minimal commitment. That minimal commitment, however, sets a tone. It sets a direction, a sense of direction, a sense of tone. It has been very important in the last 10 to 15 years in stimulating reform, in stimulating more activity that is positive at the local and State level.

The fact that our national government, the Federal Government, now is choosing to back away from that commitment and to downsize and to cut education at the Federal level has set off a domino reaction at the State levels and at the local levels to cut education fiercely in some places, and in my home State of New York, large cuts are being proposed in education aid from the State to the city of New York and in the upstate district also, but greatly the cut impacts most on the city of New York.

In the city of New York itself, the city government, the mayor has waged a war against the board of education, and in his attempt to balance the budget of the city, the board of education is being made to pay a higher price than most other city agencies.

So, what started at the Federal level has set off a chain reaction which has been carried through devastating proportions at the State and local level. I give New York as an example, but across the country this phenomenon has taken hold in most big States. There are cutbacks in most big cities. There are cutbacks, and we are going in just the opposite direction than we should be going. There should be an escalation of investment and an escalation of activities in the area of education, and we are going in just the opposite direction.

Today the Education and Economic Opportunity Committee, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunity, what we used to call the Education and Labor Committee; the new Republican majority went to great lengths to take out the word ''labor,'' not have ''labor'' appear anywhere. I am glad they at least left ''education'' in the title of the committee; the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Democratic members held a hearing, a forum, you cannot actually call it a hearing; it was a frustration forum, because out of frustration, the Democrats had to set aside time and recruit witnesses for an unusual kind of exercise. It was not an official hearing, because the people that we have sought to call for all of the official hearings have not been accepted by the majority. In fact, the majority, not following the tradition and the pattern set by the Democratic majority, which always allowed a reasonable number of witnesses from the minority in ration to the majority witnesses, the majority has chosen to limit the minority, the Democratic minority has been limited in our committee to no more than one witness at each hearing. You know, one witness has been all we have been limited to as we proceeded to discuss revolutionary changes in education, and even the number of hearings has been limited.

The hearings that are stacked in favor of the majority witnesses and opinions that are only favored by the majority have been all too few. So we are proposing revolutionary changes, gigantic budget cuts, changes in structure, elimination of the Department of Education, the restructuring of the School Lunch Program, the restructuring of the careers program, total revamping of education for individuals with Disabilities Act, all of those sweeping changes have been proposed and are under way without any reasonable number of hearings.

We have spat upon the democratic process. We have just denigrated the democratic process, which at least called for an opportunity for controversial ideas and new proposals to be discussed. The Republican majority has not permitted that.

So we had to have our own hearing out of frustration, and large numbers of people were called on one day, kind of an overwhelming enterprise that we had to undertake today. I do not recall exactly how many witnesses, but I think there were more than 20, 20 witnesses called by five panels, and some of the witnesses, of course, were outstanding spirits, outstanding philosophers, outstanding advocates for education. We are quite proud of the fact that we finally had the opportunity to have them go on record in this very critical year of decisionmaking.

This is a critical year of decisionmaking because even through the Republican majority has not been able to go through the usual democratic legislative procedure and work its will, they have not been able to get many of the revolutionary changes they wanted passed. They have chosen the appropriations route, the budget-making and appropriations route, to work their will. They cannot get the reauthorization of certain laws. They cannot get many of the items that they passed at the level of the House of Representatives passed in the other body. So they have turned to the appropriations process and legislate through the denial of funds to certain activities, denial of funds to the Department of Education, cutting back at a certain level, the denial of funds to title I.

You do not like title I, you do not have the opportunity to get ride of it fully, revamp it in the way you want it, so you cut it be $1.1 billion, about a 25 percent cut. And you follow that pattern with other programs. Even Head Start, which is frowned upon unfavorably by certain sectors of the Republican majority, and Head Start gets the first cut in the history of the program. Ronald Reagan did not cut Head Start. He increased the amount of funds for Head Start. George Bush did not cut Head Start. No President has cut Head Start. Only now does the Republican majority in the House venture to cut Head Start by $300 million.

Summer Youth Employment Program, which is on the border between education and job training, very important for education because it sends a positive message to the young people during the summer. They can be employed. It says to them that their Government cares something about them. It has been program that has been cut down, whittled down over the years.

Ten years ago, in New York City, 90,000 young people were employed in the summer youth employment program. Last year, 32,000 were employed. It has been steadily cut down to lower and lower levels over the years. Now we do not know what is going to be funded for the coming summer or not. There is a shadow over it. It is in the continuing resolution, like everything else, but when it is not mentioned specifically, it say it is funded at 75 percent of last year's level. In the case of the Summer Youth Employment Program, we cannot really determine what last year's level is, because there was a move to phase out the program, and the amount of funds appropriated was an amount needed administratively to phase it out. So there is a big question mark.

This is March 5. Summer youth employment programs usually go into motion sometime this month in terms of administrative planning, the recruitment, et cetera. As of March 5, we do not really know what is going to happen in the Summer Youth Employment Program.

We have, through the budget process, through the back door, been able to Whittle down very critical education programs. We have done all of this, as I said before, without going through the democratic legislative process. We have treated the process with great contempt.

To compensate for the contempt that the majority has shown for the democratic process, the Democrats on the committee called today's forum, which is, again, not an official hearing. It does not have minutes and records of the same type as we have in official hearings. It does not or did not have both parties there, and only the Democrats were there. So it is not a substitute for what should have happened. But it is an opportunity or was an opportunity for people who have opinions, people who are advocates, people who have been around a long time who have experience. They should have their voices heard in this process of changing education radically.

The radical changes are unnecessary. I always frowned on radical approaches when they are not necessary. Revolution is a dangerous operation always. Revolution, things can always get more chaotic and more people can end up suffering if you take the revolutionary route. So, revolution should only be undertaken when it is necessary. It is not necessary to have a revolution in education, however bad things may be. We were moving forward in an evolutionary way.

I think proposals that have been on the table for a long time, made a lot of sense, starting with the Republican President, George Bush, and his proposal for America 2000 and his establishment of the six goals, the Clinton program of Goals 2000, are not so far from the Bush Program of American 2000. There was some continuity. Democratic Governors and Democratic legislators were involved in both processes. All of that was moving forward.

Standards were being established which were first proposed by the Republican administration, and they are now being established under a Democratic administration. We did not need a revolution.

The evolutionary process needed to be speeded up. The evolutionary process needed to have some resources put behind it. All of the structural changes were not being accompanied by proposals to increase the investment. We needed more money. You know, to keep changing the structure and playing with standards to institute new evaluations and do all the kinds of things that are proposed in the Goals 2000 legislation does not really allow education to be impacted in the way it should be impacted.

During the process of these negotiations and discussions on Goals 2000 last year, not last year, year before last, when the Democrats were in the majority, during those discussions we had long debates about opportunity to learn standards. Everybody was interested in standards for teaching the subject matter. Everybody was interested in standards for testing. But we talked about opportunity to learn standards, and opportunity to learn standards means that you have to provide the resources for young people to be able to measure up to the standards that are the educational standards and to be able to pass the tests.

If you do not have science equipment, then do not ask youngsters to pass a test which is a strenuous test about science if they do not have science equipment, if they do not have the books, if you do not have the necessary physical plant. We have many schools across the country where it is just unsafe to have young people in the schools, let alone they do not have proper lighting, they do not have proper ventilation. We have asbestos, in many cases, still around when it should not be around, unsafe school as well as schools that are not conducive to study.

□ 1845

All of those factors we try to build into the standard setting process. There is a great debate, and we had a compromise. At least the phrase ''opportunity to learn'' is built into the standards.

If you follow the course of action proposed by Goals 2000 and deal with standards for curriculum, course content, you deal with standards for evaluation and have some kind of uniformity so you can compare from one district and one State to another. And if you deal with standards for opportunity to learn, if you move in that way, then you put some funding behind the opportunity to learn standards. You have to have some money. You need more money for science equipment, you need money for books. We have libraries in New York that have books that are 35 years old, history books that are 35 years old. What can you teach a youngster from a history book that is 35 years old that is going to allow them to really deal with 1996 and history standards being promulgated for the rest of the country, where the rest of the country has books that are up to date.

So in numerous ways, investment is needed. You need to put money behind the effort. Among the people testifying today at our forum was the distinguished author, Jonathan Kozol. Mr. Kozol has written many books, and I think the most famous and current of the two is ''Amazing Grace.'' Before ''Amazing Grace'' is his recent book which was released last year, before that a book called ''Savage Inequalities.'' I think that there is no more appropriately entitled book than ''Savage Inequalities.''

Mr. Kozol spent the day with us, since he testified. In fact, he is here right now in the audience. I think nothing was more penetrating than his statement that you cannot keep asking the question that most conservatives use. The favorite statement of the Republican majority, the favorite evasion of the Republican majority, the favorite evasion of the Republican majority, is ''You can't solve educational problems by throwing money at them. You can't solve the problems related to urban education by throwing money at them.''

One is supposed to cringe and fall back in the face of that kind of statement and apologize for asking for more money. I think Mr. Kozol made it quite clear that the answer to that statement is, Oh, yes, you can. Oh, yes, you must. You must have more money, more resources applied to the problem, or you definitely will not solve it.

We do not try to solve any other problems in this Nation or this society without the appropriate resources. I think this country would sort of applaud itself for its high-technology military machine that we have, a military unlike any that the world has ever seen. We are continuing to perfect that high-technology military machine. We are throwing a lot of money at that. We have thrown billions and billions of dollars at the military in order to have the military solve problems and come up with some gadgets that nobody really needs and continue to throw money at the military. We are building another *Seawolf* submarine in Connecticut, and the only justification for that submarine is we want to keep the technology alive. We want to keep the workers' ability to deal with that technology current and alive. That is the justification for building another *Seawolf* submarine, which costs $2.1 billion. We are throwing $2.1 billion at a problem that is really not a problem anymore, because we already have enough *Seawolf* submarines.

The Soviet Union does not exist anymore and is not building new submarines. We are throwing money at it. That is a problem that the establishment, a problem that the people who are hypocritical about streamlining the budget, choose to designate as a problem. So they throw money at it.

We are throwing money in the sky at F–22 fighter planes. In Marietta, GA, the Speaker's district, we are building F–22 fighter planes that are not needed. There are high-technology fighter planes unlike anything the world has ever seen. We already have the best fighter planes in the world. We already have fighter planes that nobody is challenging. The Soviet Union is not building any new fighter planes to challenge the ones we have.

Why do we have to throw money at the problem of high-technology fighter planes? But we are throwing money at it at Marietta, GA. It might not be a problem we need to throw money at to solve the problem. By throwing money at the F–22's in Marietta, GA, in the Speaker's district, we are certainly solving the problem of employment in that district. That district happens to be the district that receives the greatest amount of Federal aid in the country. The county that the Speaker represents receives the greatest amount of money per capita of any county in the whole country. So by throwing money in that direction, we certainly are solving a problem of prosperity and employment in that country.

So why not provide appropriate resources, or even, if you must have a phrase, throw money at education, if you want to solve the problem of education? We need money to build schools, because some of them are literally unsafe and falling down. Many of them are, if not unsafe, are not conducive to learning. We need money to throw at that problem and get new schools built.

Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN and I introduced a bill 2 years ago which would provide for the introduction of a program just to repair dilapidated schools and maybe build a few. It was passed in the Senate she even got an authorization of $600 million, which is a small amount when you are considering physical renovations and construction. But the other body passed it.

Later on they cut that down to $100 million, and it passed both the Senate and the House in the reauthorized legislation that we passed in the fall of 1994, before the Republican majority took over in January 1995.

That money has been totally wiped out of the budget, $100 million to deal with asbestos problems, to deal with lead in the water, to deal with unsafe conditions, $100 million zeroed out completely. It is not even under discussion anymore.

We needed to throw money at the problem of asbestos and lead in the water. We needed to throw money at unsafe conditions in certain schools.

So I want to salute Mr. Jonathan Kozol today when he said,

> Despite all that we face in education, we face the strange phenomena of being asked repeatedly by those who spend as much as $20,000 yearly to enroll their children in exclusive private schools, whether money really matters when it comes to the education of the poor. Can you solve these kinds of problems, we are asked, by throwing money at them?

I think that no more appropriate statement could be made than to begin the dialog on whether Americans in decisionmaking positions are serious about wanting a society which is a fair society, a society which is feasible in terms of being able to maintain a sense of justice and some kind of law and order that everybody can live with.

To continue from Mr. Kozol's testimony,

> I always find this a strange question, but especially when it is asked by those who do precisely this for their own children. Money cannot do everything in life. It cannot buy decency. It obviously does not buy honesty or generosity of spirit. But if the goal is to repair a roof or to install a wiring system or remove lead poison or to pay for a computer or persuade a first-rate teacher to remain in a tough job. I think money is a fine solution. Money is a fine solution.

If money is a solution for the military machine, then why is it not a solution for the building of a society where the most important resource is an educated population? An educated population is the most important resource of a great power.

Mr. Kozol goes on to point out that many people use as an example some urban district somewhere which has a high per capita education expenditure, but is not working. This is using an example of why money does not solve problems.

I doubt if you can find three or four education systems where you have a higher amount of money being spent per capita than is being spent in the suburban districts across the country. Where people have money, they choose to spend large amounts on their schools. There per capita rates are much higher.

In New York State, the highest per capita rate is $17,000 per pupil. That is only one district. Many other districts spend $12,000, $11,000, $10,000 on their schools per pupil. In New York City they barely eke out $7,000 per year per child. When studies are done on how the $7,000 per child per year is spent, there is a clear indication that it is lopsided from one district to another. New York City has a student body of 1 million pupils, 60,000 to 65,000 teachers. It is a mammoth system, shifting things around. You will find the poorest neighborhoods and the lowest grades which have the most difficulty in teaching children have the least amount of resources. They are not spending $7,000 per child simply because the biggest expenditure in any budget is the personnel budget. The personnel budget is driven by the length of time that teachers are in the system. The districts which have the children which need the help most, they have the least experienced teachers, because they have the most difficult school systems, difficult jobs. Many teachers, as soon as they qualify for tenure, they move out of those districts, they get transfers, so you have an ongoing condition where the districts that need the help most and the best teachers have the least experienced teachers. The most experienced teachers move out, and subsequently the amount of money being spent per child is lower and lower in the districts that need the most expenditures.

That is just one basic phenomena which explains expenditure difference, even in a city where the average is $7,000 per child. You have in the poorest districts, in Brownsville, which is in my district, or the South Bronx, which is in Congressman SERRANO's district, you will have the expenditure down as low as $3,000 per child, because of these disparities in personnel salaries.

So it is far too low in many cases, and in many cases, of course, there are always ways in which you can improve the distribution.

So I want to go back to the basic thesis, is if we are in times which require greater and greater amounts of education, where individuals cannot survive, families cannot survive unless they have wage earners who do have exceptional education, wage earners who have the kind of education which allows them to fit into this high-tech telecommunications information age society, we need those people, and the only way you are going to get those people is to have an education system which allows them the opportunity to get the kind of education necessary to qualify for these jobs.

This is something that planners have understood for a long time, professors in universities have understood a long time. The people in the street understand it, too. They keep crying. They cry out for more and more resources to be devoted to education. Whenever they are asked a question or given an opportunity to express their opinion, they make it quite clear that education ought to be one of the highest priorities in Federal expenditures.

We keep ignoring them. It is amazing how we just turn our back on the will of the people in a democracy. The great question is when are the people going to wake up and understand that they have the power? They have the power, if they really believe that education is a priority and it has been that way for the last 5 years, it is ranked in the top four or five. Health care was once a priority 3 or 4 years ago, but education was No. 2 or No. 3. Recently the New York Times and USA Today and some others did polls which show that education had eclipsed everything. It was at the very top for a while, over health care, over crime. So people keep telling us again and again that their commonsense knowledge tells them that we ought to be investing more in education. But we refuse to do it. We let these savage inequalities that Jonathan Kozol talks about, savage inequalities that are destroying young people, continue year in and year out. We are reminded of Shakespeare's words in King Lear, ''Fool me not so much to bear it tamely; touch me with noble anger,'' which in street language means somebody ought to get mad, ought to get very mad.

□ 1900

This is rotten. Smells to high heaven. Why are our mayors cutting education when the people said that education should be the highest priority expenditure? Why are Governors cutting education when the people in the States said education ought to be the highest priority? Why does our Federal Government insist on cutting education when the people across the Nation said education should be the highest priority? What is going on? What is going on in our democracy?

Somebody ought to get very mad, and I hope that every parent, every person who cares about America, will understand that we ought to get angry at decisionmaking which completely ignores priorities that are set by the people. Education is that clear priority.

We had testifying today Deputy Secretary of Education Madeleine Kunin, and she only echoed what the other witnesses had said before. I quote from the testimony of Deputy Secretary Kunin:

> As Secretary Riley and I meet with parents, students and business and community leaders around the country, we hear what you hear, that education is America's top priority because it is America's greatest concern. The public understands what education means for our children's future and for the future of our Nation. As they see companies downsizing, their own jobs threatened or lost, they look around and they see who is left standing: the men and women with the highest computer and technical skills.

In short, Americans are seeing that the greatest job security belongs to those who have the best and most advanced education. Education is the currency of the future.

I continue to quote Deputy Secretary Kunin. ''As the President has often said, how much you learn determines what you earn.'' Few Americans argue with that conclusion.

Many Americans, however, argue with the approach that the majority in Congress has taken in cutting support for education at the very moment when the demand for higher and more education by all Americans is growing at an unprecedented rate. Demand is growing on two fronts. Sheer numbers tell part of the story. We are going to be educating more children in elementary and secondary education than ever before. We expect growth to increase by a million students next year, nearly 6 million students by the year 2005, a 10 percent increase nationwide, including a 22 percent increase in California alone.

Continuing to quote Deputy Secretary Kunin:

> Just to imagine present class sizes, which already are too large, 50,000 new teachers will have to be hired for the coming school year. Fifty thousand new teachers have to be hired just to keep up with the growing numbers. If we want to move to improve the ratio of teachers to students and have lower class sizes, smaller classes, then of course we would need more than 50,000 new teachers.

To continue to quote Secretary Kunin:

> Today every student has to reach here or his full potential. No mind can be wasted. Without a high school degree today, you can't earn a decent living. Even with a high school degree, you have a tough time in the job market. K–12 is becoming K–14 as technical schools and community colleges are providing first-generation college students with the skill they want and they need. Our ability to meet this avalanche of demand for education depends on support from all levels of government aimed at providing better educational opportunities for children. All those who have an impact on education must join hands. Together we must build this village in which to raise our children. There is no time for the politics of blame or for demonizing the Federal Government.

It is hard to understand why the majority in Congress would decrease resources in the face of rising demand for education. the House appropriations bill would create a massive education deficit, and among the victims would be our children and our Nation's future. Their cuts are in the areas of highest priority to the American people: support for basic skills, safe and drug-free schools, raising standards, better training for teachers, getting technology into the classroom, and access to college and post-secondary education.

To continue to quote the Deputy Secretary:

> For example, the House-approved appropriations bill would take away $3.7 billion from education. That is for one year, the coming fiscal year. Sadly, the loss of these funds will have the greatest impact on children who need to read better, who want to prepare for a career, and who may attend schools where standards are still low, and these children can catch up and do well if they are given extra help, the extra help that they need.

Why should we take this chance away from them? Indeed, the purpose of title I programs is to help these needy children succeed. How odd it is then that this program takes such a big hit in the budget fight. Education takes a 17-percent cut across the board. In some communities with a high percentage of poor children, the impact of this cut will be as high as 25 percent. If these cuts are enacted, some 40,000 to 50,000 aides and teachers will have to be let go. The Washington jargon, continuing resolution it is called, has a different meaning for the children served by these aides and teachers. For them it is a discontinuing resolution, stopping their education just when many were getting started.

Let me give you a few examples of what these cuts mean in classrooms across this country. ''Last year I was in California,'' I am quoting Madeleine Kunin, Deputy Secretary of the Department of Education:

> Last year I was in California meeting with San Francisco School Superintendent Bill Rojas and mayor Willie Brown. They told me that these cuts would force elimination of 12 schools from the title I program, affecting 4,162 students who need to learn the basics to pass and get ahead. The remaining schools of the title I program could face the elimination, would face the elimination of teacher aides, library staff, computer labs, and the gutting of reading labs through the loss of reading specialists, materials, and equipment.

Their story is not unique. New York City, while we have seen great success recently in improved test scores, will lose $67 million in title I funds. And those dollars support 1,500 classroom teachers. These cuts come at a bad time, right when the new chancellor announced that he is determined to make sure that every third-grade child reads at grade level.

Secretary Riley, in his state of education speech last week, called for the entire Nation to focus on helping our children read, a goal that will not be achieved if these budget cuts stay in place. The same story is true in Philadelphia. A loss of $13 million, 300 teachers and aides as well as services. In Chicago, these title I cuts could translate to layoffs of 600 teachers. In San Diego, 11,000 students could be denied title I services. Perhaps the most disastrous impact will be felt by our youngest children at the highest poverty levels.

At McNair school in north Charleston, 80 percent of the students live in public housing. The school receives $455,000 in title I support. What will change without this money? The Charleston Post and Courier report that the programs at risk include all-day kindergarten, special reading programs, the schools' computer lab, staff development, and a 6-week summer enrichment program. These cuts will be real and painful if the Congress does not act to prevent them.

Already schools are being forced to take action because they must plan ahead. As you know, the education budget is forward-funded, and for good reason. Schools must get budgets passed in their own communities and sign contracts and buy books for next year. Such local decisions are made in the springtime, months after Congress usually enacts an education appropriations bill for the next school year. But this springtime, time is running out.

It makes no sense that some of the same people who say government should be run like a business are willing to let school principals, superintendents, legislators, and school boards twist in an uncertain wind with no sense of how much Federal aid they can expect. The result of this uncertainty is that decisions to cut back on education are being made at school board meetings around the country as we speak.

In Boston, school officials had to submit their draft budget for next year 4 weeks ago. If nothing changes, teachers must be notified by May 15 of any layoffs. Monroe County, WV, receives 25 percent of its district budget from Federal funds and would have to announce teacher contracts by April 1. Right now, they plan to lay off 15 to 20 teachers in six schools.

Moreover, the House-approved appropriations bill would actually eliminate all funding for Goals 2000, ending excellence grants to thousands of schools around the country which are trying to raise their academic standards, involve parents in communities and education, and they are preparing teachers for the challenges of the 21st century classroom.

At a time when 72 percent of Americans say drugs and violence are serious problems in local schools, it is not easy to understand how the House could approve a 55-percent cut in the safe and drug-free schools program, reducing funding in this program by nearly $200 million.

The impact of budget cuts will be felt on higher education as well. If direct lending is capped or killed, students and schools in the program will be deprived of a streamlined program that has worked, making access to student loans easier and cheaper and enabling them to pay their loans back more readily.

We also have a difference of opinion with the congressional leadership on Pell grants. We are pleased that a $100 increase was approved, but we must do more and raise the grant to $2,620 as more students depend on financial aid to further their college education.

I am still quoting from the Deputy Secretary of Education, Madeleine Kunin: From my own life, I know the value of education. I came to this country as a child who could not speak English. My mother believed that anything is possible in America and our access to education made her more than an idol dreamer. It made her a prophet. What was there for me and for you must be there for this generation of children. That is what this budget battle is all about. It is about making hope more than rhetoric, making it a reality.

I end the quote from the testimony of the Deputy Secretary of Education, Madeleine Kunin, and I return to the

statement of author Jonathan Kozol and the spirit of the testimony of Jonathan Kozol. The spirit of the testimony of Jonathan Kozol is that we have a moral dilemma. We have a situation where the powerful decisionmakers of America have made a decision to throw overboard large numbers of children, a large percentage of the population, just forget about them. We have a situation in America where large numbers of decisionmakers, people in power, are choosing to take care of their children, send them to the best schools, appropriate money and resources or make available money and resources through private sources for their own children, while the rest of America, a large part of it, goes down the drain.

I think Mr. Kozol used the word ''triage.'' Triage is something that originated in war. It is a French term where when you had large numbers of wounded congregated, they had to make some decisions about how to use their meager resources. They had a limited number of doctors, nurses, and medicine, so they would line people up, and those who were only partially wounded or not so serious were put in one category and not given much attention, and those who were so far gone that it was felt that resources should not be wasted on them were put in another category and left to die, and those in the middle, of course, who belonged to neither category were given attention.

Well, we have decided to do something similar in a situation where there is no need for it. We are not on a battlefield. There is no emergency. We do not need a revolution. We do not need to balance the budget overnight in ways which force us into a situation where we have to participate in triage. But triage is going forward because the majority in this House and the majority which controls the Congress at this point has decided that America should be an America for an elite group. We are going to go into the pampering of an oligarchy. A small group will be placed into the situation where they will be able to make unlimited profits, they will be able to live without any disturbances from the rest of the population. Ten percent of the people will make all the money they can make. Ten percent of the people would not have to be bothered with any taxes which fund the programs that make the Nation go. Ten percent of the people are going to be parasites on the national tradition and on all that has gone before them.

People are making large amounts of money on Wall Street on telecommunications investments, investments in computers, investments in cable television, investments of all kinds of gadgets which are driven by modern technology which was developed by the American people's money. Taxpayers financed the development of telecommunications. At the end of World War I and World War II, we invested billions of dollars to develop radar, to develop miniaturization, to develop ways in which you could use frequencies more effectively. All of this was developed by the resources and the taxes of the American people. And the American people deserve to have a share of that investment.

□ 1915

We now have frequencies, spectrums above our head. I have used this example many times, and I do not think I can say it too often. The spectrum belongs to the American people. The air over our heads, the atmosphere over our heads, nobody has the right to claim that. It belongs to the people. The Government should not give that away. The Government should use it in ways which benefit all of the people.

If we are going to sell it, we should sell it at prices which benefit all the taxpayers. I certainly propose we do not even sell it, we lease it, so nobody thinks they own the spectrum, they own the frequencies up there. It is like the early America, where we had the great land rush, and there was land which we claimed that nobody owned, and we gave it to white American settlers. The native Americans, they owned it, so it was taken from them.

But without getting into that argument, at least there was a democratic process of allowing people to participate in the land rush. Black people were not allowed to participate, even after the slaves were freed. They could not participate in the land rush, but all white Americans could participate in the land rush. Immigrants who were white could participate in the land rush. They were given land, land that belonged to the people, that belonged to the Government.

So we have a similar situation above our heads with a spectrum as invaluable as land. Let us not cry about the lack of resources. Let us not tax American families anymore. Let us make the corporations who want to use those frequencies and want to use those spectrums, let us let them pay for it. It is a way to justly derive revenue, revenue which can then be used to pay for more education.

Why do we not have a dedicated tax for all the Internet transactions above a certain amount of money, commercial transactions above $10, put a tax on them of some percentage, and have that tax on the Internet transactions become a way to finance the information access that is needed for the rest of the public? We need to have access for everybody, so we need libraries and schools to be wired, we need computers to be available in some public centers, public telecommunication centers, or in libraries where people can go in and make use of the information age, regardless of their income.

All of this could be financed painlessly by attaching a dedicated tax to transactions that take place over the Internet, or various other electronic communications transactions. We could have a trust fund. We call it the information superhighway, so let us use the analogy. We have a highway trust fund very successfully. The highway trust fund is based upon a tax that is placed on gasoline. That tax money is used to build highways, a successful interstate net across the country. We have the best highway system in the world, because we had a dedicated tax to take care of that.

Now we are on the information superhighway, and why not have that funded in the same way: establish a trust fund through dedicated revenue, give the revenue that we have derived back to the States on a per capita basis. If we want to hand things down to the State, there is a situation where we could easily, without a bureaucracy, hand down the money that is collected through this dedicated revenue process to the States on the basis of the number of people in each State.

I say that because I would like to see New York State for a change get a fair shake in some kind of Federal program. We have the phenomenon in New York where we are still paying far more into the Federal Treasury than we get back in aid. You would not believe that when you hear them talk. We get large amounts of aid from title I, a large amount of aid from Medicaid and Medicare. People look at all that and say ''New York gets more than anybody else.'' New York has more people, and New York chooses to spend its money on Medicaid and on Medicare, instead of on F–22 planes or *Sea Wolf* submarines. I can think of no more noble way to spend money than to spend it on the health of people.

Yes, you can always get rid of some waste, some corruption; you can always streamline the process. But if you are spending money on the health care of New Yorkers, that is money well spent. In New York, we should raise our heads high, because our share of what we are getting from the Federal Government is being used to help people in various positive ways. We are not building weapons systems that will no longer be needed, weapons systems that are very expensive and obsolete.

New York State in 1994 gave, through a tax collection process, the Federal Government $18.9 billion more than it got back in Federal aid. You might say ''Why did you calculate it that way?'' We have been following this for a few years. The Kennedy School of Government has a table which shows that consistently, New York has given more to the Federal Government then it has gotten back in terms of aid. We do not have any big defense plants, any *Sea Wolf* submarines, any aircraft carriers, so we do not get back large amounts of money like Marietta, GA, does. The southern States altogether get back $65 billion more from the Federal Government than they pay into the Federal Government.

I am mentioning this because we have a dogma here about States rights and block grants to the States, the States can do it so much better. New

York could probably exist far better if you were to give it back its own money. If we had $18 billion, almost $19 billion that is ours to spend as we see fit, we can solve all the budget problems of New York State.

Those who talk about States rights and passing education programs and school lunch programs and AFDC, Medicaid, passing it down to the States, you had better stop and think twice about placing such a high priority on States rights in running programs and funding programs. On education, there are many States that would be shortchanged if they have to pay for their own costs without Federal funds. Many of the Federal funds flow out of the northwest States like New York and Michigan; midwest States like Michigan and Wisconsin. They are still paying far more to the Federal Government than they get back.

Let me conclude by saying what we need is leadership that recognizes that triage will not work. No part of the population should be thrown overboard. If you are not going to throw a portion of the population overboard, then you invest in education.

You must face the realities of 1996. There is a technological revolution. There is an information age revolution. There are going to be large dislocations that you have always in the work force. We want to have certain kinds of value systems developed. We want to have fairness across the board, and everybody participate in the prosperity of America.

The only way we know at this point to do that, the way we are certain will have a direct impact on that problem, is education, more investment in education, more investment in job training. Some genius may come along later on and find some other way to deal with the problem in addition to investing in education and job training. It may be there may be a pill people can take to help solve the problem at some time in the future. I do not know. We do not have any way to predict the wonders of technology and medicine.

But we do know education and job training are absolutely necessary in order to cope with the current difficulties we are facing in this society, whether you are talking about crime problems, AIDS problems; you name the problem, and education is part of the solution.

Let us go forward and reject the philosophy of the Republican majority. Let us not disinvest in education at this point. Let us follow the trend of the thinking of the people who appeared at our forum today. Twenty people came from all walks of life. They said ''The American people say that common sense dictates that we should invest more and more in education.'' I hope we will go forward and do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

[Mr. KINGSTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2128

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COBLE) at 9 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today, on account of illness in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day on today and March 6, 7, and 8.
Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHRISTENSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARR of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCDERMOTT) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLAY.
Mr. LANTOS.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. REED.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FOLEY) and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
Mr. RADANOVICH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BENTSEN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. BERMAN.
Ms. PELOSI.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Ms. DELAURO.
Mr. MENENDEZ in two instances.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. BORSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS.
Mrs. MORELLA in two instances.
Mr. MENENDEZ in two instances.
Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. GILLMOR.
Mr. JACOBS.
Mr. STARK.
Mr. BORSKI.
Mr. MOAKLEY.
Mr. GOODLATTE.
Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. LEWIS of California.
Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
Mr. MEEHAN.
Mr. BARCIA.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 6, 1996, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2174. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his requests for emergency fiscal year 1996 supplemental appropriations for emergency expenses related to recent natural disasters in the United States and the Virgin Islands, and to designate the amount made available as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 104–183); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2175. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notification of the Department's intention to contract the sale of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 1, also known as the Elk Hills Reserve without providing for the use of competitive procedures; to the Committee on National Security.

2176. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final priority—Research

in Education of Individuals with Disabilities Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

2177. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled ''Ambulatory Surgery, Preadmission Testing, and Same-day Surgery: State Medicaid Programs' Experience and Findings from the Literature,'' pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 4755(b)(3)(d) (104 Stat. 1388–210); to the Committee on Commerce.

2178. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a list of all potential sales and licensed commercial exports under the act of major weapons or weapons-related defense equipment valued at $7 million or more, or of any other weapons or weapons-related defense equipment valued at $25 million or more, which the administration considers eligible for approval during the calendar year 1996 and which may, therefore, result in notification to the Congress this year, pursuant to section 25(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

2179. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on the progress made toward opening the U.S. Embassy in Jerusalem, pursuant to Public Law 104–45, section 6 (109 Stat. 400); to the Committee on International Relations.

2180. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee for Purchase from People who are Blind or Severely Disabled, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2181. A letter from the Director, Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2182. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2183. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2184. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2185. A letter from the National Endowment for Democracy, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2186. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2187. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2188. A letter from the U.S. Copyright Office, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2189. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2190. A letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 370. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 927) to seek international sanctions against the Castro government in Cuba, to plan for support of a transition government leading to a democratically elected government in Cuba, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–470). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1332. A bill to establish certain policies and responsibilities with respect to the administration of the Rongelap Resettlement Trust Fund, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104–471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 3003. A bill to establish requirements applicable to rent-to-own transactions; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. MINGE):

H.R. 3004. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the maximum period permitted between standard surveys of home health agencies and to expand the scope of deemed status and permit recognition of surveys by national accreditation bodies for providers under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FIELDS of Texas:

H.R. 3005. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws in order to promote efficiency and capital formation in the financial markets, and to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to promote more efficient management of mutual funds, protect investors, and provide more effective and less burdensome regulations; to the Committee on Commerce.

by Mr. LEWIS of California:

H.R. 3006. A bill to provide for disposal of public lands in support of the Manzanar Historic Site in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SPRATT):

H.R. 3007. A bill to establish an interagency task force to design and implement a plan for determining the extent to which U.S. currency is held in foreign countries and estimating the extent to which such currency is being counterfeited outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CALVERT, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH):

H.R. 3008. A bill to amend the Helium Act to authorize the Secretary to enter into agreements with private parties for the recovery and disposal of helium on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 3009. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Commission Act of 1983 with respect to the subpoena power of the Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas:

H.R. 3010. A bill to assure that advertisements by States for participation in their lotteries provide information to the consumer on the statistical probability of winning and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLATTE (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BONO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. EWING, Mr. MICA, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. ORTON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MOAKLEY, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland):

H.R. 3011. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of U.S. persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FROST, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 3012. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit covered beneficiaries under the military health care system who are also entitled to Medicare to enroll in the Federal Employees Health Program; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case of consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NEY:

H.R. 3013. A bill to increase the availability and continuity of health coverage for individuals, small employers, and other groups, to reduce paperwork and simplify administration of health care claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 3014. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to ensure the safety of barges carrying oil or hazardous material in bulk on lakes, bays, or sounds of the United States, by establishing equipment and manning requirements for those barges; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER (for herself, Ms. WATERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3015. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program for postreproductive health care; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 3016. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury and the Attorney General of the United States to be consulted before the manufacture, importation, sale, or delivery of armor piercing ammunition for the use of a governmental entity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3017. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the possession or transfer of handgun ammunition capable of being used to penetrate standard body armor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3018. A bill to prohibit the importation, manufacture, sale, purchase, transfer, receipt, or transportation of handguns in any manner affecting interstate or foreign commerce, except for or by members of the Armed Forces, law enforcement officials, and, as authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury, licensed importers, manufacturers, and dealers, and pistol clubs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 3019. A bill making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.J. Res. 162. Joint resolution to disapprove the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1996; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GILCHREST:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 1996 Special Olympics Torch Relay to be run through the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 15th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 65: Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 103: Mr. BALDACCI and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 218: Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 303: Mr. HANSEN and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 447: Mr. THORNTON, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 777: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 778: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 779: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 780: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 789: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 820: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia.

H.R. 833: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 972: Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 995: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 1010: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1386: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1416: Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1423: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Ms. PELOSI, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1513: Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1560: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1573: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1610: Mr. CAMP and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 1619: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1625: Mr. PETRI and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2143: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 2193: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 2202: Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. SISISKY, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 2214: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2270: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 2306: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2320: Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. EWING, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. NEUMANN, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KIM, Mr. NEY, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 2566: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2575: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2604: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 2664: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 2779: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 2795: Mr. MICA and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 2807: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 2820: Ms. PRYCE and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 2837: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 2879: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 2900: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2959: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, and Mr. DICKS.

H.R. 2966: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 2976: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 2992: Mr. COBURN, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 2994: Mr. HERGER, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.J. Res. 158: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FROST, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HORN, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FRAZER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WILSON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. TORRES, Ms. FURSE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. WILSON.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1963: Mr. FILNER.

H. R. 1972: Mr. FILNER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 994

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

(Page and line number references are to Amendment No. 1)

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 5, line 16, insert before the period the following: ''especially small entities employing 50 or fewer employees''.

H.R. 994

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

(Page and line number references are to Amendment No. 1)

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 15, line 17, strike ''functional interrelations'' and insert ''functional interrelationships (including the relationship of rules which affect business entities employing 50 or fewer employees)''.

H.R. 994

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Strike title III and insert the following:

TITLE III—REQUIREMENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF SIGNIFICANT RULES

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Significant Regulation Oversight Act of 1996''.

SEC. 302. FINDING AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDING.—The Congress finds that oversight of significant rules will be enhanced if they are subject to congressional review and approval after being proposed by an agency.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this title is to ensure that before a significant rule takes effect—

(1) Congress is given an adequate opportunity to review the rule and ensure that it is in accordance with the intent of Congress in enacting the law under which the rule is proposed; and

(2) Congress approves the rule in accordance with the procedures established by this title.

SEC. 303. REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT RULES BY CONGRESS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF SIGNIFICANT RULES REQUIRED.—A significant rule shall not take effect before the date of the enactment of a joint resolution described in section 304(a) comprised solely of the text of the significant rule.

(b) REPORTING AND REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT RULES.—(1) Before a proposed significant rule would take effect as a final rule, the agency proposing the rule shall submit to each House of Congress a report containing the following:

(A) A copy of the proposed significant rule.

(B) A concise summary of the proposed significant rule, its purpose, and anticipated effects.

(C) A complete copy of any cost-benefit analysis report that has been prepared by the agency with respect to the proposed significant rule.

(D) An explanation of the specific statutory interpretation under which a rule is proposed, including an explanation of—

(i) whether the interpretation is expressly required by the text of the statute; or

(ii) if the interpretation is not expressly required by the text of the statute, an explanation that the interpretation is within the range of permissible interpretations of the statute as identified by the agency, and an explanation why the interpretation selected by the agency is the agency's preferred interpretation.

(E) Any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive order.

(2) Upon receipt of a report under paragraph (1), each House of Congress shall provide a copy of the report to the Chairman and ranking minority party member of each committee with jurisdiction over the subject matter of the report.

(c) NO INFERENCE TO BE DRAWN WHERE CONGRESS FAILS TO APPROVE.—If Congress fails to enact a joint resolution approving a proposed significant rule, no court or agency may infer any intent of Congress from any action or inaction of Congress with regard to such rule or related statute.

SEC. 304. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR SIGNIFICANT RULES.

(a) INTRODUCTION.—Not later than 3 legislative days after the date on which an agency submits a report under section 303(b) containing the text of any proposed significant rule, the majority leader of each House of the Congress shall introduce (by request) a joint resolution comprised solely of the text of that significant rule. If the joint resolution is not introduced in either House as provided in the preceding sentence, than any Member of that House may introduce the joint resolution.

(b) REFERRAL AND CONSIDERATION.—The joint resolution shall be referred to the appropriate committee of the House in which it is introduced. The committee may report the joint resolution without substantive revision and with or without recommendation or with an adverse recommendation, or the committee may vote not to report the joint resolution. If the committee votes to order the joint resolution reported, it shall be reported not later than the end of the period (not to exceed 45 legislative days) established for consideration of the joint resolution by the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the majority leader of the Senate, as the case may be. Except in the case of a joint resolution which a committee votes not to report, a committee failing to report a joint resolution within such period shall be automatically discharged from consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(2) A vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall be taken in that House on or before the close of the 90th legislative day after the date of the introduction of the joint resolution in that House.

(3)(A) A motion in the House of Representatives to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution under this section shall be highly privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) Debate in the House of Representatives on a joint resolution under this section shall be limited to not more than 4 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to recommit a joint resolution under this section or to move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

(C) All appeals from the decisions of the chair relating to the application of the Rules of the House of Representatives to the procedure relating to a joint resolution under this section shall be decided without debate.

(D) Except to the extent specifically provided in the preceding provisions of this subsection, consideration of a joint resolution under this section shall be governed by the Rules of the House of Representatives applicable to other joint resolutions in similar circumstances.

(4)(A) A motion in the Senate to proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution under this section shall be privileged and not debatable. An amendment to the motion shall not be in order, nor shall it be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) Debate in the Senate on a joint resolution under this section, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours. The time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees.

(C) Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a joint resolution under this section shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the mover and the manager of the joint resolution, except that in the event the manager of the joint resolution is in favor of any such motion or appeal, the time in opposition thereto, shall be controlled by the minority leader or his designee. Such leaders, or either of them, may, from time under their control on the passage of a joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any debatable motion or appeal.

(D) A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a joint resolution under this section is not debatable. A motion to recommit a joint resolution under this section is not in order.

(c) AMENDMENTS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to a joint resolution considered under this section shall be in order in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. No motion to suspend the application of this subsection shall be in order in either House, nor shall it be in order in either House for the presiding officer to entertain a request to suspend the application of this subsection by unanimous consent.

(d) TREATMENT IF THE OTHER HOUSE HAS ACTED.—If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a) comprised of the same text, that:

(1) The procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House.

(2) The vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

(e) CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY.—This section is enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such it is deemed a part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and it supersedes other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent with such rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 305. EXISTING RULES.

(a) GENERAL.—Any existing rule may be revised or revoked in accordance with this section if a petition for review so requests.

(b) INTRODUCTION.—If a petition for review is filed with the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk or the Secretary shall determine whether the petition meets the requirements of subsection (d). If the Clerk or the Secretary determines that a petition meets those requirements, he or she shall notify the majority leader of that House. The majority leader so notified shall, within 3 legislative days, introduce a joint resolution (by request) that makes the revision or revocation of existing rules proposed by the petition upon the enactment of that joint resolution. If the joint resolution is not introduced as provided in the preceding sentence, then any Member of that House may introduce the joint resolution.

(c) PROCEDURES FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND THE SENATE.—Any joint resolution introduced under subsection (b) shall be considered in the House of Representatives and the Senate in accordance with the procedures respecting a joint resolution set forth in section 304.

(d) PETITIONS FOR REVIEW.—A petition for review under subsection (a) shall contain the following:

(1) Any rule affected by the petition and the contents of that rule as it would exist if a joint resolution revising or revoking that rule pursuant to the petition were enacted.

(2) For a petition in the Senate, the signatures of 30 Senators, or for a petition in the House of Representatives, the signatures of 120 Members.

SEC. 306. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this title:

(1) AGENCY.—The term ''agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code (relating to administrative procedure).

(2) RULE.—(A) The term ''rule'' has the meaning given such term by section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except that such term does not include—

(i) any rule of particular applicability including a rule that approves or prescribes—

(I) future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefor,

(II) corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or

(III) accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing, or

(ii) any rule of agency organization, personnel, procedure, practice, or any routine matter.

(B) The term ''final rule'' means any final rule or interim final rule.

(3) SIGNIFICANT RULE.—The term ''significant rule'' means any rule proposed by an agency that is specified or described as such in the Act that authorizes the rule.

SEC. 307. EXEMPTION FOR MONETARY POLICY.

Nothing in this title applies to any rule concerning monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

H.R. 994

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

(Page and line number references are to Amendment No. 1)

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 33, line 17, strike ''and'', in line 21 strike the period and insert ''; and'', and after line 21 insert the following:

(vii) regulations or other agency statements that impose trade sanctions against any country that engages in illegal trade activities against the United States that are injurious to American technology, jobs, pensions, or general economic well-being.

H.R. 994

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

(Page and line number references are to Amendment No. 1)

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 33, line 17, strike ''and'', in line 21 strike the period and insert ''; and'', and after line 21 insert the following:

(vii) regulations or other agency statements that ensure the collection of taxes from a subsidiary of a foreign company doing business in the United States.

H.R. 994

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

(Page and line number references are to Amendment No. 1)

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 33, line 17, strike ''and'', in line 21 strike the period and insert ''; and'', and after line 21 insert the following:

(vii) regulations or other agency statements that protect the health and safety of the American worker.