

cost-benefit analysis before we enact a new regulation.

Does the gentleman think it makes sense, when we talk about spending the American taxpayers' dollars to clean up waste sites, that we first do a risk assessment and we clean up the sites that are the highest risk to the environment first and the other ones later?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Well, I would think that it would make absolute sense to clean up the highest priority ones first.

But I want to inquire of the gentleman of one. Does the gentleman think when we clean up an environmental site that we should pay more to lawyers and lawsuits on cleaning up an environmental site or should we actually pay money to clean up that site?

Mr. NEUMANN. It is clear to me we should be using the dollars to clean up the site. And right now only 50 percent of the tax dollars are actually getting out there to be used on cleaning up the site.

And I would point out that is another vote that has been scored as antienvironmental if we do a risk assessment.

Now let me ask another one. If the Federal Government initiates a new rule or a new regulation, and that new rule or new regulation causes an individual's property, has individual property, to decrease in value by more than 20 percent, say, the public is going to gain by this new rule or regulation. They want a waterway through a farm, so a farmer can no longer farm his land. So they initiate this new rule or regulation.

Does the gentleman think it is reasonable that the Federal Government should compensate the individual citizen for the loss of his property value?

Mr. BROWNBACK. Not only reasonable, but I believe constitutional.

Mr. NEUMANN. That is called takings, and that is the third antienvironmental vote we took.

Let me do one more question. If there was a forest fire and the trees burned out, and we are now looking at all this charred timber out there, and a lumber company says I can still harvest some of the timber, even though it is charred, we can still harvest some of this timber.

So the lumber company makes a deal they will buy the charred timber and replant the forest. Would it make sense to the gentleman that we would allow the lumber company to go in and harvest the charred timber and replant the forest, as opposed to leaving the charred timber to stay there to rot?

Mr. BROWNBACK. That would make sense to me.

Mr. NEUMANN. That was the fourth antienvironmental vote that has been scored by the environmental groups in this country today.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I think just recently the fifth environmental vote was if a Member votes against allocating family planning, which is the code word for

worldwide abortion, if we vote against family planning as part of the foreign aid package, is that an environmental vote? If a Member voted against promoting abortion on an international basis, that is an antienvironmental vote.

I think the gentleman has a great quiz, and I want to thank my colleagues for joining me. I think we are going to keep raising this issue over the coming weeks.

Washington has drawn its strength from this myth for way too long. Washington cannot solve everybody's problems, and when it pretends to, it really ends up too often hurting America and Americans.

When we move decisionmaking to Washington, we substitute Washington wisdom, "Washington wisdom," for the common sense of the American people. That is not the direction we want to be going. That is not the direction we need to go to address the problems that are facing this country. It is costing us trillions and trillions of dollars.

I think working together we will one way restore Washington to its proper role in American society. That is what our colleague from Arizona talked about when we began this an hour ago. There is much work to do to make that happen, but we are committed to working on that and seeing what we get back to common sense America and away from Washington wisdom.

CUTS IN GOVERNMENT WASTE NOT MADE IN NEW BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHRYSLER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we passed a large appropriations bill which completed the process of budgeting and appropriations for the fiscal year which began last October 1. It is finally all over and I have read the boast in the papers and heard them on television and radio of the majority party, the Republican majority, that they have cut the Federal budget by \$23 billion this year, \$23 billion since they came into power; \$23 billion has been cut out of the Federal budget.

And one would say, well, it is wonderful that all that waste has been trimmed, but when we examine the nature of the cuts, we find that the places where one knows there is a great deal of waste have not received any great cuts. On the other hand, when we go to look at the fine print of what we passed last Thursday, we find there are many, many people on the bottom, the folks who need the most in our society, who are going to be hurt. They are the victims of the \$23 billion in cuts.

It is quite interesting just to pick up today's paper, the New York Times, and see a contrast in articles. On one page we have an article which talks about the Freeman. You might say,

well, I am getting off the subject. The Freeman are out there in Montana and surrounded by the FBI, there is a standoff, there is a possibility that we may have some kind of violent explosion there. What does it have to do with the budget of the United States? What does it have to do with the fact that the Republican majority are boasting they cut the budget by \$23 billion? Well, the article that I am referring to that appeared in today's New York Times is headlined as follows: It says "Freemen Depended on Subsidies. Evicted Anti-Tax Rancher and Partners Got \$676,000 in U.S. Aid."

These are people who are angry with the government and have been yelling loudly to outsiders that they want the government off their back. The latest sign that has been posted by the leader of this group calls the U.S. Government a corporate prostitute. Nevertheless, they are the beneficiaries. The Clark family is the beneficiary of \$676,000 in U.S. aid.

This category certainly has not been hurt much by the \$23 billion in cuts because the \$23 billion in cuts that have taken place under the leadership of the Republican majority do not involve drastic cuts in the programs that the Freeman were beneficiaries of, agriculture programs of various kinds. There is a whole slew of agricultural beneficiary programs that have been flowing to the farmers, the agribusinesses, for many years and they are not being drastically cut in this \$23 billion cut this year.

The farmers programs are going to be phased out over a 7-year period. That is the public relations hype that we have been told: Do not worry, they are going to be phased out over a 7-year period. But they are still absorbing billions of dollars in waste.

And I will read on in this article and we can see what kind of waste I am talking about.

In the case of Mr. Clark, Ralph E. Clark is the leader of the Freeman. It is his ranchhouse that is surrounded. "Mr. Clark, a Freeman in a cowboy hat, nailed to a fence post a manifesto denouncing the Federal Government as a corporate prostitute." I am quoting. "Corporate prostitute" is his language. But to read on in the New York Times article obviously April 30, 1996, which I will enter into the RECORD, to read on, quoting from the article, "But tarnishing this image of rugged individualism, a new study of Federal payments indicates that over the last decade Mr. Clark and his ranch partners received \$676,082 in government checks to cushion a variety of farming setbacks."

We, the government, we the people we the taxpayers have been cushioning the setbacks of Mr. Clark and his family over the last 10 years.

□ 2145

They were dependent on the helping hand of the government, just like everybody else up there in agriculture, said Kenneth Cook, who is the President of the Environmental Working

Group, a nonprofit group in Washington that researches farm subsidy programs. Quote, continuing: But even by the standards of agriculture, hundreds of thousands of dollars over 10 years, that is substantial, added Mr. Cook, who is an analyst who compiled the figures on Friday after studying computer files on farm subsidy checks issued by the Department of Agriculture from 1985 to 1994. Documents filed at the Garfield County courthouse also offer glimpses into the heavy reliance on government aid by the 65-year-old farmer who now symbolizes the antigovernment Freemen group.

In the 1994 foreclosure sale of Ralph Clark's 960-acre homestead, court documents show that Mr. Clark signed a 10-year contract in 1990 to receive an annual payment of \$48,269 under the Conservation Reserve Program and was paid through 1994 under that program. Under this program, which is highly popular in Montana, farmers agreed to suspend production on steep slopes and other land highly subject to erosion, planted it with grass that will not be grazed or cut for hay. Critics of the program, which began in 1985, often call the program paying farmers not to farm. I would go even worse, I would go even further. Sounds like a racketeering enterprise. To pay farmers to select steep slopes in their land and plant grass instead of planting something else in order to keep it from eroding, to pay them large amounts of taxpayers' money, I consider that a racketeering enterprise with the government participating.

Mr. Speaker, they found an excuse, they found an excuse to pay these farmers large sums of money. You would be a fool not to take it. I continue to quote from the article. You would be a fool not to take it. Nick Morner, the Garfield County attorney, said of the subsidy money, referring to the skill in winning subsidy payments. He added, everybody in the county knows that is what they have been doing with a population of only 1,300 people. Garfield County received \$63 million in farm subsidy payments from 1985 to 1994. A population of only 1,300 people in Garfield County received \$63 million of your taxpayers' money in farm subsidy payments from 1985 to 1994. Stop and think about what that means.

Now, these are not the people being cut in the 23 billion dollars' worth of cuts that the Republican majority is so loudly proclaiming victory about. These people are not being cut. These programs are not being cut. Whether it is in Montana or in Kansas, in Montana or in Kansas, these are not the programs being cut.

One of the programs that is receiving a big cut this year is the 23 billion dollars' worth of cuts in public housing, housing for poor people, housing for the homeless. I am going to switch to another New York Times article that happened to appear on the same day. Today, Tuesday, April 30, the article

reads: Dole calls Public housing one of the last bastions of socialism. Dole calls public housing one of the last bastions of socialism.

You know, what is my theme for today? My theme is that it appears that, if there is a benefit available for very poor people, people that are on the very bottom of our economic strata, then automatically it is a horrible program and anything they get is too much. Anything that people on the bottom get is too much. Anything the average American, the needy American gets, that is too much.

Mr. Speaker, on the other hand, it appears that there is a group of people in America which never have enough, and more and more is always projected and that is still not enough. We cannot give the farmers too much. More and more is projected and that is not enough. Nobody calls the agriculture program, which is rampant in Kansas, the State of Kansas, nobody calls that socialism. But there, the Senator from Kansas in this article in the New York Times today is saying that public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism.

It seems that there is a group of people that I choose to call the overlords of America. You cannot talk about them in simple class warfare terms. Class warfare is an obsolete notion. It does not tell us anything. We talk about class warfare. You have to define people as being in the middle class and the upper class and the lower class. That does not describe what is going on in the world at all.

There is a class of overlords in the world. Overlords are people who have certain privileges and seem to have access to public funds and the public treasury, and they have their own agents in public places, and we can never give them too much, the overlords. Among the overlords are the farm program recipients. Overloads are not always millionaires. There are a lot of millionaires that are taken care of by the agents of the overlords.

Greenspan is an agent of the overlords. The Federal Reserve is part of a government banking industrial complex, and Greenspan sits on top of that. He guarantees that the banking overlords will always be taken care of, even if it means suffering for large numbers of Americans who are out there in the work force.

Greenspan makes certain that as the level of unemployment drops, if our economy is doing very well, lots of people are unemployed. Greenspan puts the brakes on, tightens up on the money and the investment lessens and unemployment goes up because people are not expanding industry. They cannot hire people, and the unemployment goes up. The suffering of workers becomes a barometer for progress for Greenspan, who is the head of the Federal Reserve Bank and the agent of the banking overlords.

So the overlords for agriculture, I suppose, the chief overlord is the Sec-

retary of Agriculture. They got a whole lot of public complex boards and various entities that make judgments about who is going to get Farmers' Home Loan mortgage money, who is going to have money forgiven. I have talked before about the fact that we forgave \$11 billion in Farmers Home Loan mortgages over a 5-year period. I still have not found out how the rules are made for forgiving loans in the Farmers Home Loan mortgage program. But obviously the rules are not for ordinary common Congressmen to know. I am not a member of the overlord group.

Agents of the overlords do not have to tell how they decide who gets all of this farm subsidy money, Farmers Home Loan mortgage money. But when it comes to my district, the 11th Congressional District in New York City, in Brooklyn, the 11th Congressional District has one of the poorest communities in America located within it. Brownsville is primarily made up of public housing units. There are about 20,000 people in Brownsville who live in public housing, some of the best public housing in the country, by the way, well-kept.

The New York City housing authority over the years, for the last 30 years, certainly since public housing expanded, has been one of the leading public housing authorities in the country in terms of the way public housing is operated and kept. A lot of problems, but still there is a long waiting list. People want to get that public housing in New York City. So, public housing is good housing for poor people in Brownsville.

They have to listen now to the Senator from Kansas, who happens to be the presidential candidate for the other party call public housing one of the last bastions of socialism. Agriculture, which funnels billions of dollars to the Ralph Clarks of the world, billions of dollars to agribusiness, is never seen as socialism, but now public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism. Well, perhaps it is, and my answer to that is it is good socialism. What is wrong with socialism for ordinary people? If you are going to have socialism for agribusiness, then why do we not have socialism for the homeless, socialism for the people who might be homeless if they did not have public housing. Socialism for senior citizens.

I was at a meeting last Friday called to take a look at what is happening here in Washington with the committee on housing and banking. The people in my district have been told that the Brook amendment, which says that no more than 30 percent of your income, if you are in public housing, you do not have to pay more than 30 percent of your income for rent. And that has been eliminated by the Republican majority in the House of Representatives. The Senate has not acted on it yet, but it has been eliminated by the Republican majority here in this House. So they are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, at that meeting the room was full of senior citizens. Yes, in the area of Brownsville, there are many young families also that live in public housing. But I suspect the problem with some of the younger families is that, unlike the senior citizens, they do not know of a time when they did not have the public housing. Every senior citizen in that room knew that when they were born, federally financed public housing did not exist. They know it did not exist before they were born. They know that it is possible to lose it, that when they die it may be gone. And they are ready to fight for it.

The people who take it for granted are the ones who came on the scene, they found public housing, and they really do not understand that it came out of Democratic efforts. It came out of the New Deal. It came out of Franklin Roosevelt's grand design to help poor people, the same Franklin Roosevelt that created public housing, socialism in housing, if you want to call planning, appropriating public funds, giving people housing according to their needs, charging them only according to their income, if you want to call that socialism, then that is one brand of socialism, I guess.

It is better than the brand of socialism that the Agriculture Department applies. Agriculture does not require people to be poor. Everybody who owns some land, by the fact that they own land, Mr. Clark owned thousands and thousands of acres, it did not stop him from getting large subsidies from the Agriculture Department. In fact, the more you own, the bigger you are, the more you get from the taxpayers of America, the more you get from the Government.

So that is a socialism you might call big belly socialism. The belly of that socialism is enormous. That socialism, indiscriminately showering its socialism on the rich and the few poor farmers left. Of course, there are a few poor farmers left in America, and we certainly want to see they get some kind of help from the Government. In fact, that is what Franklin Roosevelt intended when he created the farm subsidy program. The same man who created the subsidy program in housing created the subsidy programs in agriculture, all to help poor people. The same man who created subsidy programs in housing and subsidy programs in agriculture also created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to safeguard the money that every American puts in the bank.

When Franklin Roosevelt, the Democrat, the New Dealer, the socialist, when he created the FDIC, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is socialism in banking, you might say that the Federal Government stands behind your deposits, insuring that your deposits up to a certain point will not be lost because the Government stands behind it. When Franklin Roosevelt first created it, it was \$10,000, a

reasonable amount. The banking overlords took it over, and the banking overlords have raised the \$10,000 amount up to \$100,000. And the banking overlords can play the game so that it is \$100,000 in each bank. If you are rich, you can go from bank to bank and you can end up with several million dollars in the banks insured by the FDIC so that the taxpayers are going to cover your millions of dollars under this socialized banking program.

Mr. Speaker, so socialism for banking is all right because the overlords benefit. Socialism for agriculture is all right because the overlords benefit. But all of a sudden socialism in housing is under attack and will be a leading target, one of the major targets in the coming political campaign. Socialism in housing, giving housing to poor people: Well, that also fits, I suppose in some kind of bizarre pattern, some kind of bizarre maze.

Mr. Speaker, we do not hear any attacks on the situation that created the monstrosity in Montana, the Freeman out there go home free. They are not being attacked. They are not being targeted. Probably the Democratic-Republican campaign in the coming election will completely ignore the economics of the situation that created the crisis in Montana. With a population of only 1,300 people, the taxpayers were being swindled out of \$63 million in farm subsidy payments over a 10-year period.

□ 2200

Let me continue to read from the article about the standoff in Montana and show you how the standoff in Montana relates to the \$23 billion in budget cuts that impact mostly on the poorest people of America and do not cut waste because these are the recipients of waste.

In the same period that Garfield County received \$63 million in farm subsidy payments, the section of Jordan where the Clarks live, 76 farmers in that section, 76 farmers, received \$7.3 million from 31 different farm subsidy programs.

I said before that there are a lot of different pieces in the farm racketeering setup, a lot of different pieces: The Farmers' Home Loan Mortgage, which is very seldom discussed. We talk about the farm subsidy program on the floor of the House a great deal, but we do not talk about all those other pieces. But there were 31 different farm subsidy programs that the racketeers in Ralph Clark's gang tapped into.

Continuing to read from the article, quote: "What stands out about Ralph Clark is the complexity. Ordinarily a family farm is not that complicated."

"Over a 10-year period, Federal checks went to 11 entities with interest in the main Clark homestead here—first, to Mr. Clark; then, from 1988 to 1993, to a corporation in which Mr. Clark was a stockholder, and then, in 1993 and 1994, to a revocable trust in which he had an interest.

"Around 1992, they were setting up revocable trusts as a means of avoiding

income taxes, State taxes,' Mr. Murnion, The County Attorney, said, referring to one of a series of strategies Mr. Clark tried over the last 15 years to avoid losing his farm."

"Mr. Clark's financial problems date to 1978, when, following the trend of the time, Mr. Clark borrowed heavily to expand his holdings, adding 7,000 acres to his original homestead."

Now, if you have the image of a struggling farmer out there in the New Deal days, when President Roosevelt first created the farm subsidy program, reaching out to the Federal Government to get much-deserved assistance to keep family farms alive, and then using that to maintain a family farm to not only take care of his own family but to provide to the overall economy, to keep the cost of food down, we know all the good things that flow from an agriculture program that is working properly, but not Mr. Clark. He went into heavy debt in order to expand his farm, which was already very large, by 7,000 additional acres.

In May of 1982, the Farmers' Home Administration, however, had to call in his entire outstanding debt of \$825,000 because the greed, the greed that drove Mr. Clark to expand his farm, to buy more land, evidently was not based on anything sound. In fact, it was probably part of a racketeering plot. He knew the land he was using was not going to produce anything. They just wanted the money.

Why do I say that? I am only reading from the New York Times because in another section here I am going to skip, remember the entire article will be entered into the record, if you are interested, and I am going to skip to another section which describes the behavior of Mr. Clark in case you are weeping for the man who had his farm foreclosed because he owed the Federal Government \$825,000 in outstanding debt. Do not weep. Save your tears for the people who are denied the minimum wage. Save your tears for the homeless out there who will have fewer public housing units. Save your tears for the people who really need it.

Mr. Clark, to continue reading from the article, quote, "When Mr. Clark and other Freeman farmers had money, they did not always spend it wisely, neighbors said. After winning one stay of foreclosure from the Farmers Home Administration, they recalled, he bought," Mr. Clark bought, "a Lincoln Continental. Bill Stanton, a 65-year-old neighbor who joined with the Freeman, was known by neighbors to have spent his Federal subsidy checks on things like a helicopter, a motor home and gambling trips to Las Vegas, Nevada, and the Bahamas."

Taxpayers, you want to know what you should get angry about? You want to know what should drive you into a rage? This is not atypical of the way farm subsidies, Farmers home loan mortgage money has been used.

Two years ago, we had an article on the front page of the Washington Post

that talked about four millionaires, four or five millionaires; I do not remember the exact number; who were doing worse things than this. They had airplanes, they had airfields, they had all kinds of things that they were using the taxpayers' money to finance. Mr. Clark bought a Lincoln Continental, his neighbor bought a helicopter, a motor home, and he took gambling trips to Las Vegas, NV, and the Bahamas. But he is in the overlord group. No one is criticizing him. He will not be a target in the upcoming political campaign.

Agricultural socialism is acceptable socialism obviously, and the candidate who has said that we got to get rid of housing socialism is from a State where there are large amounts of this agricultural socialism.

I am sure in Kansas there are a large number of Randolph Clarks, probably smarter than Randolph Clark because they have not gone off their rocker. They have not completely lost their senses. Mr. Clark is such an overlord and has been an overlord for so long, he has gotten so much from the Government, that he really believes that he has a divine right. You are talking about a divine right of farmers to swindle the American taxpayers. That is what Mr. Clark is upset about. I have the right, and therefore the fact that I owe \$825,000, why are you bothering me? You know, why come bother me after all these years of largess, of laying down millions of dollars? Why bother me? I am going to go to war.

So they are at war. They have got rifles. They are ready to kill people. Do not get between them and their right to the taxpayers' dollars.

Continuing to read from the article: "In the 1980's, opposition to Federal aid became heresy here." In Jordan, where these people live, anybody who came along and said they opposed Federal aid was in trouble. There was a group that came along and talked about getting rid of Federal aid, and their windshield was smashed. A smashed windshield greeted Bob Scott, a Montana environmentalist, when he visited Jordan in 1987 to propose that local ranchers be weaned from Federal aid through the creation of a huge deer and bison hunting preserve.

Let me read that again. Here is an environmentalist who comes along who also obviously cares about waste in Government. He wants to see Government streamlined and downsized. He wants to see it done honestly. He does not want to see streamlining and downsizing done on the backs of people in public housing, done on the backs of children's lunch programs. He does not want to see streamlining done by decreasing the number of jobs available in the Summer Youth Employment Program.

You know this \$23 billion that has been trimmed from the budget this year has come from the peasants on the bottom, the untouchables of America, and I use this because this is just

a psychological labeling. It is the way things are developing. It is nothing very simple. You cannot put your hand on it. Persons untouchable today could be an overlord in a few years. In fact, that is part of why the old class warfare nomenclature does not apply. You cannot talk about America in terms of class warfare because the folks on the bottom are dreaming that one day they will be overlords, and therefore it governs the way they think, it governs the way they resist the overlords, and it governs the way they react to the agents of the overlord. Large numbers of people may think I may one day be an overlord, so let us leave the system in place. What they do not know is that the evidence has shown that there are fewer and fewer people rising from the bottom, the middle class, to become overlords.

At any rate, "Increasingly the subsidy checks became crucial for the survival of the Clark clan," quoting from the New York Times article. "Increasingly subsidy checks became crucial for survival of the Clark clan. In January 1994, the Clarks led a group of armed men to stone the county courthouse here. At issue was a Federal subsidy check that the former wife of Richard E. Clark, Ralph Clark's nephew, was seeking in a divorce payment."

They were fighting among themselves over a farm subsidy check, and they stormed the courthouse. It was the beginning of the great revolution of the Freeman in Montana.

It all relates, my colleagues. These people who say they want to get Government off their back, people who say that Government does not owe them anything, Government should not help anybody, God helps those who help themselves, leave me along, I will do my own thing. Thousands and thousands of them exist out there, receiving farm subsidy checks in large amounts. They say everybody else is the recipient of socialism, but they receive socialism in gigantic amounts.

The overloads, the agricultural overlords, they do not receive nearly as much money as the banking overlords. The oil industry overlords; we have higher gasoline prices right now. There are a dozen ways in which the Government could act to bring down the price of gasoline just by making it a level playing field for the consumers versus the oil industry. But oil prices have been kept inflated for a long time now in order to pay for investments and to pay certain rate of returns.

So the socialism of the oil industrial complex is why we are having a great increase in gasoline prices that will go on for a while, a little while, while they make large amounts of money, and they will cut it off because the outcry will be so great until they have to bring down the price of gasoline probably within about 3 or 4 weeks.

Anyway, I want to conclude this article. I did not mean to go on for so long. This is an article, I say for anybody who joined us late, that appeared in

the Tuesday, April 30, today's New York Times, and it is labeled "Freemen Dependent on Subsidies, Evicted Anti-tax Ranching and Partners got \$676,000 in U.S. Aid," and the article concludes by saying "Two weeks ago, surrounded by Federal agents, embittered by Federal justice and cut off from Federal aid, Mr. Clark ordered a follower to nail to his fence the manifesto," that proclaimed, quote, "Freemen are not a part of a de facto corporate prostitute, a.k.a. the United States."

The overlords of the agriculture industry have gone berserk, and they are biting the hand that has fed them for so long, and now they even want to get violent with the people who have fed them for so long.

Americans in the rest of the country, Americans who are not on the agricultural dole, listen carefully, understand where your money goes. Most of this was not cut. It is still flowing to people like Randolph Clark and to folks who are really much better than Randolph Clark but still they are willing to sit there and take the socialism of the agricultural industry and complain that they want to get Government off their back, complain about Government spending too much money on the homeless, they complain about Government providing jobs for poor kids during the summer. These same people are guilty of monumental hypocrisy, and the Representatives that come from their States are guilty of monumental hypocrisy when they go on the floor or go anywhere and make statements about public housing being the last bastion of socialism. Public housing may be good socialism, but it is not the last bastion. It is not the worst bastion, it is not corrupted bastion.

The corrupted bastion of socialism in America is agriculture. The overlords of agriculture must be examined very closely, the whole set of activities that are occurring in America based on the overlord assumptions, assumptions that certain people owe them more and more.

Have you ever read an article in the New York Times, the Washington Post, or most of the establishment newspapers which criticized the corporations for making more profits?

□ 2215

On the contrary, when the corporations lay off people, downsize, streamline, merge, for whatever reason they lay off large numbers of people, they lay off thousands of people, the articles that appear on the editorial page are usually articles that say, we are sorry, we mourn the fact that people have been laid off; however, in the global economy, American corporations cannot survive unless they are tough. They cannot survive unless they do what they have to do. Unless they downsize or merge or streamline, they cannot continue to provide the good things that they provide to America.

The New York Times, the Washington Post, none of these entities are

blind or stupid. They know that thousands of workers are being laid off. Why do they not write editorials and say that people are losing jobs as a result of these actions being taken by these corporations? What they are saying in the case of the proposal to raise the minimum wage is, Do not do it, it is silly, it is stupid, because people will lose jobs if you raise the minimum wage. The same newspapers that have no concern about the jobs that are lost as a result of merging, downsizing, and streamlining are very concerned about jobs that will be lost because we raise the minimum wage by 1996. The theory is that if you raise the minimum wage by 1996, employers out there will not be able to afford the workers, so they will lay off some; so crocodile tears are being cried about the possibility that people will be laid off because the economics of the situation are such that to give more to the people on the very bottom will produce a situation where people lose jobs.

If we are concerned about people losing jobs, let us start at the top and say, Do not have anymore streamlining, layoffs, or downsizing, because people will lose jobs. All of a sudden the media, the newspapers, have come to the aid of the overlords. They can do no harm by streamlining. If they want to make more profit, then they are applauded. That is great for America. But if you want to take care of the untouchables and the peasants down at the bottom all of a sudden, do not do it. We have an overlord versus the untouchables mentality.

I said last week that in too many activities the overlord versus untouchable mentality crops up. The people with disabilities in America are suddenly labeled as untouchables. We have a whole series of policies being formulated, being pushed by the Republican Party, going after people with disabilities. You want to go after their Social Security benefits, you want to go after them through Medicaid, and have them defined by each State as to who has a disability or not.

The latest attack on people with disabilities is an attack on children with disabilities. In my committee, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, a bill has just been passed by the subcommittee which deals with cutting back drastically on services, Federal assistance for children with disabilities. All of a sudden, they must save money here. We must trim money here for children with disabilities. We can no longer have a commitment by the Federal Government.

There is a commitment in the authorizing legislation which says that the Federal Government will pay 40 percent of the excess costs. The difference between what it costs to educate a child who does not have a disability and what you pay additional to educate a child who does have a disability, the Federal Government is committed by the authorizing language

of the law to pay 40 percent. We have never paid that much, because the appropriation process has always kept it down. The most we pay is, we pay 8 percent. But 8 percent is still a sizeable commitment.

In the current legislation, it caught me by surprise, because when I spoke last week I did not realize that in the current legislation, somehow any discussion of the obligation of the Federal Government to that 40 percent has been omitted. Children with disabilities are on the bottom. They are untouchable in the eyes of the Republican majority here. They are not overlords. They do not deserve to be protected.

Let me just close by specifically looking at the overlord untouchable mentality at work, the attitude at work in the budget cuts last week; the final touch, the completion of the process for the budget for the fiscal year that began on October 1 of 1995. That is completed now, and as I said at the beginning, the Republican majority are happy. They are parading through the streets with a banner which says, "We cut the Federal programs. We cut the Federal Government by \$23 billion." Let us take a look at those cuts in more detail.

In education, where at first they wanted to cut \$5 billion out, but on the floor of this House there was a great campaign mounted to let the American people know the nature of those cuts. There are people who say that if you are in the minority, then who needs you? If you are in the minority, you are of no use to the Nation. But the campaign mounted by the minority, the Democratic minority, against the cuts in education is one example of why you always need the loyal opposition, why you always need a minority, because the interests of the people out there in the final analysis, if it is properly understood, if the people, if the voters understand where their interests lie, they will impact on the decision-making process in a democratic government.

It takes a lot of talking, a lot of illustrations, a lot of charts, a lot of repetition to do it, but it was done. So, \$5 billion in proposed education cuts were beaten down. We did not get them because day after day, night after night, on the floor of this House, a campaign was mounted to educate the American people about what was happening and how harmful it would be to the children of America. From the school lunch cuts to the cuts in title I, the cuts in Head Start, we kept banging away at it.

There are people who say you waste time when you go on the floor during special orders, it is a waste of public money, et cetera. We get very little time during the regular session, so we need special orders. This House, with 435 Members, meets far less than the other body, which has 100 Members. The time spent on the floor by the other body is far greater than the time spent on the floor by this House. So we

get the time we can get in order to educate the American people about what is going on.

It paid off. In the case of education, we beat back \$5 billion in cuts to very vital programs, but we did not win totally. For \$1 billion dollars was cut from the Pell grants. Pell grant carry-over money was used to make up \$1 billion. That was not known. That was a hidden cut. So you have the poorest college students, and Pell grants are for disadvantaged, low-income students, the poorest students contributed \$1 billion in cuts that they did not know about.

The Perkins loan also took a substantial cut, from \$176 million to \$113 million. The money goes to disadvantaged students seeking college aid, again the untouchables people at the very lowest rungs, and they are the people who fueled this \$20 billion in cuts.

In the Health and Human Services budget, the low-income heating assistance program lost \$14 million. Yes, we did raise our voices about that, and I am glad that we beat back an effort to cut it totally, but they lost \$14 billion.

In the housing area, which the Senator from Kansas is calling socialism today in the New York Times, there were 20 separate authorizing provisions put into the housing program. This is an appropriation bill, and the rule says you are not supposed to authorize on an appropriation bill, but rules and parliamentary procedure, democracy, in this Congress has all been thrown away long ago. So in the housing appropriations, there are 20 separate authorizing provisions, which move us closer and closer to the time when there will be no public housing as we know it.

HUD lost \$1.1 billion in grants for homeless housing; \$1.1 billion was taken away from grants to assist homeless people, \$1.1 billion from the untouchables, the people at the very bottom. The Legal Services Corporation lost 31 percent of their funding. About a third of the neighborhood law offices will have to be closed across the country.

Legal services is for the poor, people on the very bottom who want to be able to take advantage of our great democracy and the court system. If you do not have a lawyer, it is usually impossible for you to do that. This is only for civil cases, not for criminal cases. A campaign was mounted by the Republican majority and it succeeded, so some of that \$23 billion is to take away any legal assistance for poor people.

The Department of Labor took a 7-percent cut overall. The Department of Labor took a 7 percent-cut. The Department's deepest cuts, where did they fall? You can guess. The Department's deepest cuts fell in employment and training programs that help disadvantaged adults and laid-off workers. The deepest cuts fell in employment and training programs that help disadvantaged adults and laid-off workers.

The pattern is clear. The untouchables, the people on the very bottom, not the overlords, have to bear the burden of the \$23 billion in cuts.

We are still going to hear more later on about tax cuts, which is like giving to the overlords. That \$23 billion we have cut out, we are going to take part of that and make a gift to the overlords in terms of a tax cut for the rich. Some of the other programs that were cut, I want to be specific about education, since education is the committee that I serve on.

We heard the gentleman before me talk about education and how it is awful that the Federal Government is involved in education to the extent that it is. Of all the industrialized nations, the United States of America is the least involved in education at the central government level. We give the least amount of money. Less than 7 percent of our education budget is supplied by the Federal Government.

They talk about the Federal Government trying to run our schools. If you are giving 7 percent of the money, and most of the programs that you fund with the money are voluntary, how can you be running local schools through the Federal Government? But they cut magnet schools. Magnet schools made a contribution of \$16.5 million to the \$23 billion cut.

Howard University, Howard University made a contribution of \$22.3 million to the \$23 billion cut. If you have a chessboard, you can look at the rook, the knight, the queen, et cetera, and you can see as they take it away—they took magnet schools off, they got that; they got Howard University; health professions, \$19.6 million; Healthy Start, \$11.2 million; dislocated workers assistance, \$131 million; adult training, \$146.8 million; I said Perkins loans before; State student incentive grants, \$32 million; aid for institutional development lost \$34 million; graduate fellowships lost \$11 million.

Libraries, libraries get a very tiny amount of money in the total budget to begin with, they lost \$11.7 million. The Center for Substance Abuse lost \$118 million; substance abuse prevention lost \$148 million; developmental disabilities, \$7.6 million; the Administration on Aging, \$46.6 million; vocational education, \$22.9 million. The little people on the bottom lost. The overlords gained.

Mr. Speaker, I have to end on an optimistic note, so within all the darkness, there is some light at the end of the tunnel. I close with a final appreciation of the fact that our hard work paid off in education, and title I was not cut, so title I education funding is now at the same level as it was last year.

New York City schools will receive \$395 million, an increase of \$67 million over the \$328 million level in the House-passed bill. If the House-passed bill had gone through we would have lost tremendous amounts of money, but we have now regained. We are

where we were last year. The schools in New York will get the same amount of money.

Drug-free schools is restored at the 1995 level. Bilingual education, \$75 million has been added to the House level for a total of \$128 million. This is an increase over what the House had cut before. New York City will receive \$15.3 million of that bilingual education funding.

Summer jobs, unfortunately, I have overstated that in the last week. I thought we were exactly at the same level, but we are going to lose some jobs because the amount of money received by New York City will not be \$29.9 million which was received last year, it will be \$21 million, which means it will be a pretty substantial cut in the number of jobs that youngsters will be able to get this year. After all, they are on the bottom. These are poor, disadvantaged youngsters, part of untouchable class, not part of the overlords. So they have been cut. They have to make their contribution to the \$23 billion in downsizing.

□ 2230

The good news is that Head Start received additional money and New York City will receive \$97 million, an increase of \$3.8 million over last year's figure.

There is one place where we gained, Head Start for poor children, one place where the untouchables, the people at the bottom were able to gain. Cops on the Beat, \$1.4 billion is included for Cops on the Beat, compared to zero that the House had cut it to at one time which means that New York City will likely get about 2,200 additional police officers.

The good news is that when you fight and you really raise your voice and you carry the message to the American people, the American people out there in all those 435 congressional districts have a lot of common sense, and they will respond. Obviously they responded to the districts of Democrats and Republicans and they let it be known they did not want the cuts in education. They understood what was happening. It was not so complicated. And they decided that we, the ordinary people, do not want the cuts. "Don't treat us the way you treat other untouchables. Treat us the way you treat overlords. We don't want the cuts."

Mr. Speaker, I will enter in its entirety in the RECORD the article that appeared in the New York Times on today, April 30, entitled "Dole Calls Public Housing One Of Last Bastions of Socialism."

Mr. Speaker, I close with one negative note. In addition to cutting \$23 billion, the Appropriations Committee in the overlord atmosphere, they acted like agents of overlords and they usurped the power of the authorizing committees and they got rid of a concept called Opportunity to Learn Standards. It is just a concept really because it was in the Goals 2000 legisla-

tion and it said that in addition to testing children to see how much they have learned, in addition to establishing standards across the country so that you could compare what is being taught from one State to another and then testing young people from one State to another, to compare to see how they are doing, you ought to also have something called Opportunity to Learn Standards so that you look at from one State to another what opportunities to learn are being provided. Are you providing decent schools, safe buildings that do not have lead poisoning and asbestos? Are you providing laboratories for science teaching and science equipment? Are you providing library books that are up to date so that kids are not reading books 30 years old and history and geography which do not have the latest countries that have been established over the last 15 years in them? Are you providing qualified teachers so that you do not have a situation like the one in New York City which 3 years ago a survey showed that in three-quarters of the city where Latino and African-American children went to school, all the teachers of math and science had not majored in math and science in college so they were not qualified to teach math and science in junior high school so the kids went into high school crippled because of the fact they did not have a good foundation in junior high school. Opportunity to Learn Standards would have taken care of that.

The arrogant Appropriations Committee abused its power and it went into authorizations. It cut out the Opportunity to Learn Standards. We debated this for 6 months when the bill was reauthorized. We argued with the Senate in conference for 2 more months. It was a deliberative process which concluded with language that kept the concept in there and educated Americans as to what is happening overall in educational reform. The arrogant, abusive, overlord-minded Appropriations Committee cut it out. It reduces the rest of us and all the authorizing committees to untouchables in the Congress. We do not have any real power. In the final analysis all decisions are going to be made by the Appropriations Committee. It bodes ill for the process.

The overlord philosophy, the overlord ideology will destroy democracy in America if we do not confront it. Understand what is happening. There are overlords, and there are untouchables. America was built for everybody, made for everybody, and we have to go to war. I do not mean physical war but political war to make certain that the overlords do not dominate and destroy us. Overlords must be stopped first in the budget process and in the appropriations process.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1996]
 FREEMAN DEPENDED ON SUBSIDIES
 EVICTED ANTI-TAX RANCHER AND PARTNERS
 GOT \$676,000 IN U.S. AID
 (By James Brooke)

JORDAN, MT, April 26.—Striding to the edge of Ralph E. Clark's ranch here recently, a Freeman in a cowboy hat nailed to a fence post a manifesto denouncing the Federal Government as a "corporate prostitute."

But tarnishing this image of rugged individualism, a new study of Federal payments indicates that over the last decade Mr. Clark and his ranch partners received \$676,082 in Government checks to cushion a variety of farming setbacks: droughts, hailstorms and low prices for wheat wool and barley. The flow of Federal money was not enough to prevent foreclosure on the ranch two years ago, but Mr. Clark refused to leave, setting the stage for a siege that is now in its fifth week.

"They were dependent on the helping hand of Government, just like everybody else up there in agriculture," said Kenneth Cook, president of the Environmental Working Group, a nonprofit group in Washington that researches farm subsidy programs.

"But even by standards of agriculture, hundreds of thousands of dollars over 10 years—that's substantial," added Mr. Cook, whose analysts compiled the figures on Friday after weeks of studying computer files on farm subsidy checks issued by the Department of Agriculture from 1985 to 1994.

Documents filed at the Garfield County Courthouse also offer glimpses into the heavy reliance on Government aid by the 65-year-old farmer who now symbolizes the anti-government Freeman group. In the 1994 foreclosure sale of Ralph Clark's 960-acre homestead, court documents show that Mr. Clark signed a 10-year contract in 1990 to receive an annual payment of \$48,269 under the Conservation Reserve Program. Payments were made through 1994 the Environmental Working Group said.

Under this program, highly popular in Montana, farmers agree to suspend production on steep slopes and other land highly subject to erosion, planting it with grass that will not be grazed or cut for hay. Critics of the program, which began in 1985, often call it "paying farmers not to farm."

"You'd be a fool not to take it," Nick Murnion, the Garfield County Attorney, said of the subsidy money. Referring to the Clark clan's skill in winning subsidy payments, he added, "Everybody in the country knows that's what they have been doing."

With a population of only 1,300 people, Garfield County received \$63 million in farm subsidy payments from 1985 to 1994, the Environmental Working Group said. In the same period in Brusett, the section of Jordan where the Clarks live, 76 farmers received \$7.3 million from 31 different farm subsidy programs.

"What stands out about Ralph Clark is the complexity," said Clark Williams, an analyst for the Washington group. "Ordinarily, a family farm is not that complicated."

Over a 10-year period, Federal checks went to 11 entities with interest in the main Clark homestead here—first to Mr. Clark; then, from 1988 to 1993, to a corporation in which he was a stockholder, and then, in 1993 and 1994, to a revocable trust in which he had an interest.

"Around 1992, they were setting up revocable trusts as a means of avoiding income taxes, state taxes," Mr. Murnion, the County Attorney, said, referring to one of a series of strategies Mr. Clark tried over the last 15 years to avoid losing his farm, which had been in his family since 1913.

Mr. Clark's financial problems date to 1978 when, following the trend of the time, he

borrowed heavily to expand his holdings, adding 7,000 acres to his original homestead. But interest rates soared to 21 percent in 1979, drought struck in 1980 and hail flattened his wheat and barley crops in 1981. By May 1982, the Farmers Home Administration was calling in his entire outstanding debt of \$825,000.

"Someone like Ralph didn't start out hating the system," recalled Sarah Vogel, a lawyer who helped him to postpone foreclosure in 1982 and who is now North Dakota's Agriculture Commissioner. "He was a genuine, old timey rancher, who grew up without a telephone, who used to deliver mail by horseback because they didn't have roads."

In dealing with the Federal bureaucracy, Ms. Vogel recalls, Mr. Clark labored under a hidden handicap: he had never learned to read or write. "He never admitted it," she said. "I remember driving to the hearing, and he said, 'I forgot my glasses at home, could you tell me what that street sign says?'"

To handle the paperwork of modern farming, he relied on his wife, Kay, or on his son, Edwin.

Ms. Vogel's defense of Mr. Clark drew an article in Life magazine and a report by Geraldo Rivera on the ABC News program "20/20." Following this publicity, charitable donations flowed from around the nation to help the beleaguered farmer. Neighbors said financial help and counseling also came in the late 1980's from Farm Aid, a support group now in Cambridge, Mass.

"Ralph flunked out of grade school, but he had an ability to mesmerize people," said Cecil Weeding, a neighboring rancher who is married to Mr. Clark's sister Ada. "He was a natural con man."

When Mr. Clark and other Freeman farmers had money, they did not always spend it wisely, neighbors said. After winning one stay of foreclosure from Farmers Home Administration, they recalled, he bought a Lincoln Continental. Bill Stanton, a 65-year-old neighbor, who joined the Freeman, was known by neighbors to have spent his Federal subsidy checks on things like a helicopter, a motor home and gambling trips to Las Vegas, Nev., and the Bahamas.

In the 1980's, opposition to Federal aid became heresy here. Jordan, with only 450 people, is at the center of a semi-desert expanse called the Big Open, where 3,000 people are scattered over 15,000 square miles.

A smashed windshield greeted Bob Scott, a Montana environmentalist, when he visited Jordan in 1987 to propose that local ranchers be weaned from Federal aid through the creation of a huge deer and bison hunting preserve. "I remember the Clarks as the ones being the most xenophobic, with the most bizarre ideas," Mr. Scott recalled in a telephone interview from his home in Missoula. "One of the Clarks said we were a cult group that was going to bring AIDS into the area."

Increasingly, subsidy checks became crucial for the survival of the Clark clan. In January 1994, the Clarks led a group of armed men to storm the county courthouse here. At issue was a Federal subsidy check that the former wife of Richard E. Clark, Ralph Clark's nephew, was seeking in a divorce payment.

But time was running out for the Clarks in the conventional courts of the land. On April 14, 1994, Ralph Clark's homestead farm was sold for \$50,000 to an out-of-state creditor bank. In October 1995, K.L. Bliss, a local rancher, paid \$493,000 for the 7,000-acre spread that Mr. Clark bought nearly 20 years earlier.

But two years ago, Mr. Clark gave up on the courts and stopped leaving his farm. From his homestead, renamed "Justus

Township," he signed his name to a series of pronouncements setting up a parallel "common law" system of marshals and grand juries. According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Clark farm compound also began to compete with the Federal Reserve, issuing its own currency in the form of millions of dollars in bogus checks.

Two weeks ago, surrounded by Federal agents, embittered by Federal justice and cut off from Federal aid, Mr. Clark ordered a follower to nail to his fence the manifesto that proclaimed: "Freemen are NOT a part to the de facto corporate prostitute a/k/a the United States."

DOLE CALLS PUBLIC HOUSING ONE OF 'LAST BASTIONS OF SOCIALISM'
 (By Adam Nagourney)

WASHINGTON, April 29.—Senator Bob Dole called today for an end to Government-assisted housing programs, terming public housing "one of the last bastions of socialism in the world" and attacking the Clinton Administration for regulatory excess that he likened to the "thought police."

Mr. Dole called for the elimination of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and declared that Government had an obligation to maintain basic services for the poor, but he added: "These programs have failed in that mission. They have not alleviated poverty. They have not; in fact, they've deepened it."

"Public housing is one of the last bastions of socialism in the world. Imagine, the United States Government owns the housing where an entire class of citizens permanently live. We're the landlords of misery."

With his speech to a convention of real estate agents here this morning, the presumptive Republican Presidential nominee signaled his third attempt in two weeks to define differences between himself and President Clinton. And again, he did so by portraying the two men as occupying opposite ends of the ideological spectrum. He had previously attacked Mr. Clinton's record of judiciary appointments, and over the weekend, he called for a rollback of the 4.3 cent gasoline tax that Mr. Clinton had pushed through as part of the 1993 deficit-reduction package.

Mr. Dole's remarks about public housing were at the heart of a speech that included both a broad range of criticism of Mr. Clinton's record as well as a defense of Mr. Dole's ties to the Republican Congress. Aides to the Kansas Senator believe that Mr. Dole's recent political difficulties, suggested by his poor standing in public opinion polls, have been caused, at least in part, by his association with House Republicans and the difficulties he has encountered in trying to run the Senate as majority leader while running for President.

Mr. Dole made clear today that he intended neither to step down from his position in the Senate, nor to step away from his colleagues in the House. "I've read lately that all those radical ideas that we had are the reasons we may be in difficulty," said Mr. Dole. "First of all, I don't think we're in difficulty but secondly, they're not radical ideas."

He mentioned in particular the attempts by Congress to balance the budget over seven years. "We thought it was a pretty good idea," Mr. Dole said, "and it wasn't radical, wasn't some crackpot idea that Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole thought of at midnight some—one night, and said, 'Oh, let's do this,' And we did it."

Still, Mr. Dole's speech showed the difficulties he has encountered trying to find a middle ground between Mr. Clinton's policies and those of conservative Republicans in Congress. Even as he pointedly rejected suggestions that his political difficulties were

caused by this association with Mr. Gingrich, Mr. Dole made a point of saying that he thought Government "has an obligation to maintain a safety net."

And even as he offered a broad criticism of the Department of Housing and Urban Development he offered some praise for the organization he was attacking. "I think we've certainly downsized it a great deal, and I've said before we could abolish it," Mr. Dole said. "But I think their goals are commendable. They want to reduce the number of homeless; they want to expand housing opportunities and open housing markets to minorities."

Mr. Dole suggested that the public housing programs be replaced with a system of vouchers, under which people eligible for public housing assistance would be awarded certificates that they could use to pay for rent in private housing.

To clear the way for the elimination of the housing agency, Mr. Dole proposed that homeless assistance programs should be transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services, and enforcement efforts be turned over to the Department of Justice.

Henry G. Cisneros, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, said that his department had tried to push the voucher program through, but had encountered resistance from Republicans in Congress. He rejected Mr. Dole's statement as "election-year simplistic answers. What about all those units, and all those people, and what has been a 60-year consensus on house policy?"

Beyond policy, Mr. Dole singled out for criticism a senior official in the Department of Housing and Urban Development—Roberta Achtenberg—as an example of liberal excesses. He noted that she has led an effort by HUD to investigate groups that had fought the agency's efforts to build public housing.

Mr. Dole was referring to two instances in which HUD investigated citizens who sought to block public housing projects by writing letters of protest and gathering petitions.

Both investigations were scaled back in response to criticism, on orders of Mr. Cisneros. Mr. Dole, recounting the incident today, likened HUD to the thought police and said that in his administration, "There is no room for discrimination, but there will also be no room for intimidating and intrusive actions."

Ms. Achtenberg was the only HUD official Mr. Dole mentioned by name. Her appointment was noteworthy because she was the highest-level open lesbian appointed by the President, and her appointment has been opposed by some conservative Republicans, notably Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina, who is a longtime friend and supporter of the Kansas Senator. Mr. Dole's aides said the Senator has singled her out only because she was in charge of the department behind these inquiries, and they were not trying to revive the controversy over her appointment.

CORRECTION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1996—CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3019, BALANCED BUDGET LOAN DOWN PAYMENT ACT

For consideration of the House Bill (except for section 101(c)) and the Senate amendment (except for section 101(d)), and modifications committed to conference:

BOB LIVINGSTON,
JOHN MYERS,
BILL YOUNG,

RALPH REGULA,
JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
HAL ROGERS,
JOE SKEEN,
FRANK R. WOLF,
BARBARA VUCANOVICH,
JIM LIGHTFOOT,
SONNY CALLAHAN,
JAMES T. WALSH,
DAVID R. OBEY,
LOUIS STOKES,
TOM BEVILL,
JOHN P. MURTHA,
CHARLES WILSON,
BILL HEFNER,
ALAN MOLLOHAN,

For consideration of section 101(c) of the House bill, and section 101(d) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

JOHN EDWARD PORTER,
BILL YOUNG,
ERNEST ISTOOK,
DAN MILLER,
JAY DICKEY,
FRANK RIGGS,
ROGER F. WICKER,
BOB LIVINGSTON,
DAVID R. OBEY,
LOUIS STOKES,
STENY HOYER,
NANCY PELOSI,
NITA M. LOWEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

MARK O. HATFIELD,
TED STEVENS,
THAD COCHRAN,
ARLEN SPECTER,
PETE V. DOMENICI,
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,
SLADE GORTON,
MITCH MCCONNELL,
CONNIE MACK,
RICHARD C. SHELBY,
JAMES M. JEFFORDS,
ROBERT F. BENNETT,
BEN NIGHTHORSE
CAMPBELL,
ROBERT BYRD,
DANIEL K. INOUE,
FRITZ HOLLINGS,
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,
PATRICK J. LEAHY,
DALE BUMPERS,
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
TOM HARKIN,
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,
HARRY REID,
J. ROBERT KERREY,
PATTY MURRAY,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effects of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying report.

Report language included by the Senate in the report accompanying S. 1594 (S. Rept. 104-236) which is not changed by the conference are approved by the committee of conference. The statement of the managers while repeating some report language for emphasis, is not intended to negate the language referred to above unless expressly provided herein.

TITLE I—OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Sec. 101. (a).—The text of the language included under section 101(a) of this conference agreement represents the final agreement on appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies for fiscal year 1996, with the exception of those Department of Justice General Provisions that were enacted into law in Public Law 104-99. It marks the end of the process that began with H.R. 2076, reported by the House Committee on Appropriations (H. Rep. 104-196) on July 19, 1995, and passed by the House on July 26, 1995. The bill was then reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations (S. Rep. 104-139) on September 12, 1995, and passed by the Senate on September 29, 1995. The conference report (H. Rep. 104-378, * print) was filed on December 1, 1995, and adopted in the House on December 6, 1995, and in the Senate on December 7, 1995. The President vetoed the bill on December 19, 1995, and on January 3, 1996, although a majority of the House voted for the conference report, the House did not override the veto by the required two-thirds vote. Since that time, funding for many of the programs in this bill has been provided on a temporary basis, although a number of critical law enforcement, judicial, consular, diplomatic security, and small business programs were provided full-year spending authority. While this conference agreement includes the full text of the fiscal year 1996 Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, with the exception noted above, much of the language is identical to the language included in the conference report on H.R. 2076. As a result, only the changes from the conference report on H.R. 2076 are addressed in the statement of managers that follows. With the exceptions that follow, the statement of managers in the conference report on H.R. 2076 (H. Rep. 104-378, * print) and the applicable portions of the House and Senate reports on H.R. 2076, remain controlling and are incorporated by reference.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The conference agreement includes \$74,282,000 for General Administration, as provided in both the House and Senate bills. The conference agreement also includes a provision that modifies the language, proposed in the House bill and not included in the Senate bill, that limits the number of positions and amounts for the Department Leadership program. The conference agreement does not limit funding under the Department Leadership program to the Offices of the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General, as proposed in the House bill. The Senate bill did not include this provision.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

The conference agreement includes \$16,898,000 for the Counterterrorism Fund, as provided in both the House and Senate bills. The conferees understand that balances of \$24,445,000 remain available from the 1995 Supplemental Appropriation, Public Law 104-19, for authorized purposes of this Fund. The Senate bill included a provision in Title III which designated \$7,000,000 for emergency expenses to enhance Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) efforts in the United States to combat Middle Eastern terrorism, including efforts to prevent fundraising in the United States on the behalf of organizations that support terrorism to undermine the peace