

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American peoples' values do not reflect the values of President Clinton's liberal judicial appointees. Recently, disturbing evidence has come to light about liberal judges who have let criminals off the hook because their social conscience got the best of them.

Mr. Speaker, we do not need judges who care more about criminals than they do victims. We do not need judges who try to blame society for individual wrongdoings. The American people want our judicial system to hold people personally accountable for their actions.

Mr. Speaker, one thing is clear—judges make a difference in the lives of all Americans. Judges set the benchmark for what criminals think they can get away with. President Clinton's judges do not represent the values of our citizens. The Clinton judges are letting criminals off the hook.

THE ISSUE OF CRIME

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, we have been talking so much about crime and about the prevention of crime, I am going to tell you, we are not going to be able to tackle the issue of crime until we get tough on criminals and, unfortunately, the Clinton administration continues to coddle criminals through the judges that they appoint.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell you, being from Florida, I am distressed by what a Florida judge recently wrote that was appointed by Bill Clinton. Rosemary Barkett, a Clinton judge, voted to reduce the death sentence of a murderer who sent a tape to the mother of the murdered victim, boasting about his crime and killing her daughter. Judge Barkett wrote:

The killer's impatience for change, for understanding, for reconciliation matured into taking the illogical and drastic action of murder. His frustration, anger and obsession of injustice overcame reason. The murder victim was a symbolic representation of the class which caused the perceived injustices.

She went on to say he matured into the decision of killing this person, then bragging about it by mailing a tape to the mother of the murdered victim. And so she reduced the sentence. Let me tell you over the next 4 years, President Clinton or President Dole will elect and select one out of every four Federal judges that we appoint. It does not matter what laws we pass in this Chamber, so long as the President nominates justices that coddle criminals. We have got to get tough on crime by pushing the existing laws that we have and not by making new ones.

LIBERALS AND CRIME

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, well, we have just heard it, today we are celebrating that sad tragedy of a year ago, and while this House and the liberals talk about taking away private citizens' right to own a weapon, we do almost nothing to those heinous killers and criminals who violate society's rules. We have heard about Harold Baer until we are sick of it. Harold Baer decides that it is OK to run away from policemen. From kindergarten we are taught policemen are our friends and we, even if a red light is in front of them and they tell to you go through the light, do what the policeman says.

They run away from the policeman and Harold Baer says that is a natural thing to do in that neighborhood so they should not have searched the poor, sorry individual who only had 80 pounds of cocaine in the trunk of their car.

Then Rosemary Barkett, who we just heard about, and I am going to read her famous line because nobody could even believe this. She says this about a killer who killed someone and then sent a tape recording mocking the killing to the victim's mother. This is what she said about that inhuman human being:

His impatience for change, for understanding, for reconciliation matured to taking the illogical and drastic action of murder. His frustration, his anger and his obsession of injustice overcame reason. The murder victim was a symbolic representation of the class which caused the perceived injustice.

You talk about it is society's fault, what nonsense. Let us get a new President and some new judges.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

THE OKLAHOMA CITY TRAGEDY

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, today, on the first anniversary of the tragedy that shook Oklahoma City and the entire Nation, I join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in offering condolences to the friends and families of those who lost their lives—gratitude to those Federal workers and citizens whose bravery saved lives—and resolve to do all we can to prevent such acts of hateful terrorism and violence from happening again.

No words or deeds of this Congress can ever bring back the dedicated public servants, citizens, and innocent children who lost their lives in the Oklahoma City bombing. Even 1 year after this awful tragedy, it is hard to find meaning in their loss—to make sense of the random hatred they suffered. And as we move toward enacting crucial antiterrorism legislation in the Congress, the image of those who lost

their lives 1 year ago—especially the precious young children—reminds us of how fragile human life can be, and how each day is truly a blessing for ourselves and for our families.

My hope is that by remembering what happened on April 19, 1995, we will not only redouble our efforts to secure the safety and security of our citizens—beyond all boundaries of party or partisanship—but that we will also come to appreciate the gifts of service and citizenship we receive from our fellow Americans each and every day. Such gifts, like the good works of those who died in Oklahoma City and those who risked their lives to save others, are all too easy to take for granted.

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

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

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much debate over the past 6 months to 1 year over the balanced budget, and the budget battle, and Americans have been so swept away with sort of the currents of the demagoguery that is coming out of the White House and the debate that is going back and forth that we have really lost sight of really what has been happening here.

We have been governing by CR, continuing resolutions, where, since we cannot get the President to agree to a balanced budget deal, we go from month to month to month. I have been disappointed that we have not been able to get a balanced budget and wish that we could have moved swifter, wished that we would have had a President that would have signed the first balanced budget plan in a generation. But I found out something very interesting this past week.

What I found out was, even governing by CR, we are ahead of schedule to balancing the budget. We are further along on that 7-year track to balancing the budget than we would have been even if we had passed our 7-year plan last year. And this is great news. On the front page of Investors' Business Daily this morning, had a wonderful quote. The quote said that, while Bill Clinton has been winning the PR battle with the public, the Republicans have been quietly winning the war. This is great news for all of America today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER of California. It is good news, and I try and keep this fact well hidden, but I am one of the few budget analysts on the floor. For 4 years I worked for the department of finance in the State of California. If I had had

a little more personality, I would have become an accountant. But studying these figures, what we found out was we cannot change the way Washington does business. Over two-thirds of our budget is entitlements locked into law. That means an entitlement is when you show up at the window and you say, I would like some money, the Government shells it out. Until you change those laws, either requiring work from welfare recipients or requiring that people be citizens or making these other changes in laws, you are going to have the budget on automatic pilot.

Where we have made the improvements is in the discretionary funds, that small area outside of defense and outside of the entitlement areas where we can change. But there is only so much longer you can squeeze the parts in the other areas of the budget to make them efficient. It would be like asking IBM to get all of their salary savings out of the clerical help and not to do it out of the executives or any of the sales force. So IBM has to have a more balanced view as they try and downsize their corporate structure in order to make themselves profitable.

We in Government have to do the same thing. We have to change the entitlement process to make sure those people who receive a Government check are actually in need. That is what our welfare reform is about, and that is what all of the changes in immigration are about.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of discussion, especially during the presidential campaigns that Americans do not care about balancing the budget, Americans have moved their attention to something else. I can tell you that I got elected and the majority of the 73 freshmen, Republican freshmen got elected in 1994 because we promised first and foremost to balance the budget.

Social issues aside, all this other stuff aside, we said we were going to spend only as much money as we take in. We are going to balance the budget. I am still hearing Americans tell me, at the 75 townhall meetings I have held over the past year and a half, they are still saying the same thing: Balance the budget, get Washington's business in order and you guys live by the same rules that we have to live by across the country. So this is great news.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for one more thought, that is this is not even partisan. The demographics are what are crushing us. When the baby boomers, people younger than me, even, retire, 37 million people are going to stop paying 16 percent to Social Security and welfare and SDI, and they are going to start receiving.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Right.

Mr. BAKER of California. The ship goes upside down. This is not debate over whether we want to balance or whether we want to stop living off our grandkids.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Sure.

Mr. BAKER of California. By 2010 it is over. We have 14 to 16 years to straighten this out. While the others drag their feet, my own Senator ran ads saying, I will vote for the balanced budget, vote for me. She got here and reneged. It was the one vote that killed the balanced budget amendment.

We do not have the luxury any longer to debate whether. It is when and how, and those are tough decisions. I have projects in my district that I would like to see expanded, too, but we are going to have to suck it up, take our medicine and balance this budget. I appreciate the gentleman bringing up the point.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Reclaiming my time, you said something very important. This is not an ideological issue. If the environment is important to you, if you think we need to fund environmental cleanups, if somebody thinks that welfare is poverty to them, if somebody thinks Social Security is important, defense, it does not matter what the issue is.

MORE ON THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH].

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I was just going to say, regardless of what is important to you on issues, we must balance the budget first. We have got to make sure that on April 15 that Americans are not paying more of their tax money to service the debt than take care of the things that Government needs to take care of.

Again, the news today is great news. I read the news today, great news. We are actually winning the war against the deficit despite the fact we have had no cooperation from the White House.

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, next year we will go over the line. We spent more on the interest on the national debt than we do on defense. You know, this President is not hesitant about deploying our troops in all kinds of foreign wars. We have to say strong in defense. Interest on the national debt will exceed what we spend on defense.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The same people that vote against balanced budget are the same people that say we are spending too much money on defense.

Mr. BAKER of California. Fifteen percent of the budget.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If we are spending too much money on defense, we are really spending too much money on interest on the Federal debt. I say it is time we do what middle-class Americans have done for years, spend only as much money as you take in, balance the budget and cause an economic revival in this country that is unprecedented that will lift all the boats.

Mr. BAKER of California. Amen.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

CYNICISM IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, this is the anniversary of the Oklahoma explosion, which made everybody stop in their tracks and ask very deep questions about the cynicism that is raging in America and about the cynicism that has been unleashed, I think most unfairly, on Government employees. They have been the scapegoats for so much of talk radio, so much of the hate that has been unleashed.

A year ago today, we suddenly saw the faces of Federal employees, that they were like us, that they had families, they were hard-working, they were there, they were trying to live their lives and serve their country. Suddenly, many of their lives stopped or many of their lives will never be the same. I hope that we continue to fight very hard to come out of this big hole of cynicism that we have dug ourselves in.

I remind people that the word "cynic" comes from the old Greek word about yapping dogs. Cynics really do not contribute anything positive, they just yap, yap, yap, yap. And that type of thing ends up in destruction. It is very easy to destroy things. It is very difficult to rebuild. So if anyone has criticism, fine, but then tell us what you are going to do about it after your criticize.

I must also say, as I rise today to talk about this year anniversary, how very proud I am of my congressional district. Denver, CO, has been selected as the place to have the trial for the outcome of this Oklahoma explosion. Obviously the citizens of Denver were not particularly thrilled about that for fear that it just painted a big bull's eye on them for all sorts of security problems at our own Federal building, which is where the Federal courthouse is near, and all the other issues that might come from this trial, which will clearly be a very high-profile trial.

Yet, as we all know, as citizens, it is our part to make sure everybody gets a fair trial. It was determined a fair trial probably could not be held in Oklahoma City. So Denver, Colorado bit its lip and said OK, we have to do our part. I guess this goes on. This big media carnival will go on there, and we only hope justice comes out of the media carnival rather than something else. But in the interim, one of the very moving things that has happened that Coloradans have done has been their reaching out to the families of the Oklahoma victims. Many of the Oklahoma victims' families want to be present at these trials, want to come and want to see justice be done, want to sit in the courtrooms, want to participate in some way or another, to