

week, even that is embarrassingly low, but 3 hours per week be the standard, and that every broadcaster have to meet that minimal standard.

Now, we know that the good broadcasters are going to do that anyway, and they will far exceed the 3-hour minimum. But we will capture those broadcasters who think of their broadcast license as nothing more than an opportunity to print money, just take in the advertising dollars and to use it for whatever purposes they want, excluding children as a constituency. So this is very important, and it is my hope that all Members who are concerned about this issue will in fact join in the effort to advance this children's television agenda at the Federal Communications Commission.

In addition, and I want all Members to be aware of this, as part of the communications bill we also ensure that each one of the 51 public utility commissions in the United States has to go into a rulemaking to ensure that every school in the United States has access to advanced digital technologies.

□ 1415

Now why is that important? Very simply, because as we pass GATT and NAFTA here on the floor of Congress, we are basically constructing a new compact with the people in our country. One, we are letting the low-end jobs go, and increasingly that is the case across this country. But secondly, we are also saying that we are going to try to tie it to high-end jobs, the high-technology jobs of the future so that they will be based here in the United States. Well, what kind of competitive people will we have if we have not thought through a strategy to ensure that every child in the country, not just the children of the upper and the upper-middle class in our country, but every child, including those in the bottom 40 percentile, have access to the skills they are going to need, have the skill sets that they are going to need in order to compete for these higher-end jobs?

That is why we have to give parents the weapon of blocking out the excessive violence and sexual material. That is why we have to have more positive children's programming on commercial stations. That is why we have to ensure that the public broadcasting budget is kept high so that the quality programming of Sesame Street to Barney, right through the day remains on the air, and that is why we have to ensure that every child has access to these computer technologies in every classroom from K through 12 from the day they begin school.

PRESERVING THE ENVIRONMENT AND OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do today is to address the House, and the subject is the environment and you, the environment and me, and the environment and us. I am one that believes in the preservation of our natural resources, to do that in a managed way. I also believe in clean water, our water quality, and clean air.

I want my colleagues to know that I grew up on the Tippecanoe River in Indiana. When you grow up on the river, you do not belong to anybody but the river itself. My father taught me a lot of valuable lessons on the river, not only to myself but to my brother, the same lessons that his father taught him and I am now teaching to my son. Dad bought a small little farm there on the river. Dad is kind of a Johnny Appleseed. He planned everything, from 3 acres of strawberries to all these fruit trees and an acre of vegetable garden, and that is what we did. We managed all of that since I was 9 years old. So he taught us about being good stewards of the land, and how you have to take care of the land for the preservation so that you can make sure you have good yields year in and year out. So I know what it is like to be on my hands and knees and weed 3 acres of strawberries without the use of pesticides. It is a lot of work.

The reason I took the moment to share that with you is the two issues I would like to discuss on the environment are the Superfund issue and that of out of State waste. Let me start though with out-of-State waste. I bring that up because in the Fifth District of Indiana, we receive two-thirds, almost in excess of 1 million tons of out-of-State waste is dumped into my congressional district. My constituents are forced to handle the millions of tons of waste generated by States and other localities that do not dump within their borders; they dump within our borders. And almost every day when I am on the road I get to witness, not far from the Tippecanoe River along the plains in Indiana is a mountain. This mountain is the largest thing that you could ever see, and it is a mountain of trash. It does not bother me that the trash is there. What bothers me is that in Indiana and States like Indiana who are trying to act responsibly on the issues of solid waste, and we create our solid waste districts and we minimize the amount of landfills that we have so that we can do things correctly and move toward proper management, the preservation of our environment, there are States that are not acting responsibly; all they want to do is take it and shove it into other States that are acting responsibly.

So basically what we have is in America we have a nonsystem. When you have a nonsystem, it begins to penalize States that have a system, and that is what we have here. So I am very concerned on the issue of the interstate waste. The Supreme Court has already stepped forward and says it is the Congress that has to decide this issue.

Now, it seems session in, session out, the issue has come up, and this Congress has not acted. Those in the States of New York and New Jersey have made their effort to move on the flow control issue in this House, and it failed. It failed because the issues of interstate waste and flow control must move together in this House.

And I encourage this Congress to finally move with sensibility, with ration and reason and good thought with regard to how we manage our environment, and move a bill together to address the issues of flow control and interstate waste together in this House; because if we do not, we are not acting responsibly, like I think we should.

Let me address the issue of the Superfund. The reason I want to discuss the Superfund is because we are also looking at reforming the issue. Fifteen years after the Superfund toxic waste cleanup program began, over \$25 billion have been spent and only 12 percent of the toxic waste sites have been cleaned. I have a Superfund site in my congressional district. I have to take a particular interest in it. That is only an average of five sites, though, a year are being cleaned up. I believe that we have to stop, I think, let us stop the frivolous spending of taxpayer money on litigation. That is what is happening.

This is an issue between those of us that want to preserve and clean up the environment versus those who want to line the pockets of the trial lawyers and the lawyer lobbyists. I think this game has got to end. So let us find a good balance here with regard to moving Superfund reform this year so we can stop it.

I know the President is playing the environmental game, saying, "I am an environmentalist, I want to do some Superfund reform," at the same time the trial lawyers are backing his Presidential run. You cannot have it both ways. So let us act responsibly again on the issue of Superfund, and let us act in a way that moves with our passion for how we want a healthier environment in this country, how we want not only the beauty and the spirit of what makes this country good, but also what makes us well.

YESTERDAY'S RULE VOTE WAS NOT IN ANY WAY, SHAPE, OR FORM AN UP-OR-DOWN VOTE ON THE LINE-ITEM VETO

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank you for your patience in allowing me to put my matters together. I rise today to correct what I believe has been a serious misunderstanding of yesterday's rules vote. Yesterday, a number of news organizations erroneously reported that a vote on the rule, House Resolution

391, was in fact a vote on the line-item veto. Mr. Speaker, this is not the case. The vote on the rule was an extremely complicated vote on a procedural matter. It was most certainly not a place in which Members believed that they were registering either support or opposition to the line-item veto. In fact, there was not one single occasion yesterday when this House had an up-or-down vote on the line-item veto.

Anybody interested in finding a clean up-and-down vote on the line-item veto, and I want you to pay strict attention, anybody interested in finding a clean up-or-down vote on the line-item veto should read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from February 6, 1995, or they should look at some of yesterday's other votes. For instance, the vote on the motion to recommit was a vote either for or against making the line-item veto effective immediately as opposed to waiting until January 1997, after the Presidential elections.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the House are very complicated, and yesterday's rule was one of the most confusing that I have seen in a long while. In fact, even if the rule had failed, line-item veto could still have proceeded on to the President. But I believe we in the House have a responsibility to explain those rules to the people we serve, rather than simplifying them to the point that they no longer reflect the realities of the House. So let me state again, Mr. Speaker, so that I may make myself perfectly clear: Yesterday's rule vote was not in any way, shape, or form an up-or-down vote on the line-item veto.

CONTRIBUTION LIMIT TO SECTION 457 RETIREMENT PLANS

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to invite his colleagues to cosponsor legislation which he introduced this morning. The measure, similar to provisions in the Balanced Budget Act passed in December, raises the annual contribution limit that State and local government and non-profit corporation employees may contribute to their section 457 retirement plans to equal that which their private-sector colleagues may contribute to their 401(k) plans and requires that these plans be held in trust.

Under the Tax Reform Act of 1986, State and local governments and non-profit corporations were prohibited from offering 401(k) plans for their employees. Under the 1986 Act, section 457 plans were fixed or frozen at an annual contribution limit of \$7,500 while the 401(k) limit was only \$7,000 but was indexed for inflation. This indexing has increased the 401(k) limit to \$9,240. This measure states that the limit for section 457 plans will mirror that of the 401(k).

Also, by placing the assets in trust the employees retirement funds will be

protected against claims by general creditors. The financial woes of Orange County, CA, are a recent example of why this is prudent. Again, Mr. Speaker, this Member invites his colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

GROWTH AND DEFICIT REDUCTION

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to speak on growth, deficit reduction, balancing the budget and getting incomes up to a livable level, all a pretty big order in a 5-minute period. Let me talk about deficit reduction for a moment. You want to balance the budget, you want to do deficit reduction, there are a couple things we have got to realize. First of all, let us make sure we take into account what has been done. Deficit reduction is on a definite, positive trend. The deficit has been cut by one-half in the last 3 years. As to the deficit today is at its lowest point since 1979. It is at one-half of where it was in relation to our overall economy just 3 years ago. It is the lowest now in the industrialized world. It is coming in this year at even lower than was projected last year. That does not mean you let up but it means something positive is occurring. Because of that, I think we also have to make sure that in balancing the Federal budget we do not unbalance a lot of family budgets. I happen to believe that future generations should not be burdened with debt but they should not be burdened with ignorance, either. There is nothing more grievous or no more debt that is heavier than that. That the expenditures that are made today in education, whether it is title I, assistance in math and reading for elementary school students, whether it is student aid, Pell grant and Stafford, student loans, whether it is VA loans, whether it is assisting research in our universities, whether we invest in infrastructure, the roads, the bridges, the airports, the sewer systems, the water systems, those things that bring us growth and bring back more over time than what you pay out, those things are positive investments and ought to be on the positive side of the ledger. There is something else that we can do for growth in the Federal budget and that is to move this budget to the same kinds of budget that every business has and every family has, and that is to have a capital budget. That is to say that those things that we are investing in that pay out over time, we will show on the books that way. Sandy and I, my wife and I cannot afford to pay for a house in one year. We have a mortgage, like most everybody else in this country. We pay that out over 20 or 30 years. So let the Federal Government show the roads, the highways, the physical infrastructure the same way. Many people do not know but your Federal Government does not do it

that way. That needs to change. Other things we need to do is to recognize the importance of wage growth. Henry Ford had it right. He said: "I got to pay adequate wages so that my people can afford to buy my cars." Well, we are going in the opposite direction unfortunately in this country when 60 percent of the American workers are seeing declining wages over the last 15 years, not increasing wages.

□ 1430

And so both at the private sector level and at the Government level we need to be encouraging that upward growth.

Let me tell you quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, the Republican party has it wrong and the White House, the Democrats in the White House, have it wrong. If you think that 2.5-percent growth is going to get us out of this, we can balance this budget in 7 years, we can have a 2.5-percent growth and we are going to have a deficit that is bigger than it is today.

We have got to focus on getting that 2.5-percent growth up to 3 or 3.5-percent growth, not an unrealistic level. But you cannot with a Federal Reserve that chokes back growth and insists to fight only the inflation war. You cannot do it with Government policies that do not stimulate the economy, that cause it to restrict. You cannot do it with a private sector afraid to make investments. And so we have to focus on growth.

Are you worried about Social Security? Social security improves as productivity and incomes improve. Do you want to focus on the family moving ahead? The family moves ahead as the family's income and opportunities improve.

The problem is that both parties, if you are focusing on 2.3- to 2.5-percent growth, are only going to put us down the road, not up the road. So that is the challenge that I believe is ahead of us in these many months to come. Declining incomes have to come up. The rising tide does lift all boats, but the tide has to start from the bottom, not from the top down.

I will return to visit this subject another day.

THE REST OF THE STORY; PAYING MORE AND GETTING LESS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I saw the President was in New York earlier this week. He was talking about improving education. Unfortunately, he really did not tell the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey would say. The President really did not take time to tell the American people about the U.S. Department of Education and the fact that it has 5,000 Federal bureaucrats who justify their existence primarily by pumping out