United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1997 No. 31

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m.

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

May peace and unity decide our acts
for others' gain,
so that each moment would provide
a time for thought to reign.
O God who blesses each good deed
and loathes all undue pride,
encourage us by every creed,
our wills in peace allied. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 370, nays 44, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—370

Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—44

Abercrombie
Bonior
Borski
Brown (CA)
Clay
Clyburn
Condit
DeFazio
English
Ensign
Everett
Fazio
Filner
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gibbons
Green
Gutknecht
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Kucinich
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (CA)
Oberstar
Pallone
Pascrell
Pickett
Pombo
Ramstad

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Sabo	Thompson	Watts (OK)
Sherman	Velazquez	Weller
Stenholm	Vento	Wolf
Taylor (MS)	Visclosky	

NOT VOTING—18

Ackerman	Lewis (GA)	Owens
Coble	Linder	Payne
Cooksey	Menendez	Roukema
Dixon	Molinari	Rush
Greenwood	Nussle	Sanders
Kaptur	Olver	Torres

□ 1124

Mr. PASCRELL changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRADY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BRADY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces it will entertain ten 1-minute requests on each side.

HERSHEY RETREAT PAVES THE WAY TO MORE CIVIL DISCOURSE

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the spirit of bipartisanship on this side of the aisle to express my thanks and gratitude to the 200 Members who attended the bipartisan retreat that was held in Hershey, PA. It was an enormous success. We had about 150 spouses and over 100 children, and the headline in the Harrisburg paper on Sunday I think really depicts the outcome, which says: ''Retreat declared success.'' And it was a success, in part because so many Members came, so many families came, and people really had an opportunity to build friendships and relationships that I believe will last well beyond our careers in Congress and, I think, will lead us to opportunities to really have meaningful dialog and debate in I hope what will be a much more civil atmosphere.

I want to express my deep gratitude to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS], who cochaired this with me, the steering committee, the Speaker of the House [NEWT GINGRICH] and the Democratic leader [DICK GEPHARDT] for the extraordinary leadership that they showed in assisting us in getting the Members to come.

It was a great weekend, it was a great start. It is not the panacea, it is not the solution, but we have begun what I believe is an important event that will lead us to more civil discourse and continue, I think, to build the idea that the House of Representatives is the highest legislative body and the work that we do here is very important and should be held in high regard.

□ 1130

ALL U.S. ALLIES SHOULD BE TREATED FAIRLY

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I recently returned from a trip to Israel where I reviewed important aspects of the longstanding United States-Israel defense relationship. Nobody can visit this region without being struck by the fragility of the peace process and the looming potential for violence. During our meeting, Defense Minister Yitzhak Mordechi emphasized both the military risks in the region and the willingness of Israel to take risks in pursuit of peace. I am deeply concerned, however, that the United States appears to be holding Israel to one standard and her peace partners to another. Friends and allies may disagree over the appropriateness or timing of building in Har Homa, but this administration's handling of the issue is surprising and potentially counterproductive—not to mention confusing.

The administration should be congratulated for standing up in the United Nations and vetoing the anti-Israel resolution brought before the Security Council earlier this month. While condemning the Israeli Government's decision to build Jewish housing in Har Homa, the resolution did not address the failure of the Palestinians to live up to many of their commitments under the Oslo accords. The resolution made no mention of the many steps Israel has taken for peace, including redeploying Israeli security forces in Hebron, releasing terrorists convicted of killing Israelis and proposing to cede additional lands in the West Bank. The proposed United Nations resolution would have been extremely damaging to the peace process. The American veto told the world that we would not let our friend and ally be bullied, nor our concern for rational discourse and diplomacy be railroaded.

However, the actions this administration has taken since the U.N. veto—publicly criticizing Israel and agreeing to take part in an international conference in Gaza to which Israel was not even invited—threaten to undermine not only the positive effects of the veto, but the honest broker role the United States must play to promote peace in the Middle East.

Over the last week, the world has seen the President of the United States standing with Yassir Arafat and Egyptian President Mubarak, harshly criticizing Israel while ignoring the tangible risks she has taken. These public reprimands and actions do not serve the cause of peace and can only increase the potential for violent confrontation.

Mr. Speaker, the administration needs to treat all of our allies fairly. It has not done so in this case.

POSITIVE EXPERIENCE IN HERSHEY, PA

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the distinct pleasure to make some history with more than 200 of my colleagues in Hershey, PA at the bipartisan retreat. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] and everyone who worked so hard in putting this retreat together.

My experience in Hershey was very positive, and I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their cooperation in making this event a real success.

For most of the world, the U.S. House of Representatives means democracy. We, as Members of Congress, have a profound responsibility to treat this institution with respect, to uphold its rules, and to realize that the House and its traditions are bigger than any one person or party.

I also would like to remind my colleagues that disagreement in policy, disagreement in philosophy, disagreement in ideology is the wellspring of democracy, and I welcome spirited debate.

In the weeks, months, and years to come, I can guarantee one thing: We will all disagree. But after this weekend, I hope that those disagreements are made with the understanding that we all, as elected Members of Congress, are trying to do the best for our Nation.

KEEPING THE MOMENTUM OF HERSHEY GOING

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow the good lead of my colleague from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] in addressing this side of the House in the spirit of the weekend just concluded, where we had a remarkable event occur: almost half of this body, with many spouses and children, spending some time together, doing the fundamental business of any institution, which is getting to know each other, developing some minimum level of trust and respect so that we can conduct our business here on the basis of policy, not on the basis of going after each other personally.

We realized something very important over this weekend, which is that we are in charge here and we have the power, if we wish to exercise it, to change a bit the culture of the House. Many terrific ideas came out of the weekend, very practical, very much able to be implemented with the goodwill and support of the leadership on both sides which happily were in attendance for the weekend.

We will be meeting again, the organizing committee and the coleader teams tomorrow, to start to work on keeping the momentum going forward in the effort that was begun this weekend. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD]; I thank all of my colleagues, both Democratic and Republican, for the spirit with which they approached this undertaking, and we are deeply in the debt of the Pew Charitable Trusts for their support in underwriting this experiment in making the democracy work better.

GETTING TO KNOW EACH OTHER IN HERSHEY

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I too spent the weekend with my family at Hershey, PA. I want to congratulate the Members on both sides of the aisle that put the event together, and really congratulate the some 200 Members of our Congress who came to Hershey with an open mind about how we can proceed in this very difficult environment where we do have disagreements, but how we can proceed in a way that continues to allow the American people to have respect for their institution.

We are going to have our disagreements, but it does not mean that we need to be disagreeable to each other.

Probably the most long-lasting part of the weekend was the opportunity for each of us to better get to know each other. I have been here 6 years, and over the last 6 years we virtually have a brandnew Congress. Some 70 percent of this Congress has been elected since 1990, and over the last several cycles we have had large classes with little opportunity to begin to understand each other.

As we understand each other better, understand where we are coming from and why we hold the beliefs that we do, I think it allows us to have better respect and more respect for the diversity of opinion that we certainly find here in Congress.

It was a great weekend, it was a good start, and there is a lot more that needs to be done, and we need to work each and every day on helping ourselves and our colleagues deal with our disagreements in a more professional way.

UNITED STATES MILITARY WEARING COMBAT BOOTS MADE IN CHINA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that millions of Chinese dollars have popped up in American politics. I mean, check it out: China alone gets $45 billion from American taxpayers in a sweetheart deal known as most-favored-nation trade status.

Now, to me, that is absolutely disgusting, with the 17 cents an hour labor wage. But if that is not enough to rip one of those false made-in-America labels on one of those Chinese imports, check this out: The United States Air Force just issued military combat boots to our troops that were made in China. That is right. American military personnel are wearing combat boots now made in China.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. What is next, marines in Mao suits? I think it is time to take a look at what China has done and take a look at every one of these sweetheart trade deals.

I yield back the balance of all American shoe wear that has cost jobs in this country.

WORKING TOGETHER TO MAKE AMERICA BETTER

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, last weekend my family and I joined 200-plus Members of this Chamber. We gathered together in Hershey, PA to restore trust and build friendships and, of course, to eat chocolate.

Now, obviously there were many friendships and relationships in existence before Hershey, but sometimes the reach across the aisle is very short. Sometimes we look around and we cannot recognize a Member, or we have not met them or we do not know their name.

Well, at Hershey, Republicans and Democrats came together to try to change the situation. Perhaps some of the tension that occurred in the last Congress was because we did not know each other well enough.

Now, we do know that we will not always agree; we quite often disagree. But we should work to maintain rigorous standards of respect and dignity, both on and off the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that, working together, we can make America better.

LET US GET TO WORK ON BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, we need to put together a budget. Every day Republicans force poor American families to balance their budgets or plunge into poverty. Meanwhile, as the deadline draws near for our national budget to be balanced, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle submit nothing and delay action. Real people have to balance their budgets; so should we.

Consider the human face of this debate. Hardworking people have to make painful decisions on a daily basis about keeping a roof over their family's head or putting food on their table. While you waste your time on political posturing, families I represent in Williamsburg and Brooklyn, NY, study their bank statement, trying to make ends meet. They cannot postpone their budget; neither should we.

My colleagues, everyone in this Chamber supports a balanced budget, and there are already two proposals we could be working on. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Majority Leader, Americans cannot wait any longer. Let us get working.

MUTUAL RESPECT IS VITAL FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, replacing bitterness and a mean-spirited tack with mutual respect is vital to the effectiveness of this most democrat of institutions. Here in Congress, as we approach the challenges of this great Nation, we must renew our focus on the manner in which we do our work. It is here that the spirit of civility and bipartisanship must come alive if we are to build on the richness that is our heritage.

Every one of us has a vested interest to ensure that we as Members of Congress work together with abiding respect and uncompromising civility. Our ability to honor one another, while engaging in vigorous and thoughtful debate, goes to the heart of this institution and the people's faith in each and every one of us. Ultimately, restoring trust, dignity and comity will lead us to succeed on behalf of all of the American people. The people deserve nothing less, and they demand it.

□ 1145

A HERSHEY'S KISS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in thanking the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] for bringing us all together, over 220 Members, together for a bipartisan retreat.

In that retreat we all acknowledged we are going to have conservative, liberal, urban, rural differences for whatever philosophical reasons, but that we

should try to eliminate the obstacles to civility as much as possible.

One of the things my group recommended, for example, is before we give our speeches ask ourselves these questions: Is the speech fair, is it accurate, is it true? If it was the last speech you were going to give, is this the one you want to be remembered by? If your mama was sitting in the gallery, would you still give this speech?

Mr. Speaker, I think if we go through these batteries of questions and just ask ourselves to reach for a higher level, then I think it might not be necessarily easier for Republicans to kiss a Democrat or for a Democrat to kiss a Republican, but it will be easier for us all to give each other a Hershey's kiss.

BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, today there will be a lot of rhetoric, and I hope civil rhetoric, from the other side of the aisle about the President's budget. My Republican colleagues will go as far as to demand that the President submit another budget.

Mr. Speaker, the American people know that the Constitution says, and I quote, ''All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.'' It is our duty, it has been our obligation, and will continue to be this House's responsibility to approve all appropriation bills, including the budget.

Republicans are now demanding that the President resubmit his budget. This is a complete reversal of their approach of the last Congress. The American people certainly remember how the Republican majority virtually shredded the President's proposals in pursuit of a radical agenda.

I call upon my friends to seize the moment, steer the proper course, and use the President's proposal as an historic opportunity to balance the budget. The President wants this done, Democrats want this done, and the American public wants it done.

I believe that beneath their current political rhetoric the majority wants a balanced budget as well.

LET US FULLY IMPLEMENT THE CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY ACT

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act was signed into law with the overwhelming support of this body.

In just 1 year, the Helms–Burton law has successfully served its purpose of protecting the property rights of American citizens as well as reducing the level of foreign investments that help keep the Castro dictatorship in power.

Despite the Clinton administration's failure to fully implement the law, dozens of companies have stopped their operations in Cuba, while many others have postponed their plans to invest in Castro's slave economy.

The European Union, in a last-ditch attempt to profit from American stolen property and exploit the Cuban worker, has filed an irresponsible challenge before the World Trade Organization against Helms-Burton that threatens to undermine our Nation's ability to dictate our own foreign policy. We call on the President to invoke the national security clause in this battle.

A year after its passage, Mr. Speaker, this body can be proud that it stood firm in support of the Cuban people's struggle for freedom. Now let us fully implement this successful law.

KIDS' HEALTH CARE MUST BE OUR PRIORITY

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, just 2 years ago in my home State of Massachusetts, 23 percent of children under the age of 18, or some 160,000 kids, were without even basic health insurance. The people of the Commonwealth understood that this statistic was not only startling, it was absolutely unacceptable.

So Massachusetts passed the landmark piece of legislation that is on the verge of giving basic coverage to some 125,000 kids, or 80 percent of the uninsured children in my State.

By streamlining the administration of this program and by instituting a 25-cents per pack cigarette tax, Massachusetts has come up with more funds to protect children, and has become eligible for more Federal funding in return. Now Massachusetts is doing what every State in this Nation should be doing: covering children's health.

But the crisis is not over. One child in seven living in the United States today is uninsured. That is absolutely unconscionable.

Massachusetts should serve as an inspiration for the rest of our Nation. We in this Congress have an awesome responsibility before us. We have a responsibility to prepare our children to be the leaders of tomorrow by ensuring that they receive a healthy start today. Let us make health care for our kids a priority.

EPA'S IRRATIONAL POLICIES

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, today is the end of the public comment period for the EPA first phase implementation of their irrational policies.

This chart, Mr. Speaker, is not a map that shows all the great bipartisan spirit of Hershey, but this is a bipartisan issue, because where you see red on this map, Mr. Speaker, are areas throughout the United States, Democrat and Republican representation, that are going to be in jeopardy because working families are going to be at a very high risk of losing their very livelihoods and way of life because of irrational policies by the EPA.

Today ends the public commentary period. George Wolfe, an EPA scientist, stated himself before one of our hearings that these proposals are based on a policy decision by the director instead of sound science.

It is time to stop this because, Mr. Speaker, the policies they are going to try to implement are not going to do anything to make a betterment for people, but it is going to do one thing; it is going to take away working Americans' jobs, it is going to hurt the school systems, and the communities. It is time to fight these proposals.

REPUBLICANS SHOULD LEARN TO TREAT LEGAL IMMIGRANTS WITH THE SAME RESPECT LEGAL IMMIGRANTS GIVE TO AMERICA

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have announced that America can expect their budget plan in May.

I hope they mean May 1997. I should be concerned. That is 1 month after the legal deadline for submitting a budget. But I want to be positive so I will assume this delay is caused by tireless Republican efforts to craft a budget that restores programs taken away from law-abiding legal immigrants.

I will assume Republicans are crunching numbers and saying, ''How can we restore critical benefits to our needy seniors, our blind and disabled, to mothers and their children? How can we treat our legal immigrant population with decency and fairness?''

That ''should'' be the reason for the delay, because legal immigrants deserve better than this Congress has given them.

Immigrants work hard. The fact is they pay far more in taxes than they receive in benefits. They play by the rules. They are in our Nation legally, contributing their energy, hopes, and dreams to our Nation.

May is a long time from now. It should be long enough for my Republican friends to learn to treat legal immigrants with the same respect legal immigrants give to America.

THE ELEMENTS OF A CIVIL DEBATE ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this Congress now for 2 years, and too often I have seen Members come to the well of this House and demonize, trivialize, and personalize the debate. I was happy to have participated in the conference up in Hershey, PA, because I think it is time that we stop this poisoning of the well of this great Chamber.

I told a story that happened back in the Continental Congress. Benjamin Franklin one time, at the end of a couple of days of very, very bitter debate in the Continental Congress, rose slowly at the back of the Chamber one morning and he said, ''Let us for a moment, Mr. Speaker, contemplate our own fallibility.''

Mr. Speaker, let us commit ourselves to vigorous but fair debate. Let us do it with humility. Let us do it with humor. If we do, I think both this body and the body politic will be well served.

NINE DAYS REMAIN FOR THE HOUSE TO SUBMIT A PLAN TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] for what was an outstanding weekend for us to come together and to talk as human beings about our differences and about the ways in which we can get things done.

I would hope that the first way that we would show our constituents that we were serious about getting things done would be to start by balancing the budget. We do not need to have a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, as they say, we just need to do it. We need to do it in the way our families do, at kitchen tables all across the country, making sure their own priorities, protecting the interests of their families are at stake, and at the same time making sure that their own budgets are balanced.

The lessons of Hershey are that we need to work together and to get something done. We have a limited amount of time, 9 legislative days, to present a budget. We need to get serious. We need to get busy and show our constituents that we intend to have the political will to balance the budget this year.

DEMAGOGUERY CAN BLOCK BIPARTISAN CIVILITY AND COOPERATION IN SOLVING AMERICA'S PROBLEMS

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

ANNOUNCING THE BIRTH OF TWIN GRANDCHILDREN SELINA ANASTASIA AND JAMES AZARIEL BURNETT

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was going to spend my 1 minute talking about the dangers of changing the CPI until we come up with provisions to make sure we protect the Social Security trust fund. I was not able to go to Hershey because my wife, Bonnie, and I had grandchildren a few days before, and they were twins. My daughter Elizabeth and her husband, Fred Burnett, now have twins. Their names are Selina Anastasia and James Azariel Burnett. So I am glad to announce that.

But on the issue of civility, on the Committee on the Budget we have talked about the serious problems of dealing with Medicare and Social Security, tremendous financial obligations and problems for the future. So I would just urge all my colleagues that the greatest enemy of solving these problems is demagoguery, because it is so easy in campaigns to scare people. I think it is so vital that we work together in solving very tough problems.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GILLMOR] announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 26, nays 392, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—26

Berry
Brown (OH)
Conyers
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dingell
Eshoo
Fazio
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Kennedy (RI)
Martinez
McDermott
McGovern
Miller (CA)
Mink
Neal
Olver
Owens
Pelosi
Sabo
Sandlin
Strickland
Towns
Wynn

NAYS—392

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Minge
Moakley
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson

Thornberry	Walsh	White
Thune	Wamp	Whitfield
Thurman	Waters	Wicker
Tiahrt	Watkins	Wise
Tierney	Watt (NC)	Wolf
Traficant	Watts (OK)	Woolsey
Turner	Waxman	Yates
Upton	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)
Velázquez	Weldon (PA)	Young (FL)
Vento	Weller	
Visclosky	Wexler	

NOT VOTING—14

Ackerman	Hall (OH)	Riggs
Ballenger	Kaptur	Sensenbrenner
Brown (CA)	Mollohan	Torres
Coble	Pomeroy	Weygand
Cooksey	Quinn	

□ 1213

Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Messrs. EWING, LAHOOD, SHUSTER, ROHRABACHER, HASTINGS of Washington, BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado, BECERRA, LARGENT, and FATTAH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. DELAHUNT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 600

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 600.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, is it true that there will not be another vote for about an hour on the floor, and that we are about to take up a rule which will consume about an hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House is about to take up a rule, on which an hour's time is allocated, so that would be a likely conclusion.

Mr. SOLOMON. The reason I inquire, Mr. Speaker, is to get some order in the House so that Members can either leave the Chamber or take seats.

REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT SUBMIT A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 90 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 90

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the Resolution (H. Res. 89) requesting the President to submit a budget for fiscal year 1998 that would balance the Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 without relying on budgetary contingencies. The resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The resolution shall be debatable for two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget or their designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or a designee. If including instructions, the motion to recommit shall be debatable for five minutes by its proponent and five minutes by an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 90 provides for consideration in the House of House Resolution 89, which is a resolution requesting the President to submit a balanced budget under a structured rule. The rule provides for 2 hours of debate, divided equally between the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on the Budget or their designees.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to be as fair as possible, the rule also provides for one motion to recommit, which may contain instructions if offered by the minority leader or his designee. If it includes instructions, the motion to recommit is debatable for 5 minutes by a proponent and 5 minutes by an opponent, keeping in mind that there will have already been 2 hours of debate on this entire issue.

Under the rules of the House, a motion to recommit is not required to be given to the minority for the consideration of a House resolution. However, the Committee on Rules sought to provide such a motion to the minority for the purpose of the consideration of this bill to be, again, as fair as possible.

Mr. Speaker, after the 1996 elections when the American people returned bipartisan political leadership to Washington, the Republican Congress offered to begin budget negotiations right away. As a result of this bipartisan spirit, formal and informal discussions between the Congress and the White House on reaching a balanced budget has been ongoing. While these talks have been productive, they are not yet complete, an that is the way it has been year in and year out. It takes time.

As we all know, on February 6 of this year, President Clinton sent his budget to Congress, a budget which, according to the President, produced a surplus of $17 billion in the year 2002, 5 years from now. Upon the receipt of that budget, the Republican Congress reacted in the same spirit of bipartisan cooperation. The budget was not declared dead on arrival, as was so often the case when Republican Presidents would present their budget. Even though many of the budget specifics do not meet the expectation of many in this Congress, we still have kept an open mind on it.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Congress sought to give the administration every opportunity to explain and sell that budget to Congress and to sell it to the American people through the regular committee process, and that is as it should be.

After a thorough analysis by the committees, the bipartisan membership, and the Congressional Budget Office, the President's budget fails four specific tests, and I think that all Members in their offices, or wherever they might be, should pay particular attention to this, because it is what they were sent here to do, and that is bring some fiscal sanity to this body.

First, it does not achieve a balance in the year 2002; it actually leaves a deficit of almost $70 billion. So what have we succeeded in doing? The truth is nothing in dealing with this terribly important issue.

Second, it does not specifically reduce spending in the first 3 years. It actually allows, listen to this, it actually allows the 1998 deficit to increase; not decrease but to increase. That is this coming year, to increase by $24 billion. And even more so important, listen to this, it saves 98 percent of the deficit reduction in this whole 5-year period, 98 percent of any cuts, for the last 2 years.

Well, we all know what that means, It means we will not get there.

Third, it does not save Medicare from bankruptcy. It actually does less to save Medicare than even the last Clinton budget of last year.

Fourth, it does not provide permanent tax relief for American families. It actually increases taxes in the last 2 years. Imagine that. We are going to be coming down here and voting to increase taxes when the American people are already the most heavily taxed people in the world. As a result, the President's budget is found, believe me, found wanting.

Mr. Speaker, while we as the Congress are committed to negotiating a balanced budget agreement with the White House, there is one nonnegotiable item determined by the American people, by the American taxpayer: Any budget agreement must achieve balance in the year 2002 using the same deck of cards; in other words, comparing apples to apples. And that means using the Congressional Budget Office scoring so that we all can be playing with that same deck, as I said before.

This is a goal both the President and the Congress have embraced publicly and privately, and was perhaps the only item agreed upon during the budget negotiations of the last 2 years. Mr. Speaker, without an agreement on the parameters of the numbers, no real discussion on specifics can begin because no one will believe what we are talking about.

The President committed to this last year by submitting two budgets scored

in balance by CBO. However, his most recent budget, the one we have before us, reflects an abandonment of that commitment. We have to ask ourselves why.

The resolution before us today calls on the President to reaffirm that commitment to balancing the budget by 2002, using honest numbers and up-front cuts; up front in the first few years, not the last few years.

In contrast, the President's budget uses Gramm-Rudman. Now, many of my colleagues were not here back in the days of Gramm-Rudman, but that was even a Republican budget, and in that budget we had the cuts in the latter years. And guess what? We never got there, because in the last 2 years it was too doggone difficult and we could not do it. We did not have the guts to do it.

We cannot let that happen again. We cannot add another trillion dollars to this accumulated debt. That Gramm-Rudman budget took credit for cuts then, but they wanted to make the cuts at a later time and it just did not work.

Now, once we agree on these goals and what those goals mean, Congress and the President together can sit down and we can work out agreements on the details, details like this. Here is $800 billion in cuts. Take your choice, Mr. President; take your choice, Congress. But we have to do it. We cannot just ignore it and let it go on year after year. Until that time, budget negotiations will be little more than partisan bickering and will never get us to where we all say we want to be.

Some of my colleagues will argue this resolution is meaningless because Congress has not yet produced its own budget. Well, in response I would like to just make three observations, and we will discuss this during the 2-hour general debate coming up in a few minutes.

First, the current laws governing the budget process required action by both the President and the Congress. Both of us. First the President then the Congress. That is what the law says. It is in here. Read it on page 802.

Now, it is true that the President has submitted a budget, which my colleagues must remember was actually submitted to Congress late, and that is the way it usually always is. And I will admit there is nothing in current law that requires the President to submit that balanced budget, although many of us would argue that. However, for the past 2 years and during the entire Presidential campaign of 1996, all discussions of the budget have assumed a balanced budget. We all began talking along that line, balancing the budget.

By submitting a budget not in balance, the President has submitted a budget that in reality cannot be considered by this Congress. I, for one, will not let that go through the Committee on Rules. Either it will be balanced and it is going to be honest, without smoke and mirrors, or it is not coming out of that Committee on Rules.

My colleagues may also remember that for the past 2 years the Committee on Rules has required that all budgets, whether offered by Republicans, whether offered by Democrats, whether offered by the Blue Dogs, or the Black Caucus or anybody else, had to be scored by CBO and they lived up to it. They went and they had their budgets scored. My own budget was scored by CBO. They were all honest. That is not a new requirement. This is what we agreed to in the last Congress and, by golly, this is what we are going to agree to in this Congress.

This resolution, therefore, calls upon the President to follow that process. If we were to take up the President's current budget, it would have to be scored by CBO, which shows that it is, in fact, not a balanced budget. Without a new budget, Congress' hands are tied by the rules of the Budget Act.

Second, we must remember that over the past 20 years Congress, under Democrat and Republican majorities, have only met the April 15 deadline for considering the budget resolution once. Once over the last 20 years. And not one of those budget resolutions was a balanced budget.

Furthermore, according to my calendar, it is only March 12. We have more than a month to work until that April 15 deadline.

Third and finally, if my colleagues went back and reviewed the history, they would find that every year in which a budget agreement was reached between Congress and the White House, whoever the President was, the budget resolution was adopted later than the deadline. Why? Because both sides sought to reach agreement on the priorities of the budget up front. The actual implementation of that agreement came later in the year, as we all know, through the appropriation process.

□ 1230

That is exactly what Congress is trying to do this year. The Republican Congress is acting in a cooperative way and I believe a very productive manner by offering to use an honestly balanced budget presented by the President as a basis for the debate. In the long run, this will set the context for an effective and productive debate.

The President needs to lead by presenting his visions and his priorities of how the country can reach its goals. However, he fails to achieve the goal of a balanced budget. In these budget negotiations, actually achieving balance through real and significant spending cuts, it is the whole ball game, my friends. If we do not do that, there is no reason to go through this whole exercise. The resolution calls on the President as an exercise of good faith to actually submit a balanced budget. Let us hope that he does.

Let me just show Members, there is a chart down in the well, I will not bother presenting it now, but this is what Members better be thinking about when voting on the resolution today. The deficit of $69 billion in 2002, that is what Members would be voting on if they voted on the President's budget today: a $70 billion further deficit in that year, an accumulated deficit all during the 5-year period, 98 percent of the deficit reductions in the last 2 years.

That is not fair, to even come on this floor and talk about that. If we have not got the guts to vote on those cuts up front in year 1, in year 2, in year 3, then we should not be in this Congress. In this year alone we would, under the President's budget, increase the deficit by $24 billion rather than staying on that glide path to a balanced budget over 5 years.

This is what this is all about today. We are urging the President to give us that balanced budget, scored by CBO, so that we can compare apples to apples and we can at least hopefully attain the balanced budget that we all are fighting so hard for.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that last weekend's promise of new collegiality would last longer than 3 days, but this rule and this balanced budget bill have melted away that bipartisanship all too quickly.

Mr. Speaker, it should not come as much of a shock to anyone that my Republican colleagues do not like President Clinton's budget. If they do not like what the President does in the White House, I do not expect them to like what is in the President's budget. But how the President balances his budget is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The real issue is the Republican budget, which nobody has seen.

The most persistent and urgent question at this point, Mr. Speaker, is where is the Republican budget? They have got 10 days left to produce it. The House can spend all the time it wants trying to tell President Clinton what to do, but the fact is the budget needs to come from the House of Representatives. It does not matter how the President balances his budget. It does not matter even if the President has a budget, because the budget has to come from the House of Representatives before April 15.

Mr. Speaker, section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, says, ''On or before April 15 of each year, the Congress should complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of such year.''

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the budget needs to come from the House. Section 301(a) does not even mention the President. The House and Senate have to agree on a budget by April 15, and as I said, we have got 10 legislative days left to get it done. It is that simple. Yesterday House majority leader

DICK ARMEY announced that Congress will not consider a budget resolution until May, one month after the deadline that has been imposed by the law.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that President Clinton submitted his budget on February 6. His budget has been pored over for more than a month while the Republican budget is still a figment of somebody's imagination.

At this point it is easy for my colleagues to like the Republican budget. Nobody has seen it. And although how much someone likes President Clinton's budget is irrelevant, I would like to add, Mr. Speaker, that according to the Office of Management and Budget, President Clinton's budget is in balance. Even the Congressional Budget Office's March 3 analysis of the President's budget shows that it is balanced by the year 2002.

President Clinton has said in his own words that if the CBO's deficits are larger than the OMB's, the President will make sure that his budget balances with the higher deficit numbers. What could be fairer than that? He will make additional discretionary cuts, about 4 percent; he will make entitlement cuts, about 2.25 percent; and he will sunset some taxes. It does not get any better than that, Mr. Speaker.

But that is not the issue here today. The budget issue is the responsibility of the Congress. Putting together a budget with which both the House and Senate agree is the responsibility of the Congress. Meeting the April 15 deadline is the responsibility of the Congress. No amount of finger-pointing or politics is going to change that, Mr. Speaker.

So I suggest to my Republican colleagues that we remember last week's collegiality retreat and we work together constructively. The American people are not going to stand to have their Government closed down for the second year in a row because of Republican politics. And no matter how long the House waits, it is going to have to come up with a budget someday.

So I urge my colleagues, on this matter, to defeat the previous question, to make in order the Minge-Tauscher-Stenholm alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with a very difficult question here this afternoon, and that is, how does this institution reconcile the serious political differences that exist in the country with respect to the budget of the United States of America?

The President took a stab at this when he sent to Congress a budget in early February. Unfortunately, he did not have the benefit of the Congressional Budget Office in projecting revenues and expenditures in making up this budget. CBO had not yet reached that stage in its analysis that it could provide that type of assistance. Once the budget arrived, CBO did attempt to evaluate, or score, the budget. In the meantime, the Office of Management and Budget had provided the President with that guidance.

We now find that the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office disagree. The President attempted to address this difficult situation by having a so-called fail-safe or trigger mechanism, that tax cuts and certain expenditure programs would be sunsetted, reduced, if the budget was not balanced by the year 2002. For this reason, the Congressional Budget Office said that technically it can balance by 2002.

Now, it would be nice if the President would simply respond to each request that we send to him from the Hill, submit new budgets, and in a sense be negotiating with himself. But the position that we have taken and the amendment that we ask to be allowed in order to this particular resolution would simply recognize that we cannot depend on the President to do all of this. We have a responsibility here in Congress.

Some of us have put together a budget proposal which the Congressional Budget Office has indicated will balance by the year 2002 without the use of triggers, but unfortunately that budget is not being sponsored by the leadership of either party. We feel, those of us that are asking that our amendment be recognized as a viable alternative, that the leadership of this institution has a responsibility that is parallel to the President's, to introduce its own budget. Then we will have some choices on the table.

We are saying, introduce that budget on the majority side and ask the President to send up a revised budget simultaneously. We feel that this simultaneous obligation will move our process forward so that indeed we can be effective, efficient and timely. We would request that this amendment so be allowed, and if it is allowed, we would have the opportunity for an intelligent vote.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the esteemed majority leader. He is one of the reasons we have moved toward fiscal sanity in this body in the last several years.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time. If I may, let me give my regards to my good friend from Boston.

It is a pleasure for me to be able to participate in this debate, but I do feel that I want to raise a note of caution. As we all know in this town, it is all too often, I think, possible for people to gain a wrong impression of what is intended and how we act. Sometimes that is because we perhaps act in a clumsy manner. But if I could have my wish for how the President and the White House and members of his party would respond to or accept this action we are taking today, I would hope that they could accept it as an invitation and as an encouragement.

The President went out and campaigned, as well he should, for reelection, and he campaigned on a commitment to achieve a balanced budget that achieved many things, including tax relief for the American people and including saving Medicare from pending insolvency. And the President was reelected. Having won a reelection to the Office of the President of the United States, it is absolutely clear to all of us he won the right and I daresay the obligation to provide Presidential leadership to this first, most important concern of the American people.

When the President submitted his budget before us, we understood and I think we need to understand the White House went through a fairly large personnel change, two new persons at the White House, in particular, that I have enjoyed working with: Erskine Bowles the President's new Chief of Staff, and Frank Raines, his new Budget Director. It is perfectly well understandable that, given this change, that their first initial submission may have had some disappointments.

We have received the President's budget with all the consideration and all the respect that a President's budget should receive, and we have had it examined and scored by those agencies that must examine and score and see how a budget measures up.

The clear definitive agency that the President himself has spoken of so eloquently, even in front of this body in his State of the Union Message, that is definitive, is the Congressional Budget Office. What have we found? To our disappointment, and I have to say from my conversations, I will accept to the genuine surprise and concern of Erskine Bowles and Frank Raines, the President's budget just simply did not do a good job of making the mark.

His current budget raises taxes instead of cutting taxes. It delays 98 percent of the spending cuts until 2 years after the President leaves office. If we did nothing, we would be better off with respect to deficit reduction next year than if you passed the President's budget.

□ 1245

I do not believe the President and I do not believe the people that I have spoken to in the administration would find that an acceptable level of achievement, given the commitment that has been so eloquently expressed from the White House by the President, by the Vice President, and by so many of the people in the administration, and what we try to do today is extend an invitation.

Mr. President, as my mama told me so many, many times: ''Don't harbor a disappointment, don't let yourself be defeated. If at first you don't succeed, try, try again.''

Please let us work together. We are more than ready to welcome another submission, to get down and look at that. We must acknowledge one responsibility that this Congress has, and it

is the responsibility this Congress will not step down from, and that is to get before the American people in this year a truly balanced budget that makes the hard choices, that fulfills the rigorous demands, that calls on all of us to stretch ourselves out a little bit and achieves the promised goals of a balanced budget by the year 2000, of saving Medicare from the threat of insolvency and providing tax relief for the American people.

I truly believe that this year is the best year for us to get together, this body and the other body, working together and, in all that process, to work with the inclusion and the enthusiastic support and encouragement, one for another, with the administration. We can do that. We ought to do that.

Therefore, I, as we have discussed this whole question of putting this resolution on the floor today, have said from the outset we should do so, and we should do so as an invitation and as an encouragement to the administration to understand they put better work before us, and it will receive even more respect than that work which they put before us. We have understood their disappointments as the Congressional Budget Office and Joint Tax Committee have examined their work, and we want to work with them, and on that spirit I would encourage us all to vote for this resolution and encourage the White House to work with us.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the ranking minority member on the Committee on Agriculture.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, the tenor of the last speaker, my friend and colleague from Texas, is exactly why I wonder why we are doing this today. It is just like last night when I appeared before the Committee on Rules. It seemed like we were in more agreement than disagreement, and yet I have to come to the floor expressing my extreme disappointment that the amendment that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER], and I have suggested for today would not even be made in order, that we would not have the opportunity to even vote upon that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, we discussed this at length, and we specifically cleared with the parliamentarian both of the amendments that he and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] were seeking, and they are germane and they can be offered.

Mr. STENHOLM. But only as an offer to recommittal, and I am reclaiming my time.

Mr. SOLOMON. But with a clean up or down vote on this subject.

Mr. STENHOLM. But there again we both know that those are more partisan than they are actual activities on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of our alternative is to try to put an end to finger pointing and the blame game that has distracted us from doing the serious work to balance the budget. I was reminded of a speech that I was making not too long ago. When they point a finger at the other side, they should take a good look at themselves; there are three aimed back at them.

Our amendment recognizes that both the Congress and the President must demonstrate more leadership than they have to date in order to reach a balanced budget. We should not allow Congress or the President to avoid this obligation.

The Minge-Stenholm-Tauscher amendment contains the exact same language as the underlying resolution requesting that the President submit a new budget by April 7. However, our amendment would hold Congress to the same standard as the President by requiring the House Committee on the Budget to report a balanced budget by April 7 as well.

Although the underlying resolution calls on the House to consider a balanced budget resolution, it sets no deadline or timetable for action. This will allow us to continue to postpone action and continue the current stalemate. We should not vote to exempt ourselves from responsibility to produce a credible balanced budget.

I believe it is very dangerous, in spite of the very eloquent words of my colleague from Texas a moment ago. I believe it is very dangerous for Congress, as an institution, to continue to shift responsibility for the budget to the President. Article I of the Constitution gives Congress primary authority over legislation dealing with tax and spending and borrowing money.

I encourage my colleagues to read an opinion editorial on our desk in last week's Washington Times by Professor Thomas DiBacco, who pointed out that for most of our history, Congress had the primary responsibility for budgets. Although Congress has given the President more authority in budgeting in order to bring more discipline to the process, the increased presidential role in the budget process has actually coincided with increased deficits.

I would remind my Republican colleagues of the words of a previous Republican Speaker, Joe Cannon, who said, ''When Congress consents to the Executive Branch making the budget, it will have surrendered the most important part of governing. I think we had better stick pretty close to the Constitution with its division of powers well defined and powers close to the people.''

The resolution before us today allows Congress to avoid its constitutional obligations on budget issues. What they are saying in their resolution is ''Mr. President, you submit the budget.'' Our responsibilities in this body are for us to submit the budget, and I am ready to reach out and work on both sides of the aisle on going through the regular legislative process. That is what our amendment would make in order.

I urge my colleagues, if they agree with the tenor of my conversation and the concerns about the Constitution, I urge them to defeat the previous question, allow our amendment to come up in which we say to us and the President, ''Let's get on with the business of the American people.''

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER].

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule before us today, and I object to House Resolution 89. I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules has chosen to restrict debate on this measure, and I hope my colleagues will vote to defeat the previous question and allow us to offer the Minge-Stenholm-Tauscher substitute.

Our substitute, Mr. Speaker, is quite simple. It says that not only should the President have a CBO-scored balanced budget plan by April 7, but that the House Committee on the Budget must present one as well.

This is a reasonable request, and it is one that is made in the spirit of bipartisanship. It is an effort to place all the parties on a level playing field and to help facilitate useful discussions on balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that we are here today not to debate the merits of different budget proposals, but it looks like it is a cynical attempt to make the President look bad. It is counterproductive to be considering House Resolution 89, but it is even worse that the rule prevents us from offering an amendment to apply the provisions of House Resolution 89 to the Committee on the Budget as well as the President. My colleagues on the Republican side say they are simply trying to get the President to submit a budget using CBO numbers, but that begs the question: Where is the Republican budget?

I came to Congress with a commitment to make the difficult choices necessary to balance the federal budget. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Blue Dog Coalition budget proposal that makes those choices. Now it is time for the Committee on the Budget to do the same. The Minge-Stenholm-Tauscher substitute would apply the same rules of the game to each participant.

I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and support this evenhanded alternative to House Resolution 89.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman, and I also appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the distinguished former chairman, who spoke fondly of our last

weekend retreat on collegiality. It was not, however, a retreat from our commitment to balance the budget. I thank those involved in this debate because it is an important debate.

This resolution is very direct and very simple, and in fact there is a provision in the motion to recommit for other views. It asks the President to live up to his word with a budget that reaches balance by 2002, as scored by the independent Congressional Budget Office. They are the scorekeepers on this; they are the referees. Far from balancing, the latest Clinton budget is projected to have a $70 billion deficit in 2002 by the scorekeepers. So we do not have a balanced budget from the White House.

Now, some will contend that we should place Congress' own budget on the table because of the President's failure to balance the budget. Indeed we have heard that today. They say we need to begin now to do the heavy lifting necessary to balance the budget, and I could not agree more. I think we do need to get on with this, and I can assure my colleagues this process is underway. But the fact is the President must submit a budget. That is required under the law.

It is here; I could refer to it. It is page 872 of the House Rules Manual, and when we get into the law and we get into chapter 11 of title XXXI of the United States Code, section 1105, my colleagues will find in fact several pages of very fine print about what the President must do and when he must do it. And he has not done it in the sense of providing us a balanced budget. That is just the fact.

So, as the majority leader said, we are sending an invitation.

Now judging by President Clinton's track record, I think it is best to follow President Reagan's advice in these matters, and his advice was trust and verify.

President Clinton used his first State of the Union Address to endorse the CBO, and at that time it was important to use CBO estimates, he said, ''so we could argue from the same set of numbers.'' I agree with that. Yet President Clinton fails to follow that pledge at this time.

Many believe President Clinton effectively killed the balanced budget amendment by demagoguing Social Security. A few weeks after sending us a budget that utilizes Social Security trust funds for deficit reduction, it is a rather curious situation.

So given these actions, is it not reasonable for Congress to question the strength of President Clinton's commitment to balance the budget and ask him for a balanced budget?

Mr. Speaker, the American people, I think, have had enough of the rosy scenarios and the political gestures that have no particular substance. If we are to be true partners in the process toward a balanced budget, we need to know that both sides are working off the same sheet. The people I represent expect those in charge to do the job. It is therefore appropriate for us to ask the President to send up a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this resolution does.

I urge support for this rule, which is very straightforward, and I urge support for this resolution, which is also very straightforward and gets the job done.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 89 is a waste of time. To understand what I mean one has to look no further than its title: House Resolution 89, a one-House resolution, totally ineffectual to accomplish the purpose it proclaims, which is to make the President send up the second budget because it could not possibly affect the President, does not even bind the other body.

So we are doing today something we are spending 3-hours plus on what amounts to next to nothing.

Now if we are going to take up a matter like this because a majority feels that there is some purpose served by having a resolution like this debated in the House, then why not have a full and open debate? This is not a delicate, sensitive matter that cannot be entrusted to amendment on the House floor. Why can we not have full and open debate and an open rule?

Instead, we have got this rule before us, this resolution, which takes this debate and makes it even more pointless, more useless, by imposing upon it a closed rule and precluding virtually any amendments to the language that is before us in the Resolution No. 89.

Now we all know that the Budget Act calls for the President to submit his budget in early February. The President did that. He sent us a budget which complies fully with the Budget Act, scored by his budget shop, the Office of Management and Budget, not only to be balanced in the year 2002, but to be in surplus in the year 2002 by $17 billion.

□ 1300

Mr. Speaker, we all know as well that section 301(a) then calls for the Congress, this House, to produce a concurrent budget resolution by April 15. That is a tighttime frame, but it is a rule that we imposed upon ourselves; we wrote that law.

We have missed that date for the last 2 years and we are going to miss it again this year. As I stand here today, ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, I am aware of no date in the middle of March that has been set for the markup of a House budget resolution. I am aware of no date that has been set for floor consideration of a budget resolution. In fact, I am aware of no budget resolution.

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

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I just want to ask the gentleman, he said that we have not reached the April 15 deadline in the last 2 years. Is the gentleman aware we have not reached that deadline in the last 18 years out of the last 19 years?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, in the House, the House Committee on the Budget in 6 out of 8 years that it was under House Democratic control, 6 of those 8 years, we reported and considered and passed a budget resolution in 6 out of those 8 years.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, because I have a chart here——

Mr. SPRATT. We did not have the current budget resolution, but we had the House budget resolution before April 15. We at least got our work done here in the House.

Mr. DELAY. But if the gentleman would yield, the deadline is for a conference report by April 15, and this House has not reached that deadline in the last 18 years.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, that is beyond our control. That happened in the other body. We got our work done on time. If they had been moving in parallel process, we probably would have met that date.

The reason that we are doing what we are doing today is that we are about some diversion, distraction. We are trying to keep the American people from understanding that Congress is not doing its job, the majority is not doing its job. We are trying to shift attention from the fact that we do not have a budget resolution before us, have not scheduled one to be brought to the floor, by shifting the blame to the President of the United States when he has done what the law calls for him to do. He has sent us a budget scored by his budget shop as being in balance.

Everybody in this House knows what regular order calls for at this point. It calls for a House budget resolution, and that is what I call for today. Let us have a House budget resolution.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said, and I agree with him, we need to sit down and negotiate. There are lots of things in the President's budget that are not going to happen, I know that, and a lot of things in the various budget proposals are not going to happen either. But the way to frame those negotiations, since the President has put his budget on the table, is for my colleagues to put their budget on the table. We beg the question of the debate today, why have my colleagues not done that?

Mr. Speaker, let me just back up and say where we stand with the President's budget. As my colleagues all

know, the Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, took the President's budget and scored it as producing a deficit in the year we are shooting for, the terminal year of 2002, of $69 billion, not a surplus of 17. CBO took the President's budget and said, per our economic forecasts and our technical analysis, this budget will not be in surplus in the year 2002 by $17 billion, it will be in deficit by $69 billion.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that they found this budget in deficit is that the President has requested $98 billion in tax cuts. He has offset those tax cuts by $76 billion in tax renewals and extenders and the repeal of certain tax expenditures, so there is a net revenue loss in the President's budget of $22 billion.

In addition, the President has sent up over a 5-year period of time new entitlement initiatives, spending increases, that come over 5 years to about $68 billion, according to the estimates of his budget shop, OMB. By the scoring placed upon this budget by the Congressional Budget Office, this budget can accommodate these tax cuts and these spending increases without producing a deficit; in this case the deficit is $69 billion.

But I say to my colleagues, if the present budget cannot accommodate a $90 billion package of tax cuts and entitlement spending increases, then neither can a budget scored by CBO accommodate $190 billion in tax cuts, which is what the Republicans, my friends on the other side of the aisle, have been talking about. That is the range of magnitude that they have been proposing. That is why we are here today.

Mr. Speaker, they are unable to put before the House a budget resolution which can accommodate the tax cuts they are proposing without also necessitating deeper cuts in Medicare, Medicaid and education than they want to be seen openly proposing because the American people do not support it.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] says that Congress has never met the date; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] said the same thing. As I mentioned, 6 out of 8 years the House Committee on the Budget had its resolution on the floor by April 15.

But the key point is this: Why chastise Congress for not meeting the date that we have imposed upon ourselves with a resolution that calls upon the President to do something else? If we want to chastise ourselves for being tardy in the past, why not have a resolution today that sort of calls for hunkering down, for putting our hand to the wheel, for getting ahead with the problem, leaning into it.

We have a hearing today at 2:30 before the Committee on the Budget that deals with one of the most critical components in the solution to this whole problem, the so-called CPI, Consumer Price Index. Before us will be the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics testifying about ways that the CPI can work out some of the biases that lead to overstatement of inflation in our economy.

It is a critically important hearing. Many of us on the Committee on the Budget, because we have to be on the floor to debate this resolution which amounts to nothing, will not be able to attend. That is not the critical path. That is not what we need to be doing if we are going to meet the self-imposed deadlines that we put in the Budget Act ourselves.

So the best way to proceed with the resolution of the budget, proceed toward a balanced budget is to vote against the previous question here, vote against the rule, and vote for putting the budget process back on the critical path and not chasing after red herrings like this resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, another reason why we have moved toward some fiscal sanity in this Congress in recent years is because of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], our distinguished majority whip, and I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate those words more than we can imagine, and I do appreciate it. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule because I rise in strong support of this very important resolution.

We said from the beginning of this Congress that we want to negotiate with the President, but we cannot negotiate with a President that does not want to balance the budget. We do not want to negotiate over whether to balance the budget or not; we want him to submit a budget that balances by CBO which he called for. We will negotiate with him in the parameters of a balanced budget and negotiate over the priorities within that balanced budget.

But if the President cannot submit one, how do we negotiate apples with oranges? You know, the saying goes, if at first you do not succeed, try, try again.

The President's first attempt at a budget this year did not balance, so we are giving him a chance to try it again. The President has said that he supports a balanced budget, and I hope he is honest in his statement. He also said that we did not need a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution if we had the will to balance the budget. But this President, Mr. Speaker, has done everything he can to derail the balanced budget process; first, by vetoing the first balanced budget in a generation, the last Congress; then, by working overtime to kill the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution; and, finally, by submitting another budget that simply does not balance.

Why is balancing the budget so important? Why should we care whether we pile up more debt on future generations? Mr. Speaker, I will tell my colleagues why. At our bipartisan retreat this last weekend a lot of Members in both parties brought their children. The place was overflowing with kids. It was so much fun to see these kids having a good time. We are balancing the budget for their sake.

The President should explain to those kids why he will not take steps today to make their futures brighter tomorrow. The President should justify why he did not have the political will to make commonsense changes to entitlement programs so that those programs could survive when those children decided to retire.

Mr. Speaker, this debate should not be about green eyeshades, it should be about preserving the future for America's children.

So I just urge the President to be responsible and to resubmit his budget. America's children deserve better than they are getting from this President's current unbalanced budget.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN].

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to follow my colleague from Texas [Mr. DELAY] on the floor, and I look over and see the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the chairman. We have worked together on lots of bills, Mr. Speaker, but obviously today we disagree on the need for this rule and also the need for the resolution.

We only have 11 days left until Congress by law must pass a budget plan. But here we are today debating a rule and debating a resolution that says, Mr. President, send us your second budget, and yet we do not even have our first here from Congress.

While the President and Democrats have fielded criticism for weeks now from the Republicans on the President's budget plan, we have not yet seen their alternative. The Republicans need to respond with their own budget before they can ask the President for a second budget. That is what is called give and take, and that is what this process is about.

This resolution calls for the President to submit another budget because of the claims that the CBO found that the current budget proposal from the President would not be balanced in the year 2002. I happen to see a letter from March 4 that the director of CBO analyzed the President's budget and showed that it would indeed be balanced by the year 2002.

As Democrats, we are not opposed to criticism if it is accompanied by concrete and realistic proposals. In fact, we have the moderate, conservative group of Democrats who have a budget plan, but where is the Republican majority budget plan? They do not have one. The President has one out on the table, the moderate, conservative Democrats have one, and yet the Republican majority does not have one.

We have had enough time to develop a budget alternative proposal through

our committee process. But yet, like my ranking member of the Committee on the Budget said, we are spending time debating resolutions instead of working in the Committee on the Budget.

In the 1980's we heard the slogan, ''where's the beef,'' and now we are asking, ''where is the meat?'' Where is the meat in the Republican budget from our colleagues? If they want to have a balanced budget, let us see that meat that they have in their budget.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is ironic that I stand here because being honored to serve 20 years in the legislature, I saw our Governor submit budgets to us as a legislature, just like the President has done. And most of the time we would say, thank you, we can present it; and then we would work off of our own document. That is what Congress has been doing for many years, up until now. Now we are going to let the President provide that leadership?

I am not willing as a Member of this Congress to advocate that to the executive branch, no matter who is there. That is why I think it is so important that we have a congressional budget plan. I may disagree with it, but the Republicans here in the majority, they need to get up and find the meat and to do it instead of saying, well, Mr. President, you need to do a second plan because we do not like your first. Let us see what we can offer as a Congress to say, OK, Mr. President, this is our plan.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the really respected Members of this body is a former fighter pilot and a great Congressman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there may be a perception that this is not important to the other side, but the reality is important. For 28 years we have not been able to balance the budget because it has proven too difficult. In Gramm–Rudman, the deal was that for every tax dollar we take in, we will cut it by 3, and we will push out the cuts into the last year. We could not do that because the cuts were too hard.

Remember when George Bush moved his lips? The deal was that for every tax dollar we take in, we are going to cut spending by 3, and we are going to give you an absolute way to do that. We are going to put firewalls between each of the appropriation committees and we are going to put a cap. The leadership on my colleagues' side, how did they get around it? With emergency spending. We found outlandish emergency spending things on there, and the continuing resolutions that just carried over the spending. And it was not viable.

Remember in the 104th when the President gave us three balanced budgets? All increased the deficit by $175 billion. And then in the fourth one he gave us, he balanced it using CBO numbers in 7 years, and 72 percent of the cuts came in the last year.

□ 1315

It is not realistic, even if the President gave us a second budget balanced but most of the cuts take place in the last year. We know that that is not feasible. It is smoke and mirrors. It also happens to be before the Committee on National Security, when the President has said that he is going to increase modernization for DOD. Do Members think that the more liberal Members on this side are going to decrease social spending and increase national security in those same 2 years? It is not feasible, Mr. Speaker.

We need to take a look at what reality is. We want a balanced budget. They say we do not have one. Well, have the President give us a balanced budget as he campaigned in the middle of the road and many of the Democratic leadership said, we are not going to support that. We do not want a balanced budget. That is what they are opposing this resolution for, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge a note vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I intend to offer a motion which makes in order the Minge-Tauscher-Stenholm amendments which would require both the President and the House Committee on the Budget to produce budget plans by April 7 that achieve a balanced budget by the year 2002 using CBO assumptions. I believe that Members of the House should have the opportunity to vote on this.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the amendment:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 90

On page two, line three, strike ''The resolution'' and all that follows and insert in lieu thereof the following:

''The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and on any amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; (2) the amendments printed in section 2 of this resolution, which shall be considered as read, and which shall be debatable for a separate hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If including instructions, the motion to recommit shall be debatable for five minutes by its proponent and five minutes by an opponent.

''Sec. 2.

AMENDMENT (IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE) TO H. RES. 90

OFFERED BY MR. MINGE OF MINNESOTA OR HIS DESIGNEE

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives requests the President to submit to the House, not later than April 7, 1997, a detailed plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002. The House further requests that the Committee on the Budget report, not later than April 7, 1997, a concurrent resolution on the budget containing reconciliation instructions to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002. Both the budget submitted by the President and the concurrent resolution reported by the Committee on the Budget shall—

(1) use the most recent economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) reduce the deficit through programmatic reforms rather than through such budgetary procedures as automatic spending cuts and the sunsetting of tax cuts;

(3) realize a significant proportion of its total savings in the first 3 years; and

(4) offer sufficient Medicare reforms to forestall the imminent insolvency of the Medicare trust funds for a substantial period.

PREAMBLE AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 90

OFFERED BY MR. MINGE OF MINNESOTA OR HIS DESIGNEE

Amended the preamble to read as follows:

Whereas a substantial majority of the Members of Congress are on record in support of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution;

Whereas the President has observed on numerous occasions that a constitutional amendment is not necessary to balance the budget, observing in his State of the Union Address that ''. . . we don't need a constitutional amendment, we need action.'';

Whereas the President and the congressional leadership have repeatedly agreed to balance the budget by fiscal year 2002 based on the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has officially estimated that the President's budget would increase the deficit by $24,000,000,000 in fiscal year 1998 and result in a deficit of at least $69,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2002;

Whereas the Committee on the Budget has not proposed a budget resolution that could be scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and the only tax proposals introduced by the congressional leadership would increase the deficit;

Whereas article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution grants Congress the power to lay and collect taxes and to borrow money on the credit of the United States and article I, section 9 grants Congress the power to draw money from the Treasury; and

Whereas section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires that Congress shall complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget before April 15: Now, therefore, be it''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] has 4 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, as Ronald Reagan used to say, Ladies and gentlemen, I do not know what all the argument is about.

I really do not know why anyone can complain about this resolution that is on the floor here today. Let me just read the key part of it:

''The House of Representatives requests the President to submit to the House, not later than April 7, 1997, a detailed plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 for the United States, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.''

That is so we can play from the same deck of cards. What is wrong with that? That is what we did last year. That is what we did 2 years ago. The President agreed to it.

Now, we also asked that he use these assumptions:

''Uses the most recent economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office,'' that is No. 1. Who can disagree with that?

No. 2, that ''reduces the deficit through programmatic reforms rather than alternative budget procedures such as automatic spending cuts and the sunsetting of taxes.''

What does that mean? That means we do not want to cut Head Start the same as we cut legal services. In other words, let us offer the real amendment. Let us see what you are actually doing, not across the board where you are cutting good things and not cutting bad things at all. Then taxes, what are we doing? In other words, the President in his budget is sunsetting the tax cuts so that 2 years, 3 years from now they go back into effect. What kind of smoke and mirrors is that?

No. 3, ''realizes a significant proportion of its total savings in the first 3 years.''

Look at this, the President's budget. The deficit at the end of 2002 is $70 billion. We have not done anything. We said, we put out our press releases and, boy, are we brave. We are going to balance the budget. But when are we going to do it? We are going to do it 5 years from now. We are not going to do any cuts in year 1, 2, 3 or 4. Is that being fair to the American people?

No. 4, ''offer sufficient Medicare reforms to forestall the imminent bankruptcy of the Medicare trust funds for a substantial period.''

The President actually agreed to those reforms last year. We enacted them, but now is reneging on them.

Then finally somebody said, let us point fingers at each other. That is exactly what we did. We wrote in to this budget resolution, it says that the House of Representatives shall consider a budget plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 that is in compliance with what I have just said, what we are asking the President to do. So we are asking ourselves to do the same thing.

I could go on down through this President's budget. I could talk about CBO by the way, their report on the President's budget. It says on page 2, in 1998, in fact, the net effect of the President's policies is to push the deficit $24 billion above the baseline level. This says, this coming year. In other words, instead of cutting the deficit down, we are actually going to raise the deficit by $24 billion. That is why we need this resolution.

We treat ourselves the same as we do the President. We say, Mr. President, Congressmen and women, let us act fiscally responsibly. Let us pass this resolution here today.

Some Members say to defeat the previous question so that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE] and others can offer their resolution.

I went to the Parliamentarian. They told me that these two amendments that they wanted to offer are germane, can be offered in the motion to recommit and if they want to do that, fine. They are going to have 2 hours of debate on it and then they will have an up or down vote on the Minge amendments. That is being fair to everybody. I move the previous question at this time and I ask everybody to come over and vote for the previous question and for the rule and finally for the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 200, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—6

Coble
Dingell
Dixon
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Torres

Mr. FAZIO of California changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 202, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 42]

YEAS—226

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—5

Coble
Dixon
Herger
Kaptur
Torres

☐ 1350

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 90, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 89) requesting the President to submit a budget for fiscal year 1998 that would balance the Federal budget by fiscal year 2002 without relying on budgetary contingencies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of House Resolution 89 is as follows:

H. RES. 89

Whereas the President has observed on numerous occasions that a constitutional amendment is not necessary to balance the budget, observing in his State of the Union address that ''* * * we don't need a constitutional amendment, we need action.'';

Whereas the President has also repeatedly agreed, most recently on January 28, 1997, to balance the budget by fiscal year 2002 based on the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office; and

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office has officially estimated that the President's budget would increase the deficit by $24 billion in fiscal year 1998 and result in a deficit of at least $69 billion in fiscal year 2002: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) the House of Representatives requests the President to submit to the House, not later than April 7, 1997, a detailed plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 for the United States, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office, that—

(1) uses the most recent economic and technical assumptions of the Congressional Budget Office;

(2) reduces the deficit through programmatic reforms rather than alternative budgetary procedures such as automatic spending cuts and the sunsetting of tax cuts;

(3) realizes a significant proportion of its total savings in the first three years; and

(4) offers sufficient Medicare reforms to forestall the imminent bankruptcy of the Medicare trust funds for a substantial period.

(b) The House of Representatives shall consider a budget plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 for the United States that is in compliance with paragraphs (1) through (4) of subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 90, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] each will control 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU].

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here today with what we feel is an open hand to the President of the United States.

Yesterday the Washington Post ran a story stating that 75 percent of the American people feel that it is incumbent on the Congress and the President to work together to balance the budget. They know that a balanced budget will bring them economic benefits in the form of lower interest rates, more jobs and higher wages.

Here in Washington it is our job to hammer out an agreement that will balance the budget. Both Congress and the President agree that we must accomplish this goal. In fact, in his State of the Union Address the President spoke clearly. He affirmed his commitment to balancing the budget, and he

affirmed his commitment and his agreement to use the estimates of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In a departure from common practice the Congress agreed not to declare the President's budget dead on arrival and to try to use that budget as the basis for our negotiations.

Unfortunately, when the President finally submitted his 5-year plan we found that it was inadequate. That is why we are here this afternoon. If we are going to heed America's call for a balanced budget, we must get to work today.

This resolution moves us forward by sending an important message to this House. To this House and to the President and to the people of America, we send a message that we must take seriously and deal honestly with the commitment we have made to balance our Nation's books.

This resolution calls quite simply for the President to work with this House toward a balanced budget agreement. We ask that the President submit a budget that meets a set of basic criteria, and in the spirit of bipartisanship we call on this Congress to abide by the exact same standards.

This resolution is fair, it is clear, and it is intended to provide an opportunity to work together with the President from a platform that he provides.

Just what are these standards that we ask the President to meet in his 5-year budget plan?

First, we ask that the budget proposal balance in the year 2002, using estimates of the Congressional Budget Office. We feel it is essential that we work from a common set of assumptions. We need to work from a common set of assumptions in a dialogue as important as this. The administration's current plan shows a deficit of $69 billion in the year 2002.

Second, we ask that the budget proposal not rely on sunsetted tax relief for automatic across-the-board cuts in order to achieve balance. The administration's current plan uses such accounting provisions that are triggered in its final years.

Third, we ask that the budget proposal achieve a substantial amount of its deficit savings during the next 3 years. Unfortunately, the President's current plan defers over 98 percent of the deficit savings to the last 2 years of his budget after he leaves office.

Finally, we ask that the budget proposal preserve and protect Medicare for our children and for future generations. The administration's current plan simply postpones the bankruptcy of the Medicare trust fund for another 2 years.

By asking both Congress and the President to meet these four basic requirements in the submission of their budget plans we will establish a credible platform from which we can move forward together. A budget that increases spending by 200 billion over the next 3 years, it leaves a deficit of $69 billion in the year 2002, will not put money back in the pockets of working Americans, will not put money back in the pockets of American families. The results of this kind of overspending will be higher interest rates, higher costs to our families and stagnating wages. We owe the American people more than that.

Some people have argued that this resolution is a waste of time. I am sorry that they feel that way, but I believe that the substance of this debate and its impact on America's families is too important to just ignore or dismiss.

□ 1400

Honest and reasoned debate of our differences is essential to the strength and substance of this institution. Others have argued that it is inappropriate somehow to ask the President to submit a new budget when we have yet to complete work on our own. The fact is that Congress is moving forward on its own budget. We will propose a budget to the President, and this country, in compliance with budget law.

Two years ago critics claimed the Congress prepared its budget too quickly and did not take the President's import, did not take his concern into regard. Today these same critics argue that the pace is too deliberate and too slow.

Many of us were not here in the last Congress, but I do know the debate over the budget deteriorated to what a lot of American people thought was petty bickering. This year we want to change that mode of operation. We want to make things work, with the administration's cooperation, and fashion a solid budget agreement that balances in the year 2002.

But to do this we need the President to provide a realistic platform for budget discussions. I am determined to keep my faith, to keep the commitments I made to the constituents of the State of New Hampshire to fight for an honest balanced budget. I urge your support for this resolution that will enable Congress and the President to wage this fight together.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 89. This resolution demands that the President send us a second budget that meets the specifications of the Republican leadership. All it does is demand. It huffs and it puffs, but in the end it accomplishes nothing, because it is a one-House resolution. Look at its title, House Resolution 89. It is not binding on the President; it is not even binding on the other body. That is why I said earlier in the debate that this resolution is a waste of time.

It has been said that the President is obliged to send us a budget that balances, balances according to CBO scoring. If you will simply turn to the Congressional Budget Act and look at section 300, you will see that it says the timetable with respect to the congressional budget process for any fiscal year is as follows: First Monday in February, President submits his budget.

That is what it says: President submits his budget.

The President missed that by just a few days this year because he first wanted to make his State of the Union before he submitted his budget, but he has sent us a budget scored by his budget shop, the Office of Management and Budget, as being in balance; not just being in balance, being in surplus by the year 2002 to the tune of $17 billion.

Let me back up a few years and just observe why it is that we are here today earnestly talking about balancing the budget by the year 2002.

We are here today credibly talking about that goal which we commonly share because 4 years ago when President Clinton came to office, he took this challenge head on. I am sure there were other things he would have preferred to do first.

The first thing he found on his desk when he arrived there was the Economic Report of the President left behind a week before by President George Bush, and in it Michael Boskin, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors for President Bush, on page 69 predicted the deficit for fiscal year 1993 would be $332 billion.

Now, Bill Clinton has been blamed for a lot of things, but he was in Little Rock when that bill was run up. He cannot be blamed for that.

On February 17, he laid on the doorstep of Congress a plan to get rid of that deficit, or at least cut it in half, over a period of 4 years. It did not pass the House by any substantial margin, two votes. It went right to the wire. It passed the other body by one vote. There were predictions it would cut the economy off at the knees.

But here we are, 4 years later, and here is what happened. In 1993, when we closed the books on fiscal 1993, the deficit was not $332 billion, it was $255 billion. One year later, the first full year under that Deficit Reduction Act of 1993, the deficit was $203 billion. When we closed the books on 1995, the deficit was $164 billion. And last September 30, 1996, the deficit was down to $107.3 billion, down 65 percent in less than 4 years, 1.4 percent of GDP.

That makes it the lowest deficit as a percent of GDP since 1974, the lowest deficit in nominal dollars since Ronald Reagan's second year in office. That is what has been accomplished on his watch. Say what you will about his budget, the reason we are here and debating a plan to get the budget in balance within 5 years is that those 4 years were put to good purpose under a plan that he proposed.

Now, he set up a budget based upon a forecast of the economy done by his budget shop. Every President does that. That is what OMB is there for. According to their forecast, this budget will balance by the year 2002.

Now, there are things that I do not accept about that, and I have traditionally been a supporter myself of using CBO estimates, but there are some things in this forecast where I think OMB has the better half of the argument.

For example, OMB assumes that corporate income shares as a percentage of our GDP will not decline. They have increased substantially over the last few years because corporations are improving their balance sheets and improving their P&L's. That makes for a third of the difference between the two forecasts.

These are things that can be argued between reasonable people, reasonable economists, and there is no use to have a showdown on the budget today. We all know what the process calls for. We know what regular order is. We wrote the act. The Congressional Budget Act, section 301(a), says the Congress shall ''complete action on the budget resolution on or before April 15th.'' The Congress shall complete action. The President started the ball rolling. Now it is our time to complete the action.

Since my friends on the other side of the aisle, the Republicans, have been in the majority here in the House, the conference agreement on the budget resolution has not cleared the House on April 15 in any of those years; not until June, as a matter of fact, 2 months after the deadline. In fact, the House Committee on the Budget in the last 2 years has not even marked up the budget resolution until a month after the April 15 deadline. This kind of slippage, this kind of inattention to the Budget Act and the deadlines we have laid down for ourselves, led to 14 continuing resolutions and 2 Government shutdowns in the last Congress.

I do not want to see that happen again. That is why I think this diversionary tactic, to distract us from what we need to be doing, off in pursuit of this red herring, is a total waste of time.

Let me say something else. It is now 10 minutes after 2. At 2:30 the House Committee on the Budget will have one of the most important hearings we will hold on the subject of how to get our hands around this problem and bring it to resolution.

We will have before us Dr. Catherine Abraham, who is the Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and her responsibility is something called the CPI, the Consumer Price Index. That is a critical component to resolving this problem.

And where is the Committee on the Budget? We are over here debating a resolution that is totally ineffectual. Instead of leaning into the problem, earnestly trying to find a solution to the problem, attending the hearing and asking intelligent questions and hearing what she has to tell us, we are over here on the floor.

This is the first time in 14 years in the House that I have seen a major piece of legislation or a piece of legislation come to the floor at the time the committee of jurisdiction is holding a hearing. That is why this is a total waste of time. But we are debating it.

The fact of the matter is, what we are trying to do is distract attention from the fact that the majority would prefer not to have to put up its own resolution. The reason they do not want to do this is the same reason that they are able to use and criticize the President's budget. The President's budget as scored by CBO does not produce a surplus in the year 2002. According to CBO, per its economic forecast, it generates a deficit of $69 billion.

But if you use that same economic forecast and apply it to a reconstruction of what I would guess to be the Republican resolution, which would incorporate tax cuts up to $190 billion, then the deficit is twice the size of the President's recommendation; or there will have to be deeper cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and education and other things that the American people broadly support, that they would not rather embrace themselves. So they want to be allowed to have the President take the hits on this.

If we are going to get this done, the President has sent a budget up here, we need to have a budget resolution with the other side. That will frame the debate and we can then sit down and negotiate, and we will have to make concessions on both sides.

The President's budget is not going to be fully carried out, I know that, nor is your budget going to be fully realized, and I think you know that. The sooner we get around to that reality and start talking, the better. The way to get there is for you to complete the process and frame the negotiation by putting your resolution on the table, bringing it to the House floor, getting it passed and getting a concurrent budget resolution adopted by April 15 or shortly thereafter.

For all of these reasons, I suggest that the House vote down this resolution, send the Committee on the Budget back to its work, and not after this pursuit of a red herring that leads us nowhere and accomplishes nothing.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Budget, I rise to support House Resolution 89 and join the House in asking the President to send a balanced budget to Congress.

The President's budget was eagerly anticipated this year and there is a genuine desire to work constructively with him to enact a historic balanced budget plan that will eliminate the deficit by the year 2002. The budget committees of both Houses have spent the past several weeks examining the President's ideas in order to give them a full hearing and find the areas where we can work together constructively.

This is a very different approach than previous years when the Capitol was a morgue for the storage of budget plans declared dead on arrival. This year, however, the Capitol has been an emergency room, and though we are working hard to save it, the President's budget is gravely ill, primarily because it is $69 billion in the hole, backloaded to the extreme, and fails to save Medicare for any significant period of time.

I can recall, as many can, the President campaigning that he was going to save the Medicare trust fund for 10 years. I do not see that. Where is it? Let us talk about it. If the President still wants his budget proposal to be the starting point for consideration this year, and I believe that can still happen, he needs to send us a budget that meets the minimum threshold for consideration, a budget that balances in 2002 according to the estimates which he said he would use, the estimates of the independent budget office. I remember hearing him say that right here in this House.

No gimmicks, Mr. President. Our friends on the other side of the aisle are challenging us to offer our own budget now, but my answer to them today is, we have already passed 2 years of balanced budgets in this Chamber. Those two budgets were the first of their kind in 26 years. We do not need to prove to anybody on this side of the aisle that we are committed to balancing the budget. The only reason it is in front and center of the congressional list of priorities right now, and the American people, is because we put it there. I am quite comfortable with our record of writing, supporting, and passing balanced budgets in this Chamber.

Frankly, the President should be thankful that he has been given a second chance to fulfill the promises he made to this country. I hope he takes advantage of this second opportunity, and I hope he sends us a true budget that does balance without a lot of gimmicks after he is not even President of the United States anymore.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, at this mellow time of interest in bipartisanship and collegiality, I have to say that, frankly, this is a weird resolution. Some might call it a back to the future resolution. Do my colleagues remember the movie about going back to the future? Well, this is going back all the way to the days of the Government shutdowns of 1995. Those who liked those shutdowns will remember those good old days. It only cost the American taxpayer $1.5 billion for the kind of stunts that occurred in this House during 1995.

President Clinton in 1995 came forward and submitted a budget. It was scored by OMB. Our Republican colleagues, as they have said today, came forward and they said, ''We want it

scored. We want it scored by CBO, and we are going to shut the Government down until it is.'' I think some of them wanted to shut the Government down until it was scored by HBO. But they delayed and they shut the Government down in order to get the kind of budget that they wanted.

Well, those costly Government shutdowns were not simply the product of extremism. They were the product of this Congress messing around on resolutions like the one we have before us today, instead of getting down to the hard work of trying to get a budget agreement.

The Committee on the Budget did not comply with the law and get the budget resolution heard and adopted on time. The appropriations committees did not approve the appropriation bills. They did not approve more than about half of them before it was time for the Government to be shut down.

□ 1415

So we got caught in a trap that was very expensive for the American taxpayer. Today we are headed down the same path. History is repeating itself. The Republican Congress has done practically nothing for the last 2 months, and today, instead of working to try to achieve a budget agreement, they are basically saying: We have not done our job, but, Mr. President, you have completed your job and we want you to do it again.

When it comes to the budget, the porridge is always too hot; and, if the President submitted another budget, it would be too cold. It is never just right for these folks.

Anyone who has ever bought a car or a house knows there is offer and counteroffer. What they need to do is to shut down these kinds of silly resolutions instead of shutting down the government and get to work negotiating a balanced budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER], who is a member of the Committee on the Budget and has put in a great deal of effort and time in her commitment to making sure that this country balances its Federal budget.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues from New Hampshire and Pennsylvania in offering this resolution. Our resolution is not about shutdowns. Our resolution is not about CBO or OMB, and it is not about politics or partisanship. It is not even about how we score budgets. This resolution is about our America's children, about our daughters and our sons.

Today our children face a $5.6 trillion debt, $122,400 for every American. I have two sons and one daughter. That means my children owe $67,200. Every child born in our country today will owe nearly $200,000 in taxes over their lifetimes just to pay interest on the debt. That is because the Federal Government, the Federal budget has not been balanced in a generation.

Who among our children will be able to share in the American dream if each of them must pay $200,000 just to pay interest on the debt?

The answer is that our children will not be able to realize the American dream, and they will not look forward to a future of hope, growth and opportunity tomorrow unless we balance our budget today. We can have a balanced budget for the first time in a generation. During the campaign both the President, President Clinton, and leaders of Congress promised that balancing the budget would be their top priority. Now is the time for both the President and Congress to come together to make good on this commitment. A fellow Texan, Sam Rayburn, once said that anything ever achieved by Congress was done in a bipartisan way.

Achieving a balanced budget would be a lasting accomplishment for America's families. A balanced budget would reduce interest rates, slashing the cost of a typical family's mortgage by $38,000. The cost of student loans would be cut nearly $9,000. An estimated 4¼ million new jobs would be created, and family incomes would rise.

This resolution will make this great achievement possible by establishing the crucial first step for both the President and Congress to come together to balance the budget. Step one is for both the President and Congress to use the same numbers when considering budgets and for both the President and Congress to balance the Federal books the same way that hard-working families balance their checkbooks each month. That is all this resolution does.

Families have to use accurate numbers when they balance their checkbooks, and our resolution asks the President to submit a budget that uses the most careful and accurate economic numbers of the Congressional Budget Office. Families must watch their spending each month. They cannot wait until the last week to use coupons or think about how they will pay the electric bill. So our resolution asks the President and Congress to present budgets that begin to save money today, not tomorrow.

And families cannot ignore their most important obligations like paying their mortgage. Similarly our resolution asks the President and Congress to submit budgets that meet the Government's obligation to our seniors by preserving Medicare and asks both the President and the Congress for budgets that preserve Medicare not just for the next election but for the next generation. It is not just American families who must meet the standards contained in our resolution. Last year the blue dog Democrats, the Congressional Black Caucus and the Republican majority and others all submitted budgets that met these basic and simple standards. Each these budgets use the most accurate CBO numbers, each of these budgets achieve budget balance through programmatic changes. Each of these budgets help to address the long-term problem of Medicare. That is why each of these budgets would have met the commonsense standards of our resolution.

Unfortunately, the budget that the administration submitted to Congress last month did not meet these basic requirements. The administration's budget increased the deficit while this administration is in office promising to balance the budget after the President leaves office. That is just not right for our children.

This budget increased the deficit by $24 billion this year and would leave the budget unbalanced in 2002. That is just not right for our children.

It used rosy scenarios and accounting contingencies, not tough choices, to achieve deficit reduction. That is just not right for our children. It failed to protect Medicare for this generation, let alone the future. That is not right for our children, for their parents or for their grandparents.

This resolution simply asks the President to meet the same standard that the majority, the blue dog Democrats, and the Congressional Black Caucus met last year. Since we must all work together to balance the budget, it asks all of us to use the same basic standards in our budget resolution.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution to establish a bipartisan, common ground for agreement on a balanced budget. Let us ask both the President and the Congress to submit budgets that meet the same basic requirements, the requirements that our families meet every day.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for offering me this time to participate in this debate.

I find it very strange that we are having this debate in the first instance on the floor of the House. This matter should be debated in our committee. I am a member of the Committee on the Budget. We have yet to really sit down and discuss exactly what kind of budget resolution we are going to offer this House. We have a statutory obligation to have this work done by April 15, and we have not begun this job.

It is simply irresponsible for the majority to abdicate its statutory duty. There is no way that they can pass the buck to the President. Under the Constitution, he offers his budget and it is for us to dispose of it. It is not to say to him, send another or send another because we do not agree with the minutia of its contents. It is for us to decide the details first within our committee.

So I find this a very shameful operation here today. Besides which, the head of the CBO that everybody is lauding today has said that there is

substantial agreement and that the administration's budget actually comes to a balance. We may not agree how it balances it, but the fact is the majority chose 2002 as the magic date and the President has come up with a budget that essentially does the job.

Now, who is the responsible body to make judgments as to forecasts? Forecasts are very difficult. It depends upon what the individual assumptions are, how we look at the future, the unemployment rate, how much taxes are coming in, and so forth.

I have a chart here which I would like to point to my colleagues where the Congressional Budget Office is off the mark. They are very, very conservative. Each year they projected far deeper deficits than occurred. And as a result, we cannot put much confidence on the CBO estimates.

To make the final point, the budget figures which the President offers have been equally conservative and equally conservative in looking at the economic projections. They have not been any further away from it than the CBO. So at this point bringing this resolution today out of the Rules Committee, charging that rosy scenarios are the culprit on the part of the administration budget, is absolutely wrong, not based upon fact and, I think, pure politics.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to draw attention to the fact that since 1993 there have been 20 deficit projections by OMB and CBO, and in 16 of those 20 projections CBO was more accurate than OMB in predicting the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PICKERING].

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

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the resolution as a new Member of Congress, coming with what I hope will be a new start, a clean slate. There is much at stake, and we have great opportunity to do something that has not been done in 28 years. That is to actually reach agreement on balancing our budget.

I am disappointed in the President's budget that, as both the President and Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, we all ran on the same themes of a smaller government, of balanced budgets, of tax relief for families. Unfortunately, the facts of the President's budget do not meet the words and the rhetoric.

The facts are that the President's budget increased taxes, increases taxes $23 billion over the next 10 years. In fiscal year 1998, it increases the deficit $24 billion. It undoes more than 50 percent of the savings in last year's welfare reform bill. It is $69 billion short of a balanced budget in the year 2002. And instead of providing entitlement reform, it creates $70 billion in new entitlement spending over the next 5 years.

The saddest or the most troubling component is that it leaves 98 percent of deficit reduction until after the President leaves office.

Those are the facts, but it affects our families. I am here today representing the Third District of Mississippi, which has been represented in a tremendous way by G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery. He met the challenge of his day. He built a strong defense, contained Communism. Helped win the cold war. My children today have freedom and prosperity in large part because he was willing, and his generation was willing to sacrifice.

I have four small children, four boys, ages 7, 5, 3 and 1. At the end of my days, I want to say, I was part of giving them the same freedom, the same opportunity, the same prosperity. To do so, we must create a new foundation, a new framework to reach a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of House Resolution 89 as a new Member of Congress, coming with the hope for a new start, a clean slate. I am here today not only as a Representative from the great State of Mississippi, or the successor to the legendary G.V. ''Sonny'' Montgomery, but as the father of four young boys.

There is much at stake in this budget cycle, and we have a great opportunity to do something that has not been done in 28 years. That is to actually reach agreement on balancing the Federal budget. I am disappointed in President Clinton's rhetoric concerning a balanced budget because his words do not match his actions.

As the father of four boys, age 7, 5, 3, and 1, I would like to leave a nation as great as the one I received from my father. Unfortunately, at the rate our Government spends money, my four boys, and millions of other children across this great land, will not receive an inheritance from those of us in this generation.

No, Mr. Speaker, we cannot be confused, the children of today will not inherit the legacy that we did. They will not inherit the classic American dream. They will inherit our debt.

The President spoke often during the campaign of his bridge to the 21st century. And I look forward to the start of the 21st century—the next American century.

However, we will not, and cannot stand by while this administration builds a bridge to the 21st century on the backs of our children.

As of today, each child in the United States, will inherit over $188,000 of debt from us.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the American dream. This is not the American way. This is not how we restore public trust in our Government.

In America we have always passed on the hope for a better, bigger, and brighter future. Yet the children of today can only look forward to debt, our debt.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the right thing to do. Nor is it right for the President to promise a balanced budget during the election and then provide us with yet another budget that simply does not balance.

While the President claims his budget comes into balance by 2002, it includes new spending initiatives and savings gimmicks that could cause the deficit to balloon in the subsequent years.

The tax cuts he provides are temporary while his tax increases will be part of the inheritance for our children.

Mr. Speaker, the tax increases are permanent while the tax cuts are temporary. In the President's budget, if the deficit reduction targets, based on rosy economic scenarios, aren't met, the President repeals the tax cuts in 2001 but the tax cuts are still in place.

We have many choices to make in this Congress that will effect the next generation. While we contemplate and debate which path to take, I recommend that we use our God given common sense.

I would suggest that it is only common sense to balance the budget. Millions of families across the Nation balance their checkbooks on a monthly basis. Is it too much to ask that the Federal Government does the same thing?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that while we journey toward the 21st century that we take the road to action to ensure that our children are not stuck in a future with little or no hope.

We have made great strides toward balancing the budget, but we have more to do. Balancing the budget is just the first step.

House Resolution 89 will ensure cooperation between the Congress and the White House in working toward a balanced budget.

By using the same economic assumptions we can find the middle ground necessary to make the tough choices that lie ahead.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged today in a very fraudulent exercise. I will enter into the RECORD a letter from Dr.O'Neill, the head of the Congressional Budget Office.

The question was asked whether the alternative set of policies proposed by the President would achieve a budget balance in fiscal year 2002, which would be balanced.

And her answer is, ''Our analysis, which provides CBO's estimate of the effect on the deficit of the President's alternative budgetary policies, shows a zero deficit in fiscal year 2002.''

The President has submitted a bill, a budget that is balanced, according to the very person that we hear the Members on the other side saying they would worship at her feet. If she says it is balanced, it is zero, if the deficit is zero, that is good enough for them. We have the letter. This is fraudulent.

The question we have to ask ourselves is, why are we going through this exercise? I will tell you. It is very simple: 1995–96, the Republicans got burned by coming out here with policies that were unacceptable to the American people.

□ 1430

And now we are engaged in what I call the grand stall. The budget is supposed to be ready by the 15th of April. Will that budget be done on the 15th of April? We have 13 working days between now and then and we are not in the committee.

We have not had a single discussion about any alternative or a modification that we will make to the President's proposal. We are getting a case

built here that the reason we did not do it on the 15th of April was because the President never submitted us a budget.

Now, some of the freshmen out here do not understand the game. But let me tell them what it is. We will blame it on the President as long as we can, and then, finally, we will try to jam something through here without any discussion, the discussions about taking away quality of care for senior citizens and a variety of other things.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this.

The information referred to is as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 4, 1997.

Hon. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: You asked whether the alternative set of policies proposed by the President in the event that Congressional Budget Office projections are used in the budget process would achieve unified budget balance in fiscal year 2002.

As we described in our March 3 preliminary analysis of the President's 1998 budgetary proposals, ''the alternative policies proposed by the President were designed to fill exactly any size deficit hole that CBO might project under the basic policies.'' Therefore, Table 6 in our analysis which provides CBO's estimate of the effect on the deficit of the President's alternative budgetary policies shows a zero deficit for fiscal year 2002.

I hope that this answer meets your needs.

Sincerely,

JUNE E. O'NEILL,
Director.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to draw attention to the CBO report. In fact, to be clear, I will quote from it directly. ''The CBO estimates that there will be a deficit of $69 billion in 2002 under the President's basic policy proposals.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here to support this resolution. I think it is no accident that this resolution is introduced by fellow freshmen, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS; the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. SUNUNU; and the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. GRANGER, who are joining me in this Congress and who come to this Congress from an understanding of how we believe responsibility ought to be taken in the real world and in real world budgeting.

Really, responsibility has to begin at the top. And this Congress, the last Congress, has shown the willingness to do that by giving the President for the first time ever the line item veto, saying to the President, we know there are some things that you can do that nobody can do as well. The President really has to lead in this area, and for the President to lead in this area effectively, we all do have to talk about the same numbers.

A great Missourian, Mark Twain, said that forecasting is always difficult, particularly when you are talking about the future. And it is difficult when we are talking about the future to predict. Everybody understands that. Everybody understands that we ought to be talking about the same numbers.

The President has said over and over again that we ought to be using the same numbers. Over and over again the President has turned to the Congressional Budget Office and verified that their numbers, over the course of time, have been better than other numbers available. As late as January, the President said we will work with the Congress to use numbers that everybody believes, numbers that come from the Congressional Budget Office.

This budget is out of balance. It has to be brought back into balance. We need the President to submit that budget.

The Federal Government is not doing a lot of terrible things. The tough choices in life are not between bad things and good things. The tough choices in life are determining what kinds of things really have to have priority, and that is what submitting a budget is really all about, submitting a budget with priorities.

I was a president before I came here. Was not the President of the United States. I was the president of a private university. We had a $23 million budget. We had 300 employees. They all vigorously advocated what they needed to have happen. We were able to balance that budget over and over again primarily because we made those tough choices. We prioritized.

That is what we need the President to do with this budget. We need to get started with numbers that we can work with and agree with and move toward paying the bills of the country for the first time in 28 years.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. KASICH, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that we will, of course, have a budget and it will be delivered to the House. This is not out of the ordinary, that the Congress has not brought this budget up. In the last 20 years, 19 of the times the budget resolution has come beyond a certain date required in the law.

The issue is not a hard fixed date, really. The issue at hand is whether we are able to either reach agreement with the administration and be able to bring a proposal forward; and absent an agreement with the administration, we will bring one forward that we will draft ourselves and that we will have an opportunity to consider in this House.

The issue today is really rather one of no matter what budgets come to this floor, they ought to be counted as being in balance. The Blue Dogs have brought a budget. It is in balance. They are going to appear before the Committee on the Budget. I have praised the Blue Dogs for their budget. The Black Caucus, in the past, has brought balanced budgets, as has the Republican majority, and we will bring one.

We are going to bring one on some date certain. I have already said that the administration could bring a budget and slip a date. Who cares about the specific date on a calendar? It is the work product we are most concerned about and the quality of the product.

So today what we are trying to say, both to the administration and to the Congress, and to anybody else that wants to draft a budget, use honest numbers. No gimmicks. Balance the budget and put the children first.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to the gentleman from North Dakota, to simply note for the record that in 1993 the House Committee on the Budget produced a budget resolution on March 10; in 1994, on March 3.

Unfortunately, the last 2 years we have been May 10 and May 9, and under the current schedule, debating things like this, that seems to be where we are headed this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, the people I represent in North Dakota are tired of the debate in this House where one side points to the other side and says they are terrible and get a ''they are terrible'' back, and more of the fracas just continues. Unfortunately, a lot of the debate this afternoon sounds much like that tired old partisan dialogue.

We can do better than that. We stand at a great point of opportunity. The deficit is down 63 percent from where it was 4 years ago. We have made real headway. There is just that final push to get us to a balanced budget. What is more, we stand at this point in time in agreement that there ought to be a balanced budget. We stand at this point in time that we ought to have that balanced budget achieved by 2002.

So with so much agreement, it seems to me we ought to be working hard at negotiating our way to a balanced budget rather than having a spurious debate of the kind before us.

No budget plan is perfect. There will always be a great deal of give and take in crafting the final product. Now, the budget process is structured in a formalized way. The President advances his budget, and at that point in time all eyes turn to the majority party for their budget plan. When they have their budget plan on the table, the sides get together and negotiations begin in great earnestness in terms of how the differences can be resolved.

So the President has advanced his budget. All eyes turn to the majority caucus. They do not have a plan. They, in fact, want to waste our time this afternoon asking the President to submit another budget. They know very

well the process. The process is it is their turn. Bring a budget forward. It takes two to tango. It takes two budget plans to get negotiated.

For the freshmen that for the first time are directing, I think impressively, a floor debate, I would just say they are in Congress now. There is something wonderful that comes with that. If they do not like the President's budget, they should write their own. The Blue Dog Democrats have already done precisely that. Other Democrat plans, I expect, will emerge.

Rather than carp and gripe about the shortcomings of the President's plan, just put pen to paper and come up with one. That would advance the process very significantly. That would get us to the table with the differences clearly etched so that they might be negotiated.

One final comment. We do not have much time. We want to get this done by 2002. We need 5 years to get it done. If we fritter away this year in partisan finger-pointing nonsense instead of earnest negotiation to a settlement, it will be only much harder to do in the future.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Chair that I will be yielding my time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] before I go to a committee hearing.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, they say the difference between a good baseball player and a great baseball player is the followthrough. Now is the time for Congress and the President to knock one out of the park for the American people and follow through on the promise to balance the budget.

The distinguished gentleman from Washington referred to a comment about my freshmen colleagues, and said, well, the freshmen do not understand the games that are played in Washington. I agree that perhaps we do not, and the American public does not. Whenever the President promises to submit a balanced budget, and it is scored as not being in balance, the American public understands that there is a need for the President to go back to the drawing board, to resubmit his budget, and that is what this resolution calls for.

The President has thrown us a curve ball with the budget he has submitted. It claims to be in balance by the year 2002, and yet it is not. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, which the President has agreed to abide by, concludes that the administration's budget will produce a $69 billion deficit by the year 2002. This takes us in the wrong direction. And in fact next year, if no action was taken under the President's budget, there would be a $24 billion increase in the deficit. We cannot get to zero by going the wrong direction.

I am concerned about the families of America. A government that spends 15 percent of its income on interest on the debt is an impediment to hope and prosperity for the average taxpayer. The American people cannot bear the weight of an excessive and out-of-control Federal Government.

We need only to look at the difficulties faced by the average American family. There was a time in the not too distant past, when I grew up as a child, when one parent could work in a factory or a store or an office and the other stay home in order to take care of the family.

My parents are examples of this. My father had a high school education and was limited in his job opportunities. He worked as an inspector in a chicken plant in northwest Arkansas, but yet despite the modest income, he was able to provide for his family, raise his children, allowing Mom to stay at home, and that is because the government did not eat up his paycheck as is done today.

The American family cannot do that today and that is why we need to balance the budget and that is why I support this resolution to give us hope in America once again.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN].

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, in the 11 years I have been in Congress to receive Presidential budgets, this budget is the best received I have ever seen by our colleagues. And there is good reason for that. The track record of the Clinton administration has been excellent in reducing the deficit.

It is the first administration in recent times that had 4 years in a row in reducing the deficit. It has submitted a budget that balances in the year 2002, according to OMB projections. There is a disagreement between CBO and OMB. Why do we not look at the track record and look at the past 4 years? In the past 4 years, OMB has been more accurate than CBO. The deficits have actually been smaller than we thought they were going to be. The President's has been more accurate.

The President goes one step further. He says if his economic projections are wrong, he puts an enforcement mechanism in his budget that guarantees us a balanced budget by the year 2002. That is why the gentleman from Washington is correct when he says that Dr. O'Neill has said that the President's budget will have a zero deficit in the year 2002.

The Congressional Budget Act says the President should submit his budget by February. He has done that. It then says that Congress shall pass a concurrent resolution by April 15.

Now, we have heard from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget that we are not going to meet that deadline. I know that the leadership has instituted a new process known as Correction Day. Maybe we should put the Congressional Budget Act on Correction Day and eliminate the time limits that are put in here.

Rather than wasting our time on this resolution, I would support a resolution that would direct the Committee on the Budget to bring out its budget in time so that we can act by April 15.

□ 1445

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to note that with regard to the triggers that have been discussed, there is a fair amount of accuracy. There are triggers in the President's budget, and here is what the triggers do: Head Start cut $400 million over 2 years; special education cut $370 million over 2 years; Pell grants cut $680 million over 2 years; veterans' hospitals cut $1.4 billion over 2 years. That is what a trigger is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, I commend him for bringing this resolution forward, and I support it.

Let me begin by pointing out that this resolution does matter. I sat on the Budget Committee 2 years ago when Alan Greenspan pointed out that if this Congress could balance the budget, it would make a real difference to Americans. Interest rates would drop.

This chart shows that following the 1994 elections, interest rates began to drop. But when we failed to agree with the President on a plan that would balance the budget, interest rates began to go back up. This debate does matter. It is critical that we balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I sat in this room and listened to the President announce that the era of big government is over. I sat in this Chamber and listened to him pronounce that this should be the Congress which finally balances the budget, and yet the budget which the President has submitted does not do that.

I rise in good faith to ask the President to join us in this effort, and to point out that a budget which increases the deficit in the coming year by $24 billion over doing nothing is not, in good faith, an effort to balance the budget; that a budget such as the President has submitted, which results in a $69 billion deficit in the year 2002 when it is supposed to be balanced, is not a good faith effort.

This is not a partisan fight. Both sides of the aisle agree we must balance the budget. I call on the President to join us in this fight, to join us so that we can benefit the American people by the kind of falling interest rates

which will occur, the lower car loans, the lower student loans, the lower home mortgage loan interest rates that Americans would enjoy if we had a balanced budget. I call upon the President to submit a budget which does balance and to join in this effort.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this resolution. This is nothing but a diversion, a political exercise and a futile attempt to shift the blame where it does not belong.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying to cover their tracks. Having promised too much in their recent election campaigns, they now find that they are unable to produce a budget that is both in balance and fair. So instead they are taking the highly unprecedented step of requesting the President to submit a second budget, something which we have not seen with previous administrations, including those who submitted budgets that were out of balance.

Before we vote, we should consider some important facts. The Constitution of the United States clearly states that it is the Congress and not the executive branch which enacts laws and appropriates funds. Article 1, section 8, clause 18 states:

> The Congress shall have the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or officer thereof.

So, therefore, the Constitution is quite clear as to who is responsible for forming a budget. It is the Congress. Second, while the Congressional Budget Act of 1973 sets the procedure for the President to submit a budget for consideration by the Congress, ultimately it is up to the Congress to pass the laws enacting a budget for the United States. In fact, if we are to rely on the 1973 act, we find that the 105th Congress is woefully behind, with only 10 legislative days left in which the Committees on the Budget are to submit and the Congress to adopt a budget resolution. Yet only yesterday the Republican leadership stated that no budget would be submitted or debated until May.

We all know the President has submitted a budget, and while it may not be perfect, and few budgets are, he has met his goals in both form and substance. The administration can honestly state that using the assumptions of the Office of Management and Budget, the President's budget achieves balance by 2002. I might add that the CBO has also agreed with that statement. We can disagree with the President over assumptions and substance, but we cannot disagree with the fact that he has submitted his budget and it is in balance using his assumptions.

So what is the problem that requires the other side to ask that the administration submit a new budget? They have the power to submit their own budget. Many of my colleagues on the other side were here during the Reagan and Bush years. No one ever asked them to submit another budget when in fact their budgets were never in balance.

The problem, my colleagues, is that the Republican leadership cannot produce a balanced budget that cuts taxes by nearly $200 billion and does not make deep cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. They have simply overpromised and now they are stuck. They want the President to do the heavy lifting and that is why we are considering a bill here today that is nothing more than subterfuge. Let us be honest. The President has his budget, the Blue Dogs have their budget. It is time for the Republicans to put their budget on the table and let the American people compare.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] and the other freshmen who have put this together because far from being a senseless debate, as we have heard from some of our colleagues on the other side, this is a very important debate. Let me explain the consequences. Who is right and who is wrong is not as important as what happens if we are wrong.

As we have seen, we believe the President's budget is not in balance. That is important. That is significant. The deficit actually goes up and at the end of the budget cycle, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which is our official scorekeeper, the budget is still out of balance by $69 billion come the year 2002.

What does that mean? What are the consequences? The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] tried to explain, and I think Members need to understand that if the Congressional Budget Office is correct, here is what is going to happen in the year 2002. I daresay no Republicans nor no Democrats want to vote for this, because it means that Head Start will be cut $422 million, special education will be cut $369 million, education to the disadvantaged will be cut $707 million, Pell grants for college students will have to be cut $680 million, the National Institutes of Health will have to be cut over $1 billion.

Veterans hospitals, does anybody want to have to vote in the year 2002 to cut veterans hospitals by $1.4 billion? Or the women, infants and children program, the WIC Program, by $353 million? The FBI would have to be cut by $230 million; the Immigration and Naturalization Service, $147 million; the Federal Aviation Administration, they are the people who keep our airways safe, by $783 million; Federal highways by $1.4 billion; the National Science Foundation, $269 million worth of cuts if the President's triggers go into effect. Finally let me say, and we all care about national parks, do my colleagues really want to vote for a budget that could cause national parks to be cut by $105 million?

I say the answer to that question is no. That is not the budget that we want. The debate that we are having today is an important debate for this reason, and I am still wearing my name tag from Hershey because I think we need a bipartisan budget. I think we have to work together. I think we have to have an honest debate. But how can we have an honest debate about the most important issue this Congress will deal with, the budget, if one side is speaking Greek and the other side is speaking Latin?

What this debate is about today, what this vote is about today is let us all speak the same language, because if we are right and the President is wrong, it is going to have dramatic consequences for lots of our constituents. That is not what we want, that is not what you want, and frankly I do not think that is what the President wants. What we want is an honest and fair debate using honest and fair numbers. Let us agree on the assumptions, let us agree on the language, then let us have an honest debate.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I take 1 second to remind the gentleman that last year he proposed the same kind of trigger in Medicare. He trusted it then. I am not sure why he does not trust it now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I have some prepared comments which I would like to submit, but I would like to depart from those if I could, because in this discussion and debate today I have found some unusual rhetoric that I think really does not strike home to anybody outside of the beltway. I am just a poor kid from Pawtucket, RI, and when we talk about work, we mean about rolling up your sleeves, working together, agreeing to disagree but coming out with a budget.

What we have seen, though, unfortunately is a lot of political rhetoric about it is not fair to the children, we are not following through, this is a curve ball. The fact of the matter is whether you are in Pawtucket, RI; Westerly, RI; Texas; Washington; or Washington, DC, the issue before us is, let us get together and work on a budget that works.

The President submitted a budget on February 6. It balances by 2002. The Blue Dogs submitted a budget. The Black Caucus submitted a budget. But the Republicans have not yet, not today and not tomorrow, submitted one issue that is regarding a budget. Not even an amendment. Not a plan.

If we are really talking about bipartisanship, if we are talking about Hershey, PA, if we are talking about doing the things that all the people in my district in Rhode Island believe in, we should be then debating the issues of the President's budget, the Blue Dog budget, the minority caucus budget, and hopefully elements that you believe in, but let us debate them. Let us put them on the table.

Let us work to resolve the issue, rather than this political buffoonery that is before us today. This is wrong. This is not legislation. These are people being political pawns, and quite frankly everyone outside of the beltway is cringing today and saying, ''What is wrong with these people in Washington? They just don't get it.'' Let us get it, let us get on with it, let us pass a budget that balances.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to note that of the budgets mentioned in the last presentation, the coalition budget meets the criteria placed for it here. The budget put forward by this Congress 2 years ago meets the criteria in this resolution. The Black Caucus budget discussed meets the criteria in this resolution. This resolution simply calls for Congress and the President both to fall into the criteria outlined here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] who has put forward a great amount of work in supporting this resolution and working toward a balanced budget.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution urging President Clinton to submit a budget that balances by 2002. We are all aware that balancing the budget is a top priority with the American people.

The budget submitted by President Clinton was touted as a legitimate plan to balance the budget by the year 2002. It does not do that. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the independent source which the President himself has suggested we use, this effort falls short of the balance goal by $69 billion. Not only does the President's budget not balance by 2002, it leaves 98 percent of the deficit reduction until after he leaves office.

President Clinton increases the deficit by $24 billion next year over what would be if we did nothing, which is considered the baseline. If we maintained spending next year at the same level as it is today, we will have a budget deficit next year of $121 billion. That is the first year. The President would increase that deficit spending by $24 billion over that baseline, to $145 billion. That deficit spending increases and continues every year until 2002. So we would be better off if we did nothing, rather than using the President's plan.

Also, Mr. Speaker, looking at the President's budget, on page 331 we see the amount of the debt over a 5-year period, the debt today being $5.4 trillion, in 2002, $6.6 trillion. I would like to submit this for the RECORD. In other words, we increase the debt in this 5-year period by $1.2 trillion. Need I say more about needing a balanced budget?

We have not balanced the budget since 1969. To quote Thomas Jefferson, ''There is nothing more important for our children and the next generation of Americans than to leave them a Nation that is debt free.''

For the sake of our children and our grandchildren, the out-of-control spending must come to an end.

President Clinton said, ''We don't need a balanced budget amendment. We need action.''

Well, we need action. He has given us neither. It is action that we are calling for with this resolution, action that does not mean higher taxes. This proposal does raise taxes. According to the independent Joint Committee on Taxation, the President's budget would increase taxes by $23 billion through 2007, hitting middle-income taxpayers first. This will directly impact over 100 million workers across the country. Another tax hike in the President's budget penalizes American companies that create export jobs, changing the tax formula to increase the amount of their taxes on income derived from sales abroad.

□ 1500

That is a real disincentive for companies who rely on trade and exports.

Another harmful tax is the capital gains tax, which is a tax hike on 10 to 15 million Americans that will occur. They are predominantly middle-income families who own mutual funds and stocks, and these tax hikes are all permanent, but the tax cuts are temporary. For example, the $500 child tax credit is scheduled to disappear when a child reaches age 13, just about the time when kids get expensive. That means that single moms are left out in the cold after their kids are 13 and growing.

That is irresponsible. To shut down a tax credit when the going gets tough on parents like single moms is unwise.

The President's budget also calls for this tax credit to expire on December 31, year 2000, just when he leaves office.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that the President resubmit a budget that serves as a starting point for discussion. Step one to an agreement is the need to use the same numbers. By assuring that both the President and the Congress use the same numbers, we begin to travel down the same road to a balanced budget, and this resolution would do that.

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about ethics today in Washington. I would like to ask a question. Is it ethical to spend money that we do not have and to stick our kids and grandkids with the bill? Most of us, when our parents die, expect maybe to inherit a house or maybe some savings, but how would my colleagues feel if their parents went into such debt that they had to spend the rest of their life just retiring their debt? That is what we are doing to the next generation. The only people who lose in this deal are the kids.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members to support this resolution.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution really trivializes what is perhaps the most significant legislative initiative we will undertake this session. Our colleagues may disagree with the President's budget, but it does indeed balance. Our colleagues may not like how it balances, they may think it should balance early, but CBO really said, ''If you use his assumptions and his trigger, it would balance at the year that he indicated it would.'' The budget, however, provides guidance for how we spend our resources, who will we spend it on; it determines indeed what our resources will be spent on and indeed who is important.

The budget for our Nation is the most important plan that our people will have. We will decide whether small family businesses spanning generations will be able to survive through relief from unfair estate tax, we will decide the kind of assistance we will give to those who are aspiring for education, higher education, for Head Start, we decide whether American children will get a healthy start or any assistance at all. So this is no small matter talking about the budget, but it is a small matter what we are doing on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, right now as we are talking about this budget the Committee on the Budget is having a hearing that is on the issue that we should all be there. It is no accident they establish a date of April 15, tax day, the day that our citizens assume their share of the budget of our Nation that we in Congress should have a budget resolution. But at the rate we are going we will not meet that goal. Why? Because of such activities as we are having today.

The President's budget has been submitted.

Now there are some issues I disagree with, but nevertheless I am generally pleased by that budget and know that there are issues that I disagree with and I will have an opportunity to express. I urge my Republican colleagues to use that same effort: Go to the hearings, express their view, submit their budget, find a better way to improve this budget. If they want to submit a balanced budget, why not put that balanced budget on the floor?

Mr. Speaker, I urge that this resolution should not be voted on, and it should not be on the floor in the first place, and certainly we should vote against it.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by observing that in my opinion both sides in this discussion are fundamentally committed to balancing the budget. Nobody ever said that that goal would be easy to attain. If it were easy, I suspect it would have been done long ago. But it is now clear that reaching that goal will require not only determination, but real leadership if we are to fundamentally change Washington spending habits.

Against that backdrop the budget submitted by the President, in my judgment, defers simply too many of the tough decisions. It leaves them for someone else to figure out.

According to the CBO, fully 98 percent of the savings needed to balance the budget will not come until the last 2 years. In those years that responsibility will fall to a different Congress and indeed a different President.

But let us be honest. Any plan to balance the budget relies on the greatest portion of savings to be achieved in the final years. That is because when we make changes in the way that Washington spends money we do not see instant results. It takes time to accumulate substantial savings. But the President's budget simply relies too heavily on back-loaded savings.

But there is a different problem, and it is just around the corner. For 4 consecutive years the deficit has been going down. That is to the President's credit and to ours. But the deficit now we find is at its lowest level in 15 years, but next year for a variety of reasons the deficit will begin going back up.

All of us should find that change in direction very troubling, and we should seek to limit the increase in next year's deficit to the greatest extent possible. But unfortunately that is not what the President's budget would do. According to CBO, the deficit next year will be $24 billion worse than if his budget had been lost on its way up to Capitol Hill. The CBO estimates that if we stayed on our current path and did nothing, the deficit next year would be $121 billion. That is $24 billion lower than under the President's recommended spending plan.

There is another reality that we simply must face. We cannot expect to credibly balance the budget and keep it in balance beyond 2002 without making some structural changes in entitlement spending. Entitlements now account for over 55 percent of all Federal savings, and they are going up every year at an astonishing rate. We owe it to the American people to make the changes needed to keep entitlement spending under control while preserving the essential purposes of those programs.

We are committed to working with the President to end deficit spending. This resolution takes us in that direction by asking the President to take a second look at his proposal.

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

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] makes the best case for not reducing taxes. The President's budget would continue down if we did not reduce taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to get the job done, not to play games. As a freshman member of the Committee on the Budget, I am eager to get to work on a plan that will balance the budget, but here it is the second week of March and we have yet to really begin an open and honest discussion as to Federal spending and the priorities that we must face as a Congress.

There are legitimate differences over the merits of a tax cut and how to best achieve savings in Medicare and Medicaid spending, but we must start to work through these difficulties and begin debating the issues. Unfortunately, today the House is debating a resolution which serves no useful purpose. At best this resolution is a waste of time; at worst it is a diversion from our work in the Committee on the Budget, which should be meeting right now.

We have a legal obligation to submit a budget resolution by April 15. We have an obligation to our constituents to work toward a plan which will balance the budget. The time for action is now. The responsibility is ours as a Congress. We should commit ourselves to reconciling our differing visions of how to balance the budget and get to work on an honest and open debate on the issues before us.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] for yielding me the time. I would just like to take a look at what the President is proposing in the area of education.

We all recognize that much work needs to be done in education. We are currently engaged in a process which we call Education at a Crossroads which examines what is working and what is wasted in education in America today. We are taking a look at the Washington response, which is 760 programs going through 39 different agencies, spending about a $120 billion per year, and what we believe is that before we put another overlay of new programs and spending on this education bureaucracy, let us take a look at what is working and what is wasted, and, if we have new priorities, let us find some money in the old programs that appear not to be working, and let us reestablish priorities.

There is enough money in education. We do not need more money.

The President is proposing a building program, recognizing that when we put Federal dollars into building programs we prohibit the use of volunteers on those projects and we have to pay premiums through the Davis-Bacon law. And then the President on the other hand wants to encourage volunteerism by expanding the Corporation for National Service, its involvement in tutoring programs. So on one hand we are saying volunteers are bad, on the other hand we are going to say we are going to have more volunteers paid $27,000 per year involved in teaching our kids to read. It is great that they are teaching our kids to read because the Corporation for National Service cannot keep its books, and just recently there was another report that said their trust fund is now unauditable. These people cannot teach our kids math, so maybe they can help on reading.

What is the President's vision for education? He wants to build our schools, put in the technology, develop the correct curriculum, test our kids, certify our teachers, teach them about sex, teach them about drugs, feed them breakfast, feed them lunch, do midnight basketball, and other than that it is your school. He has got a vision of big government and more spending, proposing $55 billion of increased spending, new spending, $11 billion per year for the next 5 years. That means that 2.2 million American families will have to pay $5,000 a year for increased spending on education when that money already exists.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] raises the question. I say Put your alternative on the table; we would love to see it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today's debate sounds like a line from a popular song: ''Isn't It Ironic?''

Is it not ironic that the majority party is demanding the President submit a second budget when they have not yet come about to present any budget plan? Is it not ironic that the budget process is behind schedule for the third year in a row under Republican leadership? Is it not ironic that one Member of the majority party's leadership has stated it would be inappropriate for Republicans to produce a budget while another Member of the same leadership had said they will produce a budget resolution in May. Is it not ironic?

Enough of this budget gridlock, Mr. Speaker. The President has submitted a budget; the Republicans have not.

Today's resolution is nothing more than a diversion. It is simply an attempt to distract, an attempt to distract the American people from the fact that the majority is not doing its job.

Do not fall for this trick. Vote no on House Resolution 89.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon we had before us the proposition of whether we should adopt a rule that controls the debate on this matter that is pending. We did adopt a rule, and unfortunately that rule denied the minority a chance at asking this body to vote on an equitable proposition. That proposition would have challenged both the leadership of this Congress and the administration to produce a budget that complies with the standards that are set forth and have been so frequently addressed here.

I for one feel that these standards are important, that we should have conservative forecasting, that we should have a glidepath to deficit reduction or eliminating the deficit, that we should deal with the problems of the Medicare system.

□ 1515

Unfortunately, we are now grappling with just the politics of how this is to be presented. It is cosmetics, and that is one of the tragedies. We should be insisting, as newer Members of Congress, that both the Republican leadership and the Democratic White House meet the same standard and do so simultaneously. Both groups should be putting their cards on the table and saying, this is what our hand looks like, now let us sit down and negotiate the next step.

We all know those negotiations have to take place. The longer we delay those negotiations, the greater the risk that we will again experience the tragic shutdown of the Federal Government that occurred in 1995.

It is my fervent wish that we put to one side this type of a dilatory tactic and say: time to get on with the task; time, as Republican leaders to present a budget; time for the White House to present a budget that complies with the standards that we all know ought to be the standards that govern budgeting in this institution.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire for yielding and congratulate him on his work in this area.

I do rise in support of the resolution, but I really take the floor not so much because of this resolution, which I do not consider to be either dilatory or a waste of time, because it is getting its focus on what I think we should be talking about here in the U.S. Congress today, and that is balancing the budget of our country. I think it is absolutely vital.

Let us not forget that people such as Mr. Greenspan has said that we will reduce interest rates by 2 percent if we can balance the budget. We are all talking about balancing the budget, and I think we should go with doing it. I think this is a good exercise to put some of these issues on the floor.

I am not critical of the White House. As a matter of fact, I had a very good meeting this morning with Mr. Franklin Raines, the budget director, and Mr. Gene Sperling of the White House, and about a dozen of us to talk about the budget issues, the numbers. I think they showed some flexibility in terms of revisiting, relooking at some of the numbers which are here.

However, I do become concerned when we do not move forward, and I do become concerned with some of the numbers that we are dealing with with respect to this particular budget. I think, first and foremost, it really has not recognized the parameters of using the Congressional Budget Office estimates and assumptions, and I think we should get to that point so we can at least argue from the same set of numbers. I realize there will still be some differences, but we did promise to do that.

I think without the same economic baseline and numbers used for comparison purposes, it is too difficult to decide which is more and which is less. It simply allows no political accountability under the President's assumptions as we have now.

I do congratulate, by the way, the Blue Dog Coalition budget makers. I think they did an extremely good job of recognizing the issues before us that are making the kind of hard decisions that I think each of the 435 of us should make and the President and his advisors should make with respect to balancing the budget.

I might point out that it is not only the Republicans that called on the President to issue a balanced budget, but the nonpartisan Concord Coalition as well, that concurs with the Congressional Budget Office that his budget postpones most spending cuts until after the year 2000 and after he actually leaves the White House.

So we have some serious problems with the delays, and I think we need to address these and deal with it, and I hope we can keep moving forward.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHERMAN].

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are called here in this Chamber today not to do the people's business but to engage in what I think is dilatory tactics. We are called upon to spend a day in this Chamber not making laws, but engaged in a ritualistic attack on President Clinton and his fiscal record. So I figured we ought to take a minute just to look at the President's fiscal record.

This chart here shows where we were headed in terms of a deficit before President Clinton took office. We see this line exceeding $100 trillion. Now, I have only served in Congress for a short time. I remember when $1 billion was a lot of money. And we used to explain it as a line of $100 bills going from Washington all the way across the country or a stack of $1 bills all the way to the Moon. We were headed for a $100 trillion deficit. That is a stack of $100 bills going all the way to whatever planet Yoda lives on.

Instead, we have fiscal responsibility in the White House, and we have been able to bring long-term prospects represented by that lower line to a position where a balanced budget, a long-term and permanent balanced budget, is within reach.

Now, the laws says that we are supposed to have a budget resolution just 10 legislative days from today. Instead of passing resolutions, we should start by writing a budget in the Committee on the Budget. And I felt, why have the Republican majority not put forward a budget? And I thought maybe it was in absence of pen and paper and a chance to sit down and actually write some numbers down. So I brought this here.

Mr. Speaker, as we can see, it sets forth everything we have been told about the majority's budget. It comes equipped with a pen, and I would hope that in the spirit of Hershey, PA, some of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle would come down here and give us some numbers, because a journey toward a trillion-dollar budget starts with the first digit.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ALLEN].

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend half of the Members in this House participated in a bipartisan congressional retreat to help restore civility in our debate. The American people want us to do the people's work and to do so in a bipartisan fashion.

Today's resolution requesting the President to submit a second balanced budget is partisan and counterproductive. The President submitted a balanced budget in February. While we may honestly disagree about the President's budget priorities, the Constitution gives this Congress the power of the purse. Section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act requires this Congress to complete action on the budget resolution on or before April 15, 1997. That date is less than 5 weeks away. To request a second balanced budget from the President is simply irresponsible. He has done his job.

The Committee on the Budget must not duck the tough choices necessary to balance the Federal budget, but that is what is going on today. Let us do our job. Let us vote against this resolution and urge the Committee on the Budget to submit a budget resolution to this Congress by April 15.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a waste of time. Why do

my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to stall the budget process? I thought that the clock was ticking for us to enact a balanced budget, which I support. In the rush to pass a fiscal year 1998 budget, the Republicans are setting up another scenario for last-minute legislation. In that rush, the most vulnerable populations will be targeted again for the highest spending cuts and the lowest assistance. It is remarkable how far the Republicans will single out poor families.

The deadline grows near for our national budget to be balanced. Note that my Republican colleagues have not submitted a budget proposal. They must not be serious about negotiating a balanced budget agreement. What is their strategy now? To shut down the Federal Government again? Remember, it did not work before; it will not work again.

I ask my colleagues to consider the human face on this debate. Consider Miguel Pena from Brooklyn, a 72-year-old Dominican legal immigrant with mental illness who will lose his SSI disability benefits within months because he is not a citizen. He, like hundreds of thousands of other legal immigrants, has no other source of income.

Consider the 30 percent of the 30,000 Hasidic children in Williamsburg who will lose their Federal assistance. Consider Maria Rodriguez, 27 years old, a legal secretary with two children and no subsidized daycare options. Hard-working people have to make painful decisions on a daily basis about keeping a roof over their heads or putting food on their table. We should not be spending precious time on political posturing at the expense of America's future.

The families I represent in Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Queens carefully manage their limited incomes to make ends meet. They cannot postpone their budget; neither should we. Let us get on with the people's business.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a resolution which demands that the President submit yet another balanced budget plan. Apparently the first one was not to the House leadership's liking. Such an ironic twist and somewhat bold in light of the fact that the House leadership has failed to submit a balanced budget plan of their own, one that meets the criteria that they have set forth that they have asked the President to meet. To date we have the President's balanced budget plan, we have the coalition's balanced budget plan, and I have yet to see a plan from the Republican leadership.

Now, reasonable people can disagree over what should or should not be in the plan to balance the but. The President's plan is very strong on education and children's health care, and some may disagree about that. But the President made a good-faith effort to meet the demands of the House leadership, only to be told that he must submit a second budget before they even submit the first one.

The President has submitted a detailed balanced budget plan that includes the economic and accounting analysis, information on Federal receipts and collections and detailed priorities. It is a good-size document weighing more than a few pounds with a little over 1,200 pages of great detail.

I urge my colleagues who dislike the President's budget plan to meet him halfway and submit a plan of their own. The President cannot negotiate with himself and should not be asked to submit a new plan until those who disagree with him have an approach all their own.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SNOWBARGER].

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

Mr. SNOWBARGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about one particular aspect of the budget that is before us and the subject of the comments today, and that is the issue of tax relief. The fact of the matter is that over the next 10 years this budget proposes a tax increase of over $23 billion.

Mr. Speaker, if a budget is going to promise tax relief, it should be permanent tax relief. It is better to have no tax relief than phony tax relief. The child care tax credit for children under 13 is only $300 for the first 3 years. Then it supposedly increases to $500. But the budget also proposes that all the tax reductions will automatically be repealed in the year 2000 if the rosy scenario and the imaginative arithmetic conflict with reality, as CBO has said it will, and it turns out the budget then will not be balanced.

A tax credit for children should not be scheduled to expire in a few years. Neither should a tax credit for children disappear when the child turns 13, just when children become the most expensive. You know, when they eat everything in sight and go through two or complete wardrobes a year. Under the administration's plan, a family will get relief only if its children were born between 1985 and 1999.

While promising tax relief with one hand and taking it away with the other, the budget also belies the President's assertion that the age of big Government is over. The President claims to have reduced the Federal civilian work force by 299,600 employees from 1993 through 1998. This is misleading on several counts, including the following: two-thirds of these reductions are from the Department of Defense. These personnel reductions actually come from the Defense downsizing of the Bush administration, which occurred because the United States and its allies won the cold war under the leadership of the Reagan-Bush administrations. The new budget claims to reduce 26,600 additional employees by the end of fiscal year 1998. But the President fails to emphasize the fact that he is actually cutting 27,800 workers from the Department of Defense, when the non-DOD Government labor force will actually increase by 1,200.

The administration's budget also uses creative accounting to hide increased spending. The President's budget actually makes substantial increases in discretionary spending. Compared to 1997 levels the budget increases discretionary spending by $100 billion over next 5 years.

I served in the Kansas State Legislature for 12 years. During that time I worked with Republican and Democratic Governors, and reached principled compromises. I want the Congress and the President to reach an agreement on a budget that is balanced, and that will stay balanced. But it has to be an honest agreement, with honest numbers. The only way to accomplish that is for the President to submit a budget that is truly balanced. Then we can engage in the true give-and-take of the legislative process.

The difference between the President's current budget and what needs to be done on this issue is the difference between saying we're going to balance the budget and actually balancing it. To pretend we are balancing the budget when we're not dishonors us, betrays our constituents, and endangers programs like Social Security, which the President insists he wants to protect. In the long run, the promises of a bankrupt Federal Government are worthless. The best thing we can do to ensure that Social Security is here tomorrow is to start balancing the budget today.

For these reasons the House must pass this resolution calling on the President to prepare another budget, one that really balances.

□ 1530

A tax credit for children should not be scheduled to expire in a few years. Neither should a tax credit for children disappear when a child turns 13, just when the child becomes most expensive: when they eat everything in sight and go through two or more wardrobes a year.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PRICE].

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. speaker, one of my first experiences in this body in 1987 came when we were voting on the floor on four competing budget resolutions, including one offered by the majority party, as is always done, at least until this year.

I remember at the end of the day it struck me that 140 Members of this body had voted ''no'' on all four resolutions, in the spirit of a comment made by the then-minority whip, Mr. LOTT, who said, ''You do not ever get into trouble for those budgets which you vote against.''

I am sure Members in this body also remember 1993, when we passed a 5-year budget plan that has since reduced the deficit by $700 billion. Yet we barely passed that plan, by only one vote in both Houses.

It is easiest to vote ''no,'' and it is hard to produce a budget, but it is our

obligation to produce a budget. Particularly, it is the obligation of the majority party to deliver what every majority party has delivered in the past: A budget proposal which then serves as a blueprint for subsequent congressional action.

The majority apparently does not want to put its fingerprints on any budgetary unpleasantness, so they are trying to shift the blame onto the President. But the President has already produced a budget. No one is claiming that it is perfect, but our Republican friends are exaggerating the difference between CBO and OMB projections as a diversionary tactic, trying to divert attention from their own failure to do the tough work of writing and passing a budget resolution. If they do not like the President's budget they can produce a different budget, but it is the Republican majority's turn to put its own budget on the table so we can move forward to confront the country's challenges.

Surely we do not want to repeat the scenario of deadlock and Government shutdown. Time is almost up. The statutory deadline is April 15. Only 9 legislative days remain to pass a budget resolution. The majority party is way overdue in putting their own budget on the table, a budget proposal which we could be debating today rather than this irrelevant and diversionary resolution.

Let us get the budget process back on track. Defeat this resolution and bring a budget resolution to the floor, as the majority party has always done and is still obligated to do.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and congratulate him for his important work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, this is about principle. We have talked about what the President has said, and the President's words are important. The President has said, and we have repeatedly relied on these statements, because words should have meanings, Mr. Speaker; the President said, I have made it clear we will work with Congress, the Congressional Budget Office, and we are going to do this. We are going to do the right thing.

We are taking the President at his word. We are taking the President at his word that he means to make the difficult decision and that he means to be a leader and not a politician.

Politics have ruled this debate for too long on both sides of the aisle. I have heard about Hershey and the spirit of bipartisanship, and we need to treat each other civil. We should not have to be reminded about that. We are adult politicians. But the fact is that we have very legitimate policy differences, and they are subjective differences.

What is objective, Mr. Speaker, is that the President has said he will abide by CBO. CBO has said his budget is not in balance. We expect the President to give us a balanced budget. We want the President to give us a balanced budget. The American people deserve a balanced budget.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the majority leader announced that the Congress will not consider a budget resolution until May, 3 months after the President submitted to this House a balanced budget plan. Yet today my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to vote on a resolution to force the President to submit another balanced budget. They continue to criticize the President's plan, despite a letter from the director of the Congressional Budget Office asserting that the President's plan is truly a balanced budget.

Where may I ask is a Republican plan to balance the budget? My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are too busy with partisan attacks to focus on actually submitting a budget proposal of their own.

It is time for House Republicans to stop holding press conferences and to start crunching numbers. The only bill today reflecting the Republican budget priorities is a proposal by the majority leader of the Senate, and it is a tax bill. This legislation, according to Citizens for Tax Justice, would mostly benefit the wealthiest 5 percent of Americans.

It sounds to me like the Republicans are up to their old tricks: Balancing the budget on the backs of working American families while cutting taxes for the rich. The American people deserve to see how the Republicans plan to pay for these large tax cuts. Let us work together on the issues that matter to the American people.

We cannot afford to have another Government shutdown because the Republicans are too busy attacking the President to work on a balanced budget. It is time for us to work together on the issues that matter to the American people.

We have seen the Democratic proposal to balance the budget. The American people deserve to see the Republican budget proposal.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to note that this resolution is precisely about working together. This resolution is about working to get a platform from the President from which we can conduct bipartisan budget negotiations.

If we truly want to move in that direction, we need a substantive balanced budget, one that does not include triggers, one that does not include a $69 billion deficit in the year 2002, one that does not increase the deficit $24 billion in 1998. That is all we seek. We lay out criteria that will give us this platform, and we apply the exact same standards to this House that we ask the President to abide by.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, the matter before us today is viewed by many as a useless exercise in political finger-pointing. That is precisely the way it was defined in the Committee on Rules yesterday.

Perhaps we are being a bit too subtle. This is not an attack on the President or on his budget. House Resolution 89 is simply a message to the White House. It is an appeal to the President to recognize the historical opportunity available to him to actively participate in a bipartisan effort to finally craft a balanced Federal budget.

There is a genuine desire on the part of the Republican Members of this House to work with the President in such an effort. We anxiously awaited submission of his budget last month in order to let him establish the starting point in this process. My feeling is that he passed on that opportunity. Instead, he sent us a political document. I think perhaps it is the best political document that I have seen in my tenure here in the House.

Still, many of us remain prepared to work with the President and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. That is what this resolution is all about. We need to debate policies, programs, and spending cuts. Instead, we are debating, once again, whose economic assumptions, either the OMB or CBO, should be the basis for more substantive debate.

The fact is, the House will use CBO assumptions. The matter is no longer subject to debate. The Committee on the Budget will present a balanced budget, a proposal scored by CBO, in the near future. This process could be eased somewhat if the President worked from the same assumptions. In the past he said that he would, but as his budget proposal demonstrates, he will not.

This exercise today is simply one last appeal to him to join us, rather than confronting us. It is my belief that we will work with him.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FATTAH].

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, what we have is seemingly a disagreement between two groups of economists about what might happen some 5 years out in terms of the largest economy in the world, a slight difference of opinion about that between the President's economists and the CBO. But we should not waste our time here today with this resolution. This has no import or impact on the President of the United States in terms of any legal meaning.

The result of the passage of this resolution is just that the House will have taken up the time of the House, rather than working on producing a budget that could be scored by CBO and that could take into account the President's

priorities which, by the way, are the Americans' priorities, as illustrated in the last election. The public wants more investment in education and environmental protection. These are issues we should be debating, we should be working toward. This political one-upsmanship between the House and the White House does not make a lot of sense.

We have a role here in the Congress to play. We are one of two Houses, and along with the White House, and we have to do the most important thing we do every year, which is to pass a budget. I would ask that my colleagues vote ''no'' on the resolution, and then urge ourselves to get to work, not through the words we speak on the floor, but in the hard work of designing a budget to take this Nation into the next century.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate from the beginning. One of the things I am very impressed with is the demeanor on both sides of the aisle. I am particularly impressed with the contributions of the freshmen Members from both sides of the aisle, and my colleague who introduced this resolution, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU]. We are talking about ideas, we are talking about policies, and we are talking about the direction this country should head.

This congressional majority has three major objectives. We want to balance the Federal budget and get our financial house in order; we want to save our trust funds for not only future generations but for present generations, because Medicare in particular is running out of money; and third, we want to transform this caretaking society into a caring society. We want to transform this caretaking social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a caring opportunity society.

In the process of doing all three of those things, we want to move the power and the money and the influence back home and away from Washington. That is our objective. That is what we will seek to do. That is what we will do with our budget when we present our budget, which we will do, and which we are required to do.

The President deserves a tremendous amount of credit for deficit reduction since he has been present. The first 2 years he achieved deficit reduction with a Democrat majority by tax increases. The last 2 years of his 4 years as President he reduced the deficit, with the help of this new Republican majority, by spending cuts. It is clear that we are going to continue to go on a downward path by spending reductions, not tax increases.

What is alarming, however, is the President still insists on not using the same budget numbers that we are required to use, the Congressional Budget Office. This resolution soundly requires that we use the same set of numbers so we do not have a Government shutdown. It argues that we not have automatic spending cuts so we do not have a Government shutdown. It argues as well that major savings take place in the first 3 years, not the fourth and fifth year, so we do not have a Government shutdown.

Why is it important? Because we are in Congress for the next 2 years. And why is that significant? Under the President's budget, scored by CBO, they say the deficit goes up $24 billion. This year it would go up an additional $1 billion from his plan, and next year it would go up an additional $24 billion, to a $145 billion deficit.

For 4 years the President and Congress have succeeded in going down, and under his plan it is now going up. It goes up the next year and the year after that, and only slightly goes down the third year, and then the fourth and fifth year, when we are not in Congress, when he in fact is not President, in the fifth year we do most of the deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I have a big problem with the argument on the other side that it is balanced in the fifth year. It is balanced in the fifth year. It is like the person who says I am going to lose 50 pounds in the next 5 years, and seeks to gain pounds in the first 2 years, and then in the fifth year basically says, I am going to lose 49 pounds out of my 50.

□ 1545

Technically, it is balanced, but it is just a fraud. We know the next White House cannot do that, and we know that the Congress, from the next one and the one beyond, will not do that. We have got to make constructive reductions each and every year.

This resolution requires that we work together in both the White House and Congress and in using the same budget numbers so we can compare apples to apples, so we do not have automatic spending cuts. It requires Congress to do that as well and that we make substantive savings in the first 3 years of the 5-year plan, not in the fifth year. So for that, Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be associated with this effort.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Connecticut heard Mr. Rubin yesterday say that if the——

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I mean this graciously, but if the gentleman would yield time instead of just speaking without yielding himself time, I think it would be fair for both sides.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman recognizes it is taken off my time by the timekeeper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The gentleman from Connecticut knows that, if we took the tax increase out of the President's budget, we would have balance now. The question is, where is the gentleman's budget? The gentleman says everything is wrong with the President's budget, but he will not put anything on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ].

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 89. This resolution unnecessarily singles out the President by telling him to submit a second budget while ignoring the fact that the Republican leadership has yet to present a budget of its own.

We are fast approaching the statutory deadline by which we must adopt a budget resolution. Now, I have seen plenty of budgets around here: the President's, the blue dog budget, the progressive budget and several others; I might add, all of which were put forward by the Democrats. Some of them I like some pieces. Some I do not agree with. I, for one, believe we can balance the budget before the year 2002. But the problem is, without having a budget from the Republican leadership, we have nothing to talk about and no debate to go on.

Today's vote is really a waste of time, and it is so sad that we show up here every day, doing the work of the people and have nothing to show for it in the end.

It is time that we get beyond this. It is time that we get to work. I ask the other side to please put forward their budget, and I ask my colleagues to stand strong and work together to bring forward a budget that the American people can live with for the next year.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult not to be discouraged by this debate today. Why in the world are we wasting time debating a meaningless one-sided resolution which has little or no value other than seeking political points?

I must clarify several points. First, those of us who were gagged by the closed rule today are not interested in letting the President off of the hook. We wanted to include every single requirement on the President, even though he had already met his legal responsibilities that the majority created. We simply wanted to demand the same sort of responsible behavior from the Congress. We were denied an opportunity to debate our amendment.

Second, the last-minute provision added by this resolution's sponsors does not set the same requirement on

Congress. It does not set a deadline for action. It does not acknowledge Congress's constitutional and statutory responsibilities. It does not reference, in an equal manner to the President's budget, the shortcomings or the outright absence of the Republican budget efforts. It is a false statement to make on the House floor that the resolution creates the exact same standard for Congress as it does for the President.

Americans are tired of us making unfulfilled promises about balancing our budget and trying to place the blame on the other side. The public wants us to roll up our sleeves and just do it. The current standoff in which both the congressional leadership and the President refuse to move until the other side goes first simply increases the public cynicism about us all.

That is why the blue dogs have stepped up to the plate with a balanced budget plan that we believe represents a credible fair approach to balancing the budget. We have already received a good deal of editorial praise for our approach. We have the support of the most credible fiscal group out there, the Concord Coalition, received warm reception on the Senate Budget Committee the other day. Frankly, I appreciate the praise, but we would like to have some support.

That is what we are looking for now. I appreciate the fact that we are beginning to sense that on both sides of the aisle.

The chart that I have up here, the blue line shows the blue dog budget. It brings the deficit down. The other line, the red line, is the criticism that we join in on the President's budget because it does increase the deficit. But the yellow line is the baseline with the Senate recommended tax cuts, which we have to assume. And I know this is a relatively cheap shot and I am not taking it as a cheap shot. I am just pointing out that, until we have a budget resolution, that is all we have to go by.

I share the disappointment, as I mentioned, the shortcomings of the President's budget. And I know that my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the chairman, is soon to be on the floor with a budget. And I know that, once we get through this little exercise today, we are not doing irreparable harm, but it has been a great disappointment that we are even here debating this today. It is not helpful in finding a solution when we have a one-sided finger-pointing operation.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, may I have a quantification of the time left for each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. SUNUNU] has 10¼ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT] has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the previous speaker for his generous qualification of his rhetoric as a relatively cheap shot, and I want to further commend him in all seriousness for the quality of the budget that the coalition has put forward.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on a parliamentary basis, is this being credited against the gentleman's time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes, it is, indeed; as was that of the gentleman from Washington, the Chair might state for the record.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, the coalition budget, as I have mentioned in remarks before, has met the four criteria placed out in this resolution, and this resolution further asks that Congress consider a budget that meets these criteria and that the President submit a budget that meets these criteria. It is in the essence of fairness and bipartisanship that we put this resolution forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH].

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, in hearing the debate today, I wanted to announce myself as being one of those freshmen of the class of 1994 who during the course of the 104th Congress had the unfortunate, felt the unfortunate necessity of voting to shut down the government. A little bit earlier in the debate it was mentioned that the reason that we voted to shut down the Government was because of the fact that we did not get the budget that we wanted. I wanted to come down and clarify the record that the reason that we unfortunately had to go through a Government shutdown 2 years ago is that we felt that rhetoric was not being matched with deed as far as the seriousness of putting forward straight proposals to balance the budget.

The budget process, many of us believe, is an opportunity to accomplish four things for this country, for America. The budget process could end with better health for Americans. It could end with better protection for every senior citizen in this country, better environmental protection and better education. A budget that serves as a blueprint toward these things would work. Unfortunately we have to get serious about our budget. This one is not serious.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, what is happening today is a classic saying of an old adage, the Republicans are doing that, it is, do as I say and not as I do. They are criticizing the President for purportedly not submitting a balanced budget when in fact they have not submitted a balanced budget. They have not submitted any budget at all.

So how can they be critical of the President's budget when they have not even put forward their plan? We saw the Republican plan last Congress in the 104th Congress when they put forth their balanced budget, which gave huge tax breaks for the rich at the expense of cutting Medicare and cutting Medicaid and giving us the largest education cuts in the history of the United States and gutting the environment and hurting working men and women in this country. That was their proposal for a balanced budget in the 104th Congress. They were burned by it. The voters saw what it was, and the voters answered it. And a lot of them were burned by it.

So being afraid to be burned again, they are just sitting tight on their hands, not submitting a budget, and pointing fingers at the President. It would seem to me that it is absolutely preposterous to point a finger at the President when at least he submitted a budget. You may disagree with his budget. You may not like his budget. You may say it is not balanced, and that is in question. Some say it is; some say it is not. But how do you point a finger and criticize when you have not even put forward one of your own?

The fact of the matter is, under this President the deficit has gone down 3 years in a row. That has not happened since Truman's administration. It has gone down. It needs to come down further. We need to have a balanced budget. No one is disputing that. But it would seem to me in a deliberative body like this, when we have to make decisions, we need to have a budget. We need to have the Republican budget.

And so we have the President's budget and the Republican budget and then we can compromise somewhere in the middle. But when you have not even played the game and you will not play the game, how do you point a finger at anybody else? This is preposterous and this resolution ought to be defeated.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS].

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the argument that we are wasting our time. Nothing could be more important than relentlessly pressing for a budget that truly balances by the year 2002.

On a bipartisan basis, the President's plan has left many Members very disappointed. We just heard a representative of the blue dogs recognize that Clinton's plan does not balance. The concern is not just coming from Republicans. Members of the press have expressed dissatisfaction. Even Members on the other side in the Committee on the Budget have expressed concern about backloading tough decisions.

We do not want to punish President Clinton for a disappointing first attempt. We just want him to try again and use the same numbers that Congress has to use, CBO numbers. Unless we use the same numbers, we are never going to reach agreement. I urge Members to pass the resolution.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before I begin I would just like to make a brief comment about the gentleman from California's suggestion just a few moments ago that he was guided by principle when it came to shutting down the Government. The most telling quote about the Government shutdown came from that sage of wisdom in the Republican leadership on the Senate side when he looked at the House at that grim moment and said, ''It is time for adult leadership over in the House.'' For anybody to suggest that the Government shutdown ought to be used as an example for not getting the budget resolution out on time fails under any sort of scrutiny.

As of last night in this institution, we had cast about 38 rollcall votes. We have been in session since the beginning of January and we have had few legislative days. Now I know we all would say that that is a welcome contrast to what we had done 2 years ago. But who even in this institution today speaks of the Contract With America? Who even remembers the term the ''Contract With America''?

What I think is more telling is that there must indeed be a middle ground between what we did 2 years ago and what we are doing so far in the 105th Congress.

It strikes me as being odd that while we have had, since January 3 or January 4, an opportunity to proceed with a budget resolution, that we have accomplished so little.

I used to do a lot of contract negotiations. I can tell you that in successful contract negotiations, both sides offer up opening positions. To have meaningful, substantive accomplishment at the end of the day, we simply go back and forth until we reach a resolution that all might not love, but all can learn to live with. Have we seen any evidence of that from the other side? The flat response is, absolutely not. We should have seen some guidelines for spending. We have seen none on this occasion.

□ 1600

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to note that this resolution is not about Government shutdowns. In fact, the three principal sponsors of this resolution are the three new members of the Republican Committee on the Budget. We were not here 2 years ago.

Our interest is not in moving to the past, it is to move forward and it is to move forward in cooperation with this President.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. GRANGER].

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, wasting time pointing fingers is not what we are about here. This resolution is about working together in a bipartisan way to balance the budget. That is why our resolution invites our President to take the lead and for this Congress to follow the President's leadership.

As a freshman, I was sent by my district to work in a bipartisan way to solve our problems. They believed and I believe also that we can solve the problem of the deficit if we work together. This resolution makes this possible by asking the President and the Congress to use the same numbers.

I spoke about our responsibility to children, the children of this Nation. I have spoken to the young people who have sat in this Chamber listening to this debate. We must work in a bipartisan way to leave them a nation that does not spend their future.

I say no to partisanship rancor and debate over numbers, but I do say yes to bipartisanship and a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and hope we have support in this Chamber.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PASCRELL].

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, working families from the Eighth Congressional District in the State of New Jersey elected me to solve problems, to work together across the aisle and, specifically, to bring closure on issues such as campaign finance reform, environmental sensibility, and balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the majority is bringing a resolution to the floor to demand that the President submit a second budget when the majority has yet to present their first budget. Where is the Republican budget?

Section 301(a), the Congressional Budget Act, requires that the Congress complete action on the budget resolution on or before April 15. Since the majority became the majority party in the House, the conference agreement on the budget resolution has not cleared both houses until June, 2 months after the deadline.

Over the last 10 years, the House Committee on the Budget marked up the budget resolution well in advance of the April 15 deadline. Six out of the eight times it was controlled by the Democrats. In 1992, the Committee on the Budget markup was on February 27. In 1993 the markup was on March 10, and March 3 in 1994.

This budget resolution is behind schedule for the third year in a row under Republican leadership. And there is a simple reason why Republicans have not released the budget. They want $200 billion in net tax cuts, but they have not figured out how to balance the budget and enact huge tax cuts without imposing deep cuts in programs such as Medicare, Medicaid, and education.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member very much for allowing me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are confused here this afternoon. We are confused because even in the Washington Times it clearly says that for most of the Nation's history, Congress simply did the budgeting.

This resolution shows that we are overly confused. The President has done what he needed to do, and that is to offer us an advisory budget. The Congressional Budget Office indicated that the estimate of the effect on the deficit of the President's alternative budgetary policy shows a zero deficit for fiscal year 2002. What more do we want?

Actually, what we are saying is that the President has offered a balanced budget; but while we need to move forward and discuss Medicare and Medicaid, affordable housing in the 18th Congressional District, the need to preserve education and higher education for our youth around the Nation, and, yes, in my district, NASA and the space station, and ISTEA 69 and the provisions for transportation, we are here debating whether the President has offered a budget.

If we ask the American public, they recognize that not only has the President offered a budget, but he has his philosophy. He agrees we should enforce and be concerned about children's health care, he believes we should be the education Congress and the education Nation, he believes that Americans should have affordable housing.

The real issue is that we will be jeopardizing our business if we, in this Congress and the Republican leadership, do not insist upon putting forth a budget that does not have the drastic tax cuts that will have a negative effect on bringing down the deficit.

The failed balanced budget amendment took up most of the time when we here can actually balance the budget. I voted for a balanced budget, and I believe we can do it, considering the responsibilities to education, to senior citizens, to affordable housing, to transportation, to the space station, to science. We can balance the budget. The real question becomes: Do we know our job to handle the pursestrings for America and to do it right?

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to the absurdity of this motion. The Constitution gives Congress authority over the Nation's purse strings. This authority bring with it responsibility. And it is a responsibility that the Republicans seems eager to dodge.

The President is required by law to submit his budget proposals to Congress. He has done so. The President's budget proposal is not law, it is precisely that, a proposal. It is nothing more than his request or recommendation to Congress. Once he has made these recommendations, it is the responsibility of the Members of this Congress to review the budget and to pass a concurrent resolution on the budget by April 15.

I believe the President's budget, deserves our serious consideration. In it he provides $100 million for a new access to jobs and training initiative; $10 million to expand HUD's

Bridges-to-Work project, which links low-income people in central cities to job opportunities in surrounding suburbs; provides an increase of funding by more than 50 percent for basic skill, high school equivalency, and English classes for disadvantaged adults; and expand the Community Development Financial Institutions fund, thereby expanding the availability of credit, investment capital, financial services, and other development services in distressed urban and rural communities.

But whether you support every item of the President's budget proposal, or even support the budget as a whole, is irrelevant. The point is that we need to move forward. It is our responsibility to move forward. If there are problems with the budget, we can hammer them out here.

The Republicans have yet to show us an alternative to the budget proposal that is now on the table. Obviously, they have discovered that it is awfully easy to sit back and criticize and poke holes. It is considerably more difficult to actually put together a responsible constructive proposal.

Let's stop this posturing, vote against this motion, and move forward with the people's business.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close in the same manner that I started.

This resolution before us today accomplishes very little. We will have a vote in just a little while. The House will declare itself, probably in favor of asking the President to send up another budget, and little will be noted after that.

I understand the other body has no intention to follow up and, in any event, this is designated House Resolution 89. It is not binding on anybody, barely binding on us. What we need to do is take the resolution, the earnestness that we have seen here on the floor today, and put it to work getting a budget resolution produced by the Committee on the Budget and on the floor of this House according to regular order, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, I will offer at the close of debate a motion to recommit which will go just to that objective, getting on with the business at hand, getting the budget resolution passed in the House, sending it to the Senate so that we can complete our work on time this year.

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

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to offer a closing note before yielding to the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

I want to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that we have attempted today to carry on a reasoned debate about an important subject matter, not a waste of time. Terms like ''political buffoonery'' were used, and I do not think that those are the most appropriate terms to discuss the important matter of balancing this Nation's budget, of putting money back in the pockets of working American families, and trying to move forward in a bipartisan way with the President.

We have encouraged the President with this resolution to put forward a budget that can be used as a platform for bipartisan negotiations, and that is the intention of the resolution. The goal of the resolution is to apply to the President the exact same set of standards that we applied to this House of Representatives.

By treating each other fairly, by trying to move forward together, by trying to work with a budget that the President submits, meeting some basic criteria of fairness and financial legitimacy, I think we will have that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let us try to get to this all in perspective. The President came up here several years ago and stood right at this podium and the President said, we are going to use the same arithmetic; Congress is going to use the arithmetic that I use, I am going to use the arithmetic they use, and we will use the most conservative numbers.

Some of the Republicans booed him when he said that, but we decided to take him up on the challenge. We might argue a lot about policy, but we should not argue about arithmetic.

The simple fact of the matter is the President sent us a budget and it is not in balance. It is $69 billion short. So for the Americans out there hoping that we can finally get this done, they need to understand that we now have the first part of this. The President sent us a budget. It does not balance. It is almost $70 billion in the hole in the last year. Plus, in the very first year, the first real test of the intent of the President's budget, the deficit is $24 billion higher than if the President's budget had never gotten here.

In other words, if the guy coming from the White House with the documents up to Capitol Hill stopped at a pizza shop and somebody broke into his car and stole the documents, next year's deficit numbers would be $24 billion less than if that budget had never gotten up here. So in the very first year we go up.

Let me say there are also six new entitlement programs. The President says he wants to declare an end to the era of big government. He can hardly declare an end to the era of big government while creating six new entitlement programs to drain resources from hardworking families in this country. We want to let families keep more of what they earn so that they can stay together, be stronger and more prosperous.

In addition to that, we have the typical Washington diet budget. The typical Washington diet is, I am going to lose 50 pounds this year. In the first 51 weeks, I am going to lose 1 pound, but in the last week, I am going to lose 49. Now, that is the way we do things in Washington. And it is time to stop that process.

In other words, let us start doing the job right today. Let us not push up the deficit, push up the spending, keep the spending real high, and then when the President leaves office, it falls off of a cliff using a bunch of gimmicks.

We do not want to do that anymore, and I do not think the President wants to do it, honestly. This is really an opportunity for the President to come back and to complete his job, to give us a document that meets the arithmetic as he promised.

Now, what about us? What about our budget? Why have we not seen it yet?

What is interesting is that the President of the United States is the leader of the free world. He is the big man. He ought to be. He is the man we revere and respect regardless of what party or what personality. He is the leader. The country, the American people have a right to examine carefully, closely, and take some time in understanding exactly what the leader of the free world is proposing for the way the Government of the United States ought to look.

Frankly, what we are saying today is the President has fallen short. We need a better effort on his part. And Congress will have to meet the same standard. Congress cannot weasel out. We cannot wiggle out. We cannot go out the back door. We have to send the budget that has the integrity where the arithmetic adds up.

And when will we bring it here? We are going to bring it here really very soon, and we are going to bring it here like we have, and I have been involved with, since 1989. I brought budgets up here in 1989 and 1990 and 1991 and in 1993. Two in 1993 with Penny-Kasich, and in 1994 and in 1995 and 1996, and there will be one in 1997.

Have no doubt we will produce a budget and have no doubt that it is going to meet the arithmetic challenge. In fact, we will start to improve the lives of Americans by beginning that road to improving their standard of living by raising wages and giving their children a chance at the future.

Let me just suggest to my colleagues here today that the bigger disappointment in some respects than the President not balancing the budget is he does not have a plan to save Medicare. He does not have a plan to solve the long-term problems of Medicaid. He has not addressed the Consumer Price Index and the way in which we can have more accurate projections. These are big issues and we have to get at them and we have to get at them together.

At the end of the day, we will come forward with our plan. Maybe before we come forward with our plan, we will be able to reach an agreement with the White House. But that plan ought to put us on the road to using honest arithmetic, leveling with the American people, starting the progress now, letting people keep more of what they earn, addressing the problems that provide security for our senior citizens

while, at the same time, not bankrupting our adult children, and beginning to restore the American dream as we all knew it as children.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to this House, let us pass this resolution. And this is not just a signal to the President of the United States. Frankly, it is a signal to my colleagues as well. My Republican friends, we have to do it. We will do it right and we want the President to join us.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting House Resolution 89 today because it is vital that the President submit a true balanced budget proposal so that serious bipartisan talks on balancing the budget can begin. Unless both the President and Congress are willing to confront the hard choices a balanced budget requires, we cannot succeed. The burden of starting the process rests squarely on the President.

The truth is that there are no gimmicks, no sleight-of-hand tricks or silver bullets to magically make the Federal budget balance. We have to cut spending and change programs to spending cuts work. We cannot flip-flop, reversing our course depending on how close we are to an election. Republicans offered the President clear examples of the hard choices that need to be made when we offered our Balanced Budget Act of 1995—much of which the President would later sign into law. For a true bipartisan effort, we need the President's budget to show where he and his party are willing to make hard choices now.

The President's February budget does not do the job. First, it will leave us with nearly a $120 billion deficit in the year he leaves office and a $69 billion deficit 2 years after he is gone. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office says 98 percent of the spending cuts proposed in his budget are scheduled to occur after the President leaves office. The new spending he proposes, including $60 billion in new entitlements, goes on forever.

The President's budget also produces a $23 billion tax increase, not a tax cut, over its lifetime. The targeted tax breaks he offered people for education, savings, and several other things completely vanish in 3 years when he leaves office. The tax increases he proposes are permanent.

With regard to Medicare, the President certainly missed the mark. We should be striving to save Medicare for current and future retirees by dealing with the factors that make Medicare spending grow by billions of dollars every year. The President's budget proposes to hide Medicare's problems through illusory savings that are actually accounting tricks.

We want a bipartisan budget that gets results. The President claims to want one but he opposes amending the Constitution to require a balanced budget. If he's serious about making discipline the key to Federal budgeting, he can end the mistrust of his policies by submitting a new budget that actually meets the goals he says he wants to meet.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this resolution calling for the President to submit a new budget using the most recent CBO assumptions. Last month, our President presented a budget that did exactly what both parties have identified as a priority and that is having a balanced Federal budget in 2002. The President's budget proposal makes tough choices but is responsible economic policy.

I strongly oppose the efforts of this resolution. The President should not be required to submit two budgets before Congress even comes up with one. Does this resolution's sponsors have a prepared alternative for us to review? Since the President introduced his budget, there have been no concrete alternatives proposed by the Republican leadership. In fact, the Republican leadership has indicated it would be May before a budget resolution is passed. By law, the conference report is supposed to be done by April 15. Even as recently as 1992, with a Democratic Congress and a Republican administration, this body has passed the budget resolution on March 5—well over a month before the required April 15 deadline.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can move on to the real work before this Congress, and that is getting the budget resolution ready as quickly as possible. The President has done his part; this body must do ours.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 90, the resolution is considered as read for amendment and the previous question is ordered.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman the designee of the minority leader?

Mr. SPRATT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. SPRATT. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves to recommit the resolution, House Resolution 89, to the Committee on the Budget with instructions to report a detailed budget plan to achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002 in sufficient time for the House of Representatives to fulfill its obligations under section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, which requires Congress to complete action on or before April 15 on a concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year beginning on October 1 of such year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I do not need to take the allotted time of 5 minutes to explain this motion because it does not need much explanation.

What we are calling for is purely and simply regular order. What we are asking for in this motion to recommit is to follow the procedures that this House, this Congress has laid down for our own internal processes that have been observed ever since the Budget Act of 1974 was first adopted, for more than 20 years.

This resolution, House Resolution 89, does not advance the budget process. It does not move us one single inch. In fact, it retards the process. It slows us down. It does not focus the House on the hard decisions that have to be made, on what needs to be done here in the House itself, in the Committee on the Budget, and on the floor, in the well of this House.

What we need to be about is the formulation of a budget, making the hard choices that will go into our budget resolution and bringing them to debate here on the House floor before April 15, well before April 15. Instead, what we do with this resolution is shift attention from the work at hand by trying to shift the blame, by pointing the finger at the President and saying to him that he should come, present another budget even though he has complied, literally complied with the Budget Act by sending his budget up within the time that is required under the law.

This is no way to advance the budget process. This is no way to move us toward a balanced budget in 5 years, pointing fingers, wasting a whole legislative day on a fruitless resolution.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] says the President needs to send us a plan to save Medicare. He sent a plan up to save Medicare. Part A would be rendered solvent for years to come. They do not agree with the manner in which the President does it. They do not want to see part of the cost of home health care shifted out of part A into part B. Fine. Put up your substitute. Put up your alternative. Put up your plan to save Medicare.

The same with Medicaid. The President has taken a bold step there, bold enough that almost all the Governors in this Nation have opposed him. He says we are saving substantial sums because the cost of Medicaid has come down 4 percent in 1995, 3.3 percent in 1996. We need to hold those cost savings in place, and if we can, we can realize as much savings in Medicaid or more than we were attempting in the last session of Congress.

He has proposed per capita caps. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget does not support per capita caps. Fine. That is what this process is all about. Put up your alternative. That is the point which we are now on. What we need to do is frame this debate.

The other part of the frame that is missing and required at this point in time is a budget resolution adopted by the House which we can put on the table, and at that point we can then sit down and talk about everything, including CPI adjustments as part of the whole mix.

We need to be about regular order, we need to be focused on the procedure that is time-tested and been shown to work. We need to be about our own business. We need to bring a budget resolution to this floor so that we can have a concurrent resolution by April 15. That is exactly what this motion to recommit calls for, regular order towards a successful outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone to support this motion to recommit so we can get on with the business at hand.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, it is a good thing I have been lifting weights. This is what I could accumulate in terms of what the Republicans and any budget team that I have been associated with since 1989 have put together in terms of details. See this? This is pretty heavy. Most Americans would probably have a little trouble, and I am not sure if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT] could hold this up, actually. This is pretty heavy. But, nevertheless, all that is detailed work to provide for a balanced budget.

This was an effort that some of us started in 1989. When it was not cool to be for balanced budgets, we were out here doing it. We got as many votes as you could put in a telephone booth, but the fact is that we came in 1989 and I came on this floor against a Republican President. I came on this floor in 1990 against a Republican President.

I came on this floor twice in 1990, the first time in 1990, the second time I went to the Rules Committee with about $780 billion worth of savings and the Rules Committee would not let me offer it on the House floor because it was $10 billion short. Then in 1993 the President said show us your budget, and the Committee on the Budget wrote the most detailed and extensive budget ever produced since the Budget Act of 1974. And then we came back in 1994 and then we came back in 1995 and in 1996.

I have got to tell you this. I am so proud of my colleagues, the ones that voted for the first effort, frankly the first effort, real effort since 1969 to actually put our detailed program on the floor. You have got to give me a break when you start wondering whether we are going to have a budget. Of course we are.

This motion to recommit is designed to send this back to committee and kill this whole idea that the President has fallen short in his arithmetic. The simple fact of the matter is that we have got to defeat the motion to recommit, we have got to pass the resolution, and of course we are working. We are working right now with the administration. We are working right now internally to develop our package, and at the end of this year I suppose I will be able to come back and add to this amount that is the most detailed work by any congressional committee in recent memory to actually meet this challenge, and I suspect at the end of the day I am going to have to have lifted more weights, because that next document is going to make this even heavier.

So let us defeat the motion to recommit, pass the resolution, and let us get off to a good start in terms of fairness for America, a good future for our children, and a stronger American family.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman makes my case. All of that is the handiwork of the Budget Committee. We have done it in years past. All this resolution calls for is that we do it again this year, all of that effort there.

Mr. KASICH. Let me tell the gentleman two things. First of all, I am the one that worked to get the President the economics as early as was possible, and I am the one that said to the President and his administration officials, ''You don't have to meet some deadline on your budget. If you need more time, you take it.'' You see, I think that deadlines and calendars are not the key. What is key is the quality of the work.

Unfortunately the quality just is not there with the President when it comes to meeting the challenge. The quality has been there for us in the past. No one ever criticized the intellectual honesty of our proposals. You may disagree with the policies.

And we are going to try to come in with an April 15 deadline if we can, but deadline is not the deal. What is important is that we reach agreement, and we will, and you have got my word on it in terms of coming before us with a proposal.

Let us not send this thing back to committee and kill this whole resolution. Let us reject that, let us get on with it, and this resolution will force the Congress to do precisely what we are asking the President to do. If we ask for anything less than that, it would not be fair. Let us pass the resolution and defeat the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 225, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—202

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—225

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)

Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Andrews
Dixon
Kaptur
Livingston
Souder

☐ 1642

Messrs. DUNCAN, BONO and POMBO and Mrs. CUBIN changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. FLAKE and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the resolution.

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

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 197, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—231

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paul
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—197

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—4

Andrews
Dixon
Kaptur
Souder

☐ 1700

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 89, the resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 96–388, as amended by Public Law 97–84 (36 U.S.C. 1402(a)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the United States Holocaust Memorial Council:

Mr. YATES of Illinois.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of section 5(b) of Public Law 93–191, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. THOMAS of California, chairman;
Mr. NEY of Ohio,
Mr. BOEHNER of Ohio,
Mr. HOYER of Maryland,
Mr. CLAY of Missouri, and
Mr. FROST of Texas.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF SOCIAL SECURITY ADVISORY BOARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Section 703 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C.903) as amended by Section 103 of Public Law 103–296, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following member to the Social Security Advisory Board to fill the existing vacancy thereon:

Ms. Jo Anne Barnhart, Arlington, Virginia.

There was no objection.

SCHOOL FUNDING IN AMERICA NEEDS OUR HELP

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include therein extraneous material.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the USA Today written by columnist DeWayne Wickham entitled ''Cash-Short Schools Need Nike More Than Twain.''

In order to make up for shortfalls in their educational budget, the school system in Seattle has figured out a creative way to gather and galvanize funds for the school system. They have invited commercial advertisers into school grounds and school property to advertise to help make up for the shortfall.

I say to this Chamber and I say to colleagues on both sides of the aisle, what kind of message are we sending people in America? We can find money for programs throughout the budget. When it comes to children, we have to ask corporate America, and I salute our private citizens and the private sector for coming forward, but at a time when prison construction is growing at a rapid and exponential rate, Mr. Speaker and Members on both sides of the aisle, in this bipartisan fervor, what kind of message are we sending the children, schools, parents, and teachers throughout this Nation when we do not have the courage, the temerity or the will to step up to the plate and make sure that future generations of America are prepared, equipped, and ready for the challenges that we face in the 21st century marketplace.

[From USA Today, Mar. 11, 1997]

CASH-SHORT SCHOOLS NEED NIKE MORE THAN TWAIN

(By DeWayne Wickham)

The Washington Bullets do it. So do the Indianapolis Colts, Boston Celtics and New York Yankees. But if opponents get their way, Seattle's school system won't be following the lead of these and other major sports franchises. While the moguls of pro sports are lining their pockets with revenue from deals that transform sporting venues into giant billboards, Seattle's cash-strapped system is embroiled in a debate over whether to allow ''reputable'' companies to advertise their products on school grounds. Cigarette and liquor ads would not be allowed.

The system's bean counters predict that the sale of advertising on athletic field scoreboards and at selected locations inside school buildings might generate $1 million annually. That's roughly 8.5% of the $35 million funding shortfall facing Seattle schools over the next three years.

But the plan, approved by the school board in November, is under attack. Last week, it tabled a call by its school superintendent to suspend the proposal. The superintendent's request followed complaints from people who want Seattle's schools to be an advertising-free zone. Like the constitutional separation of church and state, they think this divide should be a basic tenet of our way of life. I think they need a reality check.

Schools already are overrun with advertising. The free kind. Most of it is worn into classrooms by schoolchildren. They are human ads for Tommy Hilfiger, Calvin Klein, Nike and a host of other name-brand makers. Banning advertising won't stop the walking commercials that many fashion-conscious students have become. The only thing this policy reversal will do is deepen the school system's financial problems.

The projected budget deficit, a result of caps on state education aid and property tax rates, has forced the board to consider requiring thousands of middle and high school students to ride public buses to save on transportation costs. As this revenue crisis deepens, opponents remain unmoved. They say students are a captive audience, and it isn't fair to allow companies to target them, even if it would bring in some badly needed cash. But if the job of schools is to prepare youngsters for the real world, why not introduce them to it by opening the doors to advertisers? The benefit of doing so can be more than financial.

School systems that permit advertising are in a better position to influence the kinds of ads students see. They can reject moronic, tasteless ads. Conditioning advertisers to make more intelligent, less socially offensive commercials can produce some valuable, long-term rewards. Commercial ads are an important part of this nation's pop culture. Like it or not, the Energizer Bunny is probably better known to most schoolchildren than Mark Twain. But that can change.

Forced to compete for the chance to put their images before youngsters—many of whom will be making lifelong product choices—advertisers will bend over backward to satisfy the demands of educators for the highest quality commercial messages. Enter Mark Twain.

That's the kind of change school officials ought to be climbing over each other to achieve. Students who grow up with smart ads will become adults who expect no less from product promoters. That's a small but important victory against the dumbing of America.

Seattle can turn its fiscal crisis into an educational triumph for students—and advertisers. Or it can fool itself into believing that by refusing to accept paid ads, city schools will be commercial-free zones.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

DECERTIFICATION

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

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my feelings about certification of Mexico. I feel very strongly about this issue because I despise what drugs are doing to this Nation. It is a scourge that is ravishing our most precious resource: our youth.

Unfortunately, we know this all too well in the area of the Nation that I represent, south Texas. Daily in our papers and on the news, we see the devastation that is occurring with the impact that drugs are having on our children and our communities. It is a problem that I am committed to addressing, and one that is a priority of mine.

I know, however, that this is not a problem that I alone can solve. If we are to win the war, it will take a united effort. By that I mean efforts must be made on every level: local, State, and Federal. Just as important are the efforts we must make in our own homes. Only by joining together in combating this epidemic will we ever be able to declare victory.

That is why the issue of certification is so important to me. We are all aware that the drug problem is not unique nor internal to our Nation. It is an international crisis. As it affects us, so does it affect our neighbor to the north and our neighbor to the south. So when I say we must work together, I mean all of us, because we share borders. By doing so, and only by doing so, can we begin to turn the tide.

On March 1 the President certified Mexico, and since then we have heard from many who feel this was not a wise decision, that they are not making enough of an effort in this battle. I, however, feel that to take any action other than certification would be counterproductive, injurious, and unfair. I say this because I think it is we, in the long run as a nation, who ultimately will lose.

First, let us look at the facts. Last year Mexico seized 30 percent more marijuana than in 1995, 78 percent more heroin than in 1995, 7 percent more cocaine than in that same year, and arrested 14 percent more drug traffickers than this in 1995. Those are substantial numbers, showing the improvement that has been made. They are impressive numbers. What these figures tell me is that Mexico is making the effort, that Mexico is cooperating. Why then do we want to send back a message that says, nice try, but you failed?

In addition, Mexico has greatly improved its record on extraditions. During 1996 Mexico extradited a record number of individuals. Two of these

were Mexican nationals wanted in the United States for drug-related crimes.

Additionally, Mexico expelled drug kingpin Juan Garcia Abrego. These facts speak for themselves, showing that diligent efforts are being made by the Government of Mexico.

In my hand I have a letter from the Ambassador of Mexico responding to the charges that have been leveled against our neighbor to the south.

I would like to quote the following:

> Mexico is aware that much more needs to be done by us and other countries in the fight against drugs. This is a permanent fight, not just an annual exercise. While there have been failures and setbacks, they are mostly due to the magnitude of the problem and the power of the enemy, not to a lack of political will by our country.
>
> The reason why we fight against drugs is not to get a grade or a certification from anyone. We fight against drugs because we want to preserve our institutions, because we want to protect our youth, and because we are convinced that we need international cooperation to effectively deal with this gigantic problem.

Decertification will also result in severe economic, social, and cultural ramifications along our Nation's border. When bad things happen to Mexico, bad things happen to us in south Texas. When Mexico goes into a recession, my counties go into a recession. When illegal immigration increases due to crises in Mexico, then it increases in my 11 counties.

□ 1715

When the peso drops, retail and real estate sales drop. When friendly relations with Mexico are strained, the people of my district also suffer. To turn our backs on our neighbor is to jeopardize the progress they have made. We need to recognize their commitment and the work they have done to date.

Again, let me reiterate, on March 1, the President certified Mexico. Then we have heard from many who feel this was not a wise decision.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I appreciate the opportunity to have been able to have given my first 5 minutes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and present my 5-minute remarks at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DIAZ-BALART). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

UNFAIR GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH SMALL BUSINESS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, when the White House Conference on Small Business met in 1995, it listed unfair government competition with small businesses as one of its top concerns and most serious problems. This is not a new problem. In fact, during the Eisenhower administration in 1955, the administration felt it necessary to adopt as official U.S. policy the following statement:

> The Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary business channels.

Yet every day in almost every congressional district, big government agencies are competing with small businesses. This is why I have introduced H.R. 716, the Freedom from Government Competition Act. This legislation is supported very strongly by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Coalition for Fair Competition, and numerous other professional associations, too many to list at this time.

In addition, H.R. 716 already has more than 20 cosponsors from both parties and Senator CRAIG THOMAS has introduced a companion bill in the Senate. This legislation will require that Federal agencies get out of private industry and stick to performing those functions that only Government can do well. At the same time, it will allow our great private free enterprise system to do those things it does best, providing commercial goods and services in a competitive environment.

Under the Freedom From Government Competition Act, Federal agencies will be required to identify those Government activities that can be performed more cost effectively and efficiently by the private sector. After these areas are identified, the private sector will have the opportunity to compete for providing those goods and services. In 1987, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that 1.4 million Federal employees were engaged in so-called commercial activities. The Heritage Foundation has estimated that if we contracted out those commercial activities to private industry, we could save taxpayers at least $9 billion a year.

In addition to saving taxpayers money, the Freedom From Government Competition Act will help spur the growth of private businesses. This, in turn, will increase our tax base. In other words, we can reduce Federal spending and increase the revenues taken in by the Federal Government at the same time without raising taxes.

With a debt of almost $5.5 trillion, this is the kind of legislation we need to actively pursue. H.R. 716 is a modest proposal. It does not require the Government to contract out everything. I realize that the Government performs a number of functions that only the Government should do. In fact, this legislation specifically exempts those functions which are inherently governmental. If the Government can do something cheaper and better than the private sector, then it will be allowed to continue to do so under this legislation.

Nonetheless, all too often Government agencies are involved in activities that it cannot do well. In the end, this winds up hurting small businesses costing taxpayers hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars and hurts the economic growth of our private sector.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, we should pin a medal on anyone who can survive in small business today. Everything we do in big government seems only to benefit extremely big business. I have nothing against big business. However, big businesses seem to get almost all of the tax breaks, the big government contracts, the favorable regulatory rulings and all sorts of incentives such as free land or other inducements. We do very little for small businesses, and this is why so many of them are going under or are in a real struggle to survive. This is one thing we can do for small businesses. This is a small step in the whole scheme of things. However, this legislation will go a long way toward helping our small businesses survive.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government were the answer to all of our problems, then the Soviet Union would have been heaven on Earth. But our Founding Fathers felt that most problems could be solved through the private sector and that Government should only do those things that the people could not do for themselves. The Freedom From Government Competition Act will return this great country to the type of governing system that our Founding Fathers envisioned. I hope my colleagues will help me stop big government agencies from competing with small businesses and join me in supporting the Freedom From Government Competition Act.

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

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 412, OROVILLE-TONASKET CLAIM SETTLEMENT AND CONVEYANCE ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–19) on the resolution (H. Res. 94) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 412) to approve a settlement agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Oroville-Tonasket Irrigation District, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 58, DISAPPROVAL OF DETERMINATION OF PRESIDENT REGARDING MEXICO

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105–20) on the resolution (H. Res. 95) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

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

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE 105TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the rules governing procedure for the Committee on Science for the 105th Congress, adopted on March 12, 1997.

RULE 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) The Rules of the House of Representatives, as applicable, shall govern the committee and its subcommittees, except that a motion to recess from day to day and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable motions of high privilege in the committee and its subcommittees. The rules of the committee, as applicable, shall be the rule of its subcommittees.

OVERSIGHT REPORTS

(b) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the members of the committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day).

RULE 2. COMMITTEE MEETINGS

TIME AND PLACE

(a) Unless dispensed with by the Chairman, the meetings of the committee shall be held on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday of each month the House is in session at 10:00 a.m. and at such other times and in such places as the Chairman may designate.

(b) The Chairman of the committee may convene as necessary additional meetings of the committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the committee or for the conduct of other committee business.

(c) The Chairman shall make public announcement of the date, time, place and subject matter or any of its hearings at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. If the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this Rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, and promptly entered into the scheduling service of the House Information Systems.

VICE CHAIRMAN TO PRESIDE IN ABSENCE OF CHAIRMAN

(d) Meetings and hearings of the committee shall be called to order and presided over by the Chairman or, in the Chairman's absence, by the member designated by the Chairman as the Vice Chairman of the committee, or by the ranking majority member of the committee present as Acting Chairman.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(e) The order of business and procedure of the committee and the subjects of inquiries or investigations will be decided by the Chairman, subject always to an appeal to the committee.

MEMBERSHIP

(f) A majority of the majority Members of the committee shall determine an appropriate ratio of majority to minority Members of each subcommittee and shall authorize the Chairman to negotiate that ratio with the minority party; Provided, however, that party representation on each subcommittee (including any ex-officio Members) shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee. Provided, further, that recommendations of conferees to the Speaker shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members which shall be no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio for the Full Committee.

SPECIAL MEETINGS

(g) Rule XI 2(c) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference (Special Meetings).

RULE 3. COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

QUORUM

(a)(1) One-third of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for all purposes except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3) of the Rule.

(2) A majority of the Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum in order to: (A) report or table any legislation, measure, or matter; (B) close committee meetings or hearing pursuant to Rules 3(i) and 3(j); and (C) authorize the issuance of subpoenas pursuant to Rule 4(g).

(3) Two Members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for taking testimony and receiving evidence, which, unless waived by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, shall include at least one Member from each of the majority and minority parties.

PROXIES

(b) No Member may authorize a vote by proxy with respect to any measure or matter before the committee.

WITNESSES

(c)(1) Insofar as is practicable, each witness who is to appear before the committee shall file no later than twenty-four (24) hours in advance of his or her appearance, a written statement of the proposed testimony and curriculum vitae. Each witness shall limit his or her presentation to a five-minute summary, provided that additional time may be granted by the Chairman when appropriate.

(2) To the greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) which is relevant to the subject of his or her testimony and was received during the current fiscal year or either of the two preceding fiscal years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

(d) Whenever any hearing is conducted by the committee on any measure or matter, the minority Members of the committee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of them before the completion of the hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

INVESTIGATIVE HEARING PROCEDURES

(e) Rule XI 2(k) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby incorporated by reference (rights of witnesses under subpoena).

SUBJECT MATTER

(f) Bills and other substantive matters may be taken up for consideration only when called by the Chairman of the committee or by a majority vote of a quorum of the committee, except those matters which are the subject of special-call meetings outlined in Rule 2(g).

(g) No private bill will be reported by the committee if there are two or more dissenting votes. Private bills so rejected by the committee will not be reconsidered during the same Congress unless new evidence sufficient to justify a new hearing has been presented to the committee.

(h)(1) It shall not be in order for the committee to consider any new or original measure or matter unless written notice of the date, place and subject matter of consideration and to the extent practicable, a written copy of the measure or matter to be considered, has been available in the office of each Member of the committee for at least 48 hours in advance of consideration, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this rule, consideration of any legislative measure or matter by the committee shall be in order by vote of two-thirds of the Members present, provided that a majority of the committee is present.

OPEN MEETINGS

(i) Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, of the committee shall be open to the public, including to radio, television, and still photography coverage, except when the committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of matters to be considered would endanger national security, would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House. No person other than Members of the committee and such congressional staff and such departmental representatives as they may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public. This Rule does not apply to open committee hearings which are provided for by Rule 3(j) contained herein.

(j) Each hearing conducted by the committee shall be open to the public including radio, television, and still photography coverage except when the committee, in open session and with a majority present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of

matters to be considered would endanger national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person, or otherwise would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, and Rule 2(g), a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the rules of the committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony:

(1) may vote to close the hearing for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security or violate Rule XI 2(k)(5) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; or

(2) may vote to close the hearing, as provided in rule XI 2(k)(5) of the Rules of the House of Representatives. No Member may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of any committee or subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize a particular committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by the same procedures designated in this Rule for closing hearings to the public: Provided, however, that the committee or subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of the hearing.

(3) Whenever a hearing or meeting conducted by the committee is open to the public, there proceedings shall be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography, except as provided in Rule XI 3(f)(2) of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall not be able to limit the number of television, or still cameras to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

REQUESTS FOR ROLLCALL VOTES AT FULL COMMITTEE

(k) A rollcall vote of the Members may be had at the request of three or more Members or, in the apparent absence of a quorum, by any one Member.

AUTOMATIC ROLLCALL VOTE FOR AMENDMENTS WHICH AFFECT THE USE OF FEDERAL RESOURCES

(l)(1) A rollcall vote shall be automatic on any amendment which specifies the use of federal resources in addition to, or more explicitly (inclusively or exclusively) than that specified in the underlying text of the measure being considered.

(2) No legislative report filed by the committee on any measure or matter reported by the committee shall contain language which has the effect of specifying the use of federal resources more explicitly (inclusively or exclusively) than that specified in the measure or matter as ordered reported, unless such language has been approved by the committee during a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members.

COMMITTEE RECORDS

(m)(1) The committee shall keep a complete record of all committee action which shall include a record of the votes on any question on which a rollcall vote is demanded. The result of each rollcall vote shall be made available by the committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(2) The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule XXXVI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any Member of the committee.

(3) To the maximum extent feasible, the committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

(n) The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the committee which are decided to be printed shall be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Any requests by those Members, staff or witnesses to correct any errors other than errors, in transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, shall be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted. Prior to approval by the Chairman of hearings conducted jointly with another congressional committee, a memorandum of understanding shall be prepared which incorporates an agreement for the publication of the verbatim transcript. Transcripts of markups shall be recorded and published in the same manner as hearings before the committee and shall be included as part of the legislative report unless waived by the Chairman.

OPENING STATEMENTS; 5-MINUTE RULE

(o) Insofar as is practicable, the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, shall limit the total time of opening statements by Members to no more than 10 minutes, the time to be divided equally among Members present desiring to make an opening statement. The time any one Member may address the committee on any bill, motion or other matter under consideration by the committee or the time allowed for the questioning of a witness at hearings before the committee will be limited to five minutes, and then only when the Member has been recognized by the Chairman, except that this time limit may be waived by the Chairman or acting Chairman. The rules of germaneness will be enforced by the Chairman.

(p) Notwithstanding rule 3(o), upon a motion, the Chairman, in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may designate an equal number of Members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 30 minutes, or, upon a motion, may designate staff from each party to question a witness for equal specific periods.

REQUESTS FOR WRITTEN MOTIONS

(q) Any legislative or non-procedural motion made at a regular or special meeting of the committee and which is entertained by the Chairman shall be presented in writing upon the demand of any Member present and a copy made available to each Member present.

RULE 4. SUBCOMMITTEES

STRUCTURE AND JURISDICTION

(a) The committee shall have the following standing subcommittees with the jurisdiction indicated.

(1) Subcommittee on Basic Research.—Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to science policy including: Office of Science and Technology Policy; all scientific research, and scientific and engineering resources (including human resources), math, science and engineering education; intergovernmental mechanisms for research, development, and demonstration and cross-cutting programs; international scientific cooperation; National Science Foundation; university research policy, including infrastructure, overhead and partnerships; science scholarships; government-owned, contractor-operated, Department of Energy laboratories; computer, communications, and information science; earthquake and fire research programs; research and development relating to health, biomedical, and nutritional programs; and to the extent appropriate, agricultural, geological, biological and life sciences research.

(2) Subcommittee on Energy and Environment.—Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to energy and environmental research, development, and demonstration including: Department of Energy research, development, and demonstration programs; federally owned and operated Department of Energy laboratories; energy supply research and development activities; nuclear and other advanced energy technologies; general science and research activities; uranium supply, enrichment, and waste management activities as appropriate; fossil energy research and development; clean coal technology; energy conservation research and development; measures relating to the commercial application of energy technology; science and risk assessment activities of the Federal Government; Environmental Protection Agency research and development programs; and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including all activities related to weather, weather services, climate, and the atmosphere, and marine fisheries, and oceanic research.

(3) Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics.—Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to astronautical and aeronautical research and development including: national space policy, including access to space; sub-orbital access and applications; National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its contractor and government-operated laboratories; space commercialization including the commercial space activities relating to the Department of Transportation and the Department of Commerce; exploration and use of outer space; international space cooperation; National Space Council; space applications, space communications and related matters; and earth remote sensing policy.

(4) Subcommittee on Technology.—Legislative jurisdiction and general and special oversight and investigative authority on all matters relating to competitiveness including: standards and standardization of measurement; the National Institute of Standards and Technology; the National Technical Information Service; competitiveness, including small business competitiveness; tax, antitrust, regulatory and other legal and governmental policies as they relate to technological development and commercialization; technology transfer; patent and intellectual property policy; international technology trade; research, development, and demonstration activities of the Department of Transportation; civil aviation research, development, and demonstration; research, development, and demonstration programs of the Federal Aviation Administration; surface and water transportation research, development, and demonstration programs; materials research, development, and demonstration and policy; and biotechnology policy.

REFERRAL OF LEGISLATION

(b) The Chairman shall refer all legislation and other matters referred to the committee

to the subcommittee or subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within two weeks unless, the Chairman deems consideration is to be by the Full Committee. Subcommittee chairmen may make requests for referral of specific matters to their subcommittee within the two week period if they believe subcommittee jurisdictions so warrant.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

(c) The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member shall serve as ex-officio Members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote and be counted as part of the quorum and ratios on all matters before the subcommittee.

PROCEDURES

(d) No subcommittee shall meet for markup or approval when any other subcommittee of the committee or the Full Committee is meeting to consider any measure or matter for markup or approval.

(e) Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the committee on all matters referred to it. Each subcommittee shall conduct legislative, investigative, and general oversight, inquiries for the future and forecasting, and budget impact studies on matters within their respective jurisdictions. Subcommittee chairmen shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman and other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

(f) Any Member of the committee may have the privilege of sitting with any subcommittee during its hearings or deliberations and may participate in such hearings or deliberations, but no such Member who is not a Member of the subcommittee shall vote on any matter before such subcommittee, except as provided in Rule 4(c).

(g) During any subcommittee proceeding for markup or approval, a rollcall vote may be had at the request of one or more Members of that subcommittee.

POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(h)(1) Notwithstanding subparagraph (2), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by the committee in the conduct of any investigation or series of investigations or activities to require the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers and documents as deemed necessary, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Chairman.

(2) The Chairman of the full Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the full Committee, may authorize and issue such subpoenas as described in paragraph (1), during any period in which the House has adjourned for a period longer than 3 days.

NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

(i) All national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping. The Chairman of the Full Committee may establish such regulations and procedures as in his judgment are necessary to safeguard classified information under the control of the committee. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any Member of the committee, or any other Member of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

SENSITIVE OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION RECEIVED PURSUANT TO SUBPOENA

(j) Unless otherwise determined by the committee or subcommittee, certain information received by the committee or subcommittee pursuant to a subpoena not made part of the record at an open hearing shall be deemed to have been received in Executive Session when the Chairman of the Full Committee, in his judgment, deems that in view of all the circumstances, such as the sensitivity of the information or the confidential nature of the information, such action is appropriate.

RULE 5. REPORTS

SUBSTANCE OF LEGISLATIVE REPORTS

(a) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall include the following, to be provided by the committee:

(1) the oversight findings and recommendations required pursuant to Rule X 2(b)(1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, separately set out and identified [Rule XI 2(l)(3)(A)];

(2) the statement required by section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified, if the measure provides new budget authority or new or increased tax expenditures as specified in [Rule XI 2(l)(3)(B)];

(3) with respect to reports on a bill or joint resolution of a public character, a ''Constitutional Authority Statement'' citing the specific powers granted to Congress by the Constitution pursuant to which the bill or joint resolution is proposed to be enacted;

(4) with respect to each rollcall vote on a motion to report any measure or matter of a public character, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, and the names of those Members voting for and against, shall be included in the committee report on the measure or matter;

(5) the estimate and comparison prepared by the committee under Rule XIII 7(a) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, unless the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office prepared under subparagraph 2 of this Rule has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report [Rule XIII 7(d)];

(6) in the case of a bill or joint resolution which repeals or amends any statute or part thereof, the text of the statute or part thereof which is proposed to be repealed, and a comparative print of that part of the bill or joint resolution making the amendment and of the statute or part thereof proposed to be amended [Rule XIII 3];

(7) a transcript of the markup of the measure or matter unless waived under Rule 3(m).

(b)(1) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall further include the following, to be provided by sources other than the committee:

(A) the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office required under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, separately set out and identified, whenever the Director (if timely, and submitted prior to the filing of the report) has submitted such estimate and comparison of the committee [Rule XI 2(1)(3)(C)];

(B) a summary of the oversight findings and recommendations made by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight under Rule X2(b)(2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, separately set out and identified [Rule XI2(1)(3)(D)].

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (2) of this Rule, if the committee has not received prior to the filing of the report the material required under paragraph (1) of this Rule, then it shall include a statement to that effect in the report on the measure.

MINORITY AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS

(c) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the committee, any Member of the committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than two subsequent calendar days after the day of such notice (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that Member, with the clerk of the committee. All such views so filed by one or more Members of the committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the committee with respect to that measure or matter. The report of the committee upon that measure or matter shall be printed in a single volume which shall include all supplemental, minority, or additional views, which have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report, and shall bear upon its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, or additional views (and any material submitted under paragraph (a) of Rule 4(j)) are included as part of the report. However, this rule does not preclude (1) the immediate filing or printing of a committee report unless timely requested for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, or additional views has been made as provided by this Rule or (2) the filing by the committee of any supplemental report upon any measure or matter which may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by that committee upon that measure or matter.

(d) The Chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, shall advise Members of the day and hour when the time for submitting views relative to any given report elapses. No supplemental, minority, or additional views shall be accepted for inclusion in the report if submitted after the announced time has elapsed unless the Chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, decides to extend the time for submission of views the two subsequent calendar days after the day of notice, in which case he shall communicate such fact to Members, including the revised day and hour for submissions to be received, without delay.

CONSIDERATION OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

(e) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee shall not be considered by the Full Committee until after the intervention of 48 hours, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and legal holidays, from the time the report is submitted and printed hearings thereon shall be made available, if feasible, to the Members, except that this rule may be waived at the discretion of the Chairman.

TIMING AND FILING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

(f) It shall be the duty of the Chairman to report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any measure approved by the committee and to take or cause to be taken the necessary steps to bring the matter to a vote.

(g) The report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee shall be filed within seven calendar days (exclusive of days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the clerk of the committee a written request, signed by the majority of the Members of the committee, for the reporting of that measure. Upon the filing of any such request, the clerk of the committee shall transmit immediately to the Chairman of the committee notice of the filing of that request.

(h)(1) Any document published by the committee as a House Report, other than a report of the committee on a measure which has been approved by the committee, shall be approved by the committee at a meeting, and Members shall have the same opportunity to submit views as provided for in Rule 5(c).

(2) Subject to paragraphs (3) and (4), the Chairman may approve the publication of any document as a committee print which in his discretion he determines to be useful for the information of the committee.

(3) Any document to be published as a committee print which purports to express the views, findings, conclusions, or recommendations of the committee or any of its subcommittees must be approved by the Full Committee or its subcommittees, as applicable, in a meeting or otherwise in writing by a majority of the Members, and such Members shall have the right to submit supplemental, minority, or additional views for inclusion in the print within at least 48 hours after such approval.

(4) Any document to be published as a committee print other than a document described in paragraph (c) of this Rule: (A) shall include on its cover the following statement: ''This document has been printed for informational purposes only and does not represent either findings or recommendations adopted by this Committee;'' and (B) shall not be published following the sine die adjournment of a Congress, unless approved by the Chairman of the Full Committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority member of the Full Committee.

(i) A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by this committee and one or more other committee(s) may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

(j) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, or additional views, that member shall be entitled to not less than seven calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(k) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chairman of the committee may file at any time with the Clerk the committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least seven calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

NOTIFICATION TO APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(l) No later than May 15 of each year, the Chairman shall report to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations any departments, agencies, or programs under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science for which no authorization exists for the next fiscal year. The Chairman shall further report to the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations when authorizations are subsequently enacted prior to enactment of the relevant annual appropriations bill.

OVERSIGHT

(m) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Oversight and the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, in accordance with the provisions of clause 2(d) of Rule X of the House of Representatives.

(n) The Chairman of the committee, or of any subcommittee, shall not undertake any investigation in the name of the committee without formal approval by the Chairman of the committee after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee.

OTHER PROCEDURES AND REGULATIONS

(o) During the consideration of any measure or matter, the Chairman of the Full Committee, or of any Subcommittee, or any Member acting as such, shall suspend further proceedings after a question has been put to the Committee at any time when there is a vote by electronic device occurring in the House of Representatives.

(p) The Chairman of the Full Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee.

LEGISLATIVE AND OVERSIGHT JURISDICTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

''Rule X. Establishment of Standing Committees.

''The Committees and Their Jurisdiction.

''1. There shall be in the House the following standing committees, each of which shall have the jurisdiction and related functions assigned to it by this clause and clauses 2, 3, and 4; and all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing committee as listed in this clause shall (in accordance with and subject to clause 5) be referred to such committees, as follows:

* * * * *

''(n) Committee on Science.

''(1) All energy research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor, and all federally owned or operated nonmilitary energy laboratories.

''(2) Astronautical research and development, including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities.

''(3) Civil aviation research and development.

''(4) Environmental research and development.

''(5) Marine research.

''(6) Measures relating to the commercial application of energy technology.

''(7) National Institute of Standards and Technology, standardization of weights and measures and the metric system.

''(8) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

''(9) National Space Council.

''(10) National Science Foundation.

''(11) National Weather Service.

''(12) Outer space, including exploration and control thereof.

''(13) Science Scholarships.

''(14) Scientific research, development, and demonstration, and projects therefor.

''In addition to its legislative jurisdiction under the preceding provisions of this paragraph (and its general oversight function under clause 2(b)(1)), the committee shall have the special oversight function provided for in clause 3(f) with respect to all nonmilitary research and development.''

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT FUNCTIONS

3. (f) The Committee on Science shall have the function of reviewing and studying, on a continuing basis, all laws, programs, and Government activities dealing with or involving nonmilitary research and development.

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE 105TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD a copy of the amendment, adopted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on March 12, 1997, to the rules previously submitted in accordance with clause 2(a) of rule XI of the rules of the House.

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Rule XIV(a) of the Rules of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is amended by striking subparagraphs (1) through (6) and inserting the following:

(1) Subcommittee on Aviation (34 Members: 19 majority, 15 minority).

(2) Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation (9 Members: 5 majority, 4 minority).

(3) Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development (11 Members: 6 majority, 5 minority).

(4) Subcommittee on Railroads (20 Members: 11 majority, 9 minority).

(5) Subcommittee on Surface Transportation (50 Members: 28 majority, 22 minority).

(6) Subcommittee on Water Resources and the Environment (36 Members: 20 majority, 16 minority).

CUBAN LIBERTY AND DEMOCRATIC SOLIDARITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it was only a year ago today that the Helms-Burton law was signed into law after this Chamber, in all of its wisdom and its support of the oppressed people of Cuba, passed that landmark and historic legislation by an overwhelming majority. A year later the Members of the House of Representatives who supported this bill known as the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act can be proud of casting their vote in favor of the bill because after only 1 year of its implementation, it has proven to be an effective weapon in the battle to rid Cuba of the Castro dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, evidence of the success of the Helms-Burton Act can be found in various statements by top Castro officials who have faulted Helms-Burton for, among other things, the decision by the Mexican conglomerate, Grupo Domos, to withdraw from its agreement to reconstruct Cuba's domestic telecommunications system, and these same Castro officials have stated that Helms-Burton is responsible for the lack of private financing for equipment that is needed for Cuba's important sugar harvest.

Just today the Castro regime's foreign minister, Roberto Robaina, on a

stop in Brazil, stated that Helms-Burton has had a very strong psychological effect and has frustrated investments. He added that the Cuban economy has not grown as expected in large part due to this legislation.

But whether or not Castro's thugs agree that Helms-Burton has been successful or not, it is clear that this legislation has stopped in its tracks Castro's efforts to sell Cuba as an investment paradise, a paradise where workers who enjoy no rights are virtual slaves to the wicked partnership of Castro and the foreign investors who profit from American stolen property.

All of this, Mr. Speaker, has taken place despite the failure of the Clinton administration to fully implement the law. The President has ignored congressional intent and has twice waived title III of Helms-Burton. This is the provision that grants American citizens the right to sue in American courts those foreign investors who traffic in their stolen American property in Cuba.

Similarly, title IV of the legislation that denies entry to the United States of those officials of corporations that are investing in illegally confiscated American property in Cuba, has only been enforced against two corporations: Sherritt of Canada and Grupo Domos of Mexico, despite evidence that other companies like Spain's hotel builders, Sol-Melia, are doing business with United States confiscated properties.

The Castro regime's desperation to silence any support for Helms-Burton inside the island was translated a few months ago into an antidote law that virtually prohibits any positive talk of Helms-Burton on the island.

Articles 8 and 9 of this totalitarian law makes it a crime for any Cuban citizen to facilitate the implementation of Helms-Burton. The main victims but not the only victims of this new oppressive law have been the independent journalists on the island who bravely attempt to offer the people of Cuba and the outside world an objective view of the repressive situation on the island.

Raul Rivero, who presides over Cuba Press, an independent journalist association in Cuba, and many other colleagues who bravely attempt to break Castro's information monopoly, have been systematically harassed and arrested by Castro's thugs since this draconian law took effect.

These journalists are subject to so-called repudiation acts, which are government sponsored mobs, which in the middle of the night scream insults such as ''traitor,'' and in fact they vandalize these reporters' homes.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, many of our allies have followed Castro's lead. They have mounted a campaign of their own to revoke Helms-Burton in order to be able to continue to profit and participate in Castro's slave economy.

Mr. Speaker, only by denying Castro the resources he needs to maintain power can we help the people of Cuba in their struggle to eliminate the last dictator of our hemisphere, Fidel Castro.

BRAVERY AND VALOR

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, bravery and valor are qualities we do not hear much about anymore. Recently though, Galveston County, TX, was the site for two notable displays of those qualities, and their heroes deserve our praise.

Mr. Speaker, my sister is a quadriplegic. I cannot think of anything more frightening than her being caught in a fire. That is the tragedy that befell a man in Santa Fe, TX, last week. As he slept, his home caught fire. Officers were dispatched to the scene. When Sgt. Lee Stephenson and Officers Carl Nunn and David Thomas arrived, they were told by neighbors that the occupant was wheelchair-bound. Unable to get through either door due to the flames and smoke, the officers broke through a bedroom window, located the man and carried him to safety.

Every day, men and women who have devoted their lives to protecting our communities put themselves at risk. We should honor them every day, and I am pleased to tell their story. Before this U.S. House of Representatives, I recognize and I salute the bravery and valor displayed by Santa Fe police officers Lee Stephenson, Carl Nunn, and David Thomas. I also wish to recognize the efforts of the Santa Fe Volunteer Fire Department for their hard work and dedicated public service.

An even scarier situation emerged last month in Galveston County when a man driving with his two toddler daughters in the car had a seizure while approaching the Galveston Bay Causeway on Interstate 45. The car flew off the highway and fell 15 feet into the water, landing fortunately at a shallow point.

Five young people were following a few hundred yards behind. They saw the tragedy unfold, pulled over and rushed into the water to help. They pulled the two little girls and their father to safety so they could receive medical attention. Before this House of Representatives, I recognize and I salute the bravery and valor displayed by Mark Kneip of Texas City, TX, and Shawn Cook, Katherine Holmes, Paul Holmes, and Evelyn Urban, all of Dickinson, TX.

I am understandably proud to come before this body and tell the American people these stories of heroism from my district.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues and the charitable interests who organized last weekend's bipartisan retreat.

□ 1730

As a new Member of this body, I appreciated the opportunity to discuss the operation of the people's House without regard to party affiliation or seniority.

I and most of my freshmen colleagues recognize that we were elected in part as a response to the marked partisanship of the previous Congress. This weekend was a giant leap forward toward a more collegial and, therefore, more productive House of Representatives.

MARGIE JANOVICH'S SACRIFICE

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, today in Omaha, NE, we had a funeral for a young lady that has meant a lot to me over the last 2 years. Her name was Margie Janovich. Margie was an inspiration, I think, not only to Omaha, but after people hear about her story, will be an inspiration to every family in this country.

Margie was diagnosed about 2 years ago with thyroid cancer, and she was 5 months pregnant at the time she was diagnosed with thyroid cancer. She was a strong, committed believer of the right of the unborn child. Margie felt compelled to forego the treatments on her thyroid and to forego the chemotherapy until her baby was born 4 months later.

Margie already had 8 children: Nick, 21; Tina, 19; Terri, 17; Jim, 16; Mike, 12; Joe, 9; Dan, 7 years old; and Andy, 3. So they had a wonderful family and Margie thought that she could not bring herself to endanger her unborn child. So she forewent the chemotherapy and delivered little baby Mary safely.

During those 4 months that she decided not to go through treatments, the cancer spread. It spread to her lungs and it spread on into the rest of her body. For the last 20 months Margie has fought cancer, and it took her life Sunday night and we buried her today.

During those last 20 months, I have had an opportunity to spend a lot of time with her. I have gone over to her house several times, had pizza delivered a couple of times, and every time I was over there Margie always had the greatest attitude. She never once was concerned about her own self. It was, how are you doing, what is going on in Congress, are you going to get that partial birth abortion bill through this year. She was very, very, very sick, but she always was concerned about other people.

During the last 20 months she home schooled three of her children. Neighbors surrounded them, took a lot of food over and tried to help out however they could. Ron was always there, a tremendous husband. But this is a story about the quality of life and the respect for life for this little child, Mary Beth Janovich.

Mary Beth is only 15 months old, but someday, when she is old enough to understand the sacrifice that her mother gave, it will be quite a story that Ron will be able to sit down and tell her about.

Mr. Speaker, I think about next week or the week following when we start debating the partial birth abortion again, and 10 days ago in the hospital I told Margie that we would pass the partial birth abortion bill and that we would get it through the Senate and, with God's help, we would override a veto this year. Because I believe that probably the most important thing that we can do for Margie, for the Janovich family, is to pass a bill that respects life, that respects the unborn child, that gives hope and opportunity to every unborn child.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about the President's dilemma, as he was presented so much false evidence last time by the pro-abortion lobby, I would hope and I would pray that our President would think seriously again about this legislation; that when it comes before him this year that he would think about the Janoviches, that he think about the sacrifice that Margie Janovich gave and made for her child.

Life is precious. As he talked last week during his speech on the cloning issue, talking about that an embryo has a soul, well, Mr. Speaker, I would hearken to advise the President that, yes, an embryo has a soul and that embryo is an unborn child only 9 months later.

So Margie was a tremendous inspiration to me, Ron and the kids. I want to thank them for everything that they have done because it has been a story that has touched every life in Omaha, NE, in the Midwest, and I believe that as America finds out about Margie Janovich, we will once again turn our hearts towards the value of life and the value of the unborn child. May God bless her.

THE PERSIAN GULF WAR HELP LINE

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to report some good news for our Nation's Persian Gulf war veterans. The Veterans Administration has set up a help line phone number that gulf war veterans can call for health examinations. Veterans who are in need of care or who wish to take advantage of the physical examination under the Persian Gulf registry or who have general questions about their experience in the Persian Gulf war can call the VA's Persian Gulf information hot line. That number is 1–800–PGW-VETS. Or, if they need the numbers, 1–800–749–8387.

Active-duty service members who were deployed to the gulf during the war may receive a health examination through military treatment facilities by calling 1–800–796–9699. The VA encourages all gulf war veterans to participate in this important program.

I am proud to support President Clinton's action to make it easier for Persian Gulf war veterans to collect compensation benefits for undiagnosed illnesses resulting from this war. At the urging of Veterans Affairs Secretary Jesse Brown, the President agreed to extend the period during which undiagnosed illnesses, such as Persian Gulf war syndrome, will be considered related to a veteran's service in the gulf, thereby entitling that veteran to compensation benefits.

Congress had begun to address this problem prior to President Clinton's decision. My esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. LANE EVANS, the ranking member on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, introduced a bill earlier this year that would lengthen the time that gulf war veterans can file for disability compensation. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill, the Persian Gulf War Veterans Compensation Act.

President Clinton listened to Congress, and to the thousands of veterans across the Nation who are suffering from the mysterious illness known as Persian Gulf War Syndrome. Mr. Speaker, our inability to find an exact cause of gulf war syndrome requires that we give our veterans the benefit of the doubt. We must move forward and provide care for our suffering Persian Gulf war veterans even as the search continues for a cause of this syndrome.

America and this Congress must not shirk its responsibilities to its veterans. I applaud the actions taken by President Clinton and the Veterans Administration to give our veterans the care that they need and deserve.

Remember that help line phone number. It is 1–800–749–8387. Please get the help that is now offered through the Veterans Administration.

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

[Mr. SOUDER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

BIPARTISAN RETREAT IN HERSHEY A SUCCESS

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my colleagues in the House, both Republican and Democrat alike, who attended the bipartisan retreat in Hershey, PA, last weekend, but especially to commend the gentleman from Illinois, Republican Representative RAY LAHOOD, and the gentleman from Colorado, Democratic Representative DAVID SKAGGS, for their vision and all the hard work they put into making the retreat last weekend, I think, an unqualified success.

I would also like to commend the political leadership of both parties, the gentleman from Georgia, Speaker GINGRICH, and the gentleman from Missouri, DICK GEPHARDT, for their presence, without whom this whole attempt to try to find greater civility in the House of Representatives will not go anywhere.

I also want to thank the Pew Charitable Trust and the Aspen Institute for investing in this retreat and making sure not one taxpayer dollar went for this retreat, and to give the Members a chance to explore civility.

The premise for this historic gathering, unprecedented in our Nation's history, was very simple, and that is for any legislature to function, its members must have a level of trust and understanding of one another. That trust can only develop when the members have an opportunity to get to know one another a little bit better, as people, and outside the partisan political arena.

When people know each other and their spouses and their children, they are less likely to let policy differences turn into personal animosity or hostility or to question one another's motives. In short, it is a lot harder to demonize someone when you know them on an individual and personal level.

Over 200 Members came together in an attempt to explore ways in which to bring greater civility to the House of Representatives. No legislative business was conducted, no political games, just Members and their families taking time to get together, to get to know one another a little better, and to examine the environment in the House of Representatives and figure out how we can do the Nation's work at a level of decorum that this great democracy deserves.

This was not a hug-fest. We continue to recognize that there will be deep, passionate policy differences between the parties. I think today's debate on the House resolution was a classic example, and we have no desire to blur those distinctions. Conflict in Congress is unavoidable, and the Nation is well served by healthy and vigorous debate. In fact, it is crucial to the functioning of this democracy.

The retreat, rather, was about handling those disagreements constructively and honoring our democracy with debates that are more civil, more respectful and, ultimately, more productive; in short, to explore ways where we can disagree without being disagreeable.

To build upon the future, we have to have knowledge of the past. History teaches us that when we unite as a country for a grand purpose there is nothing that we cannot accomplish. It was altogether fitting that during the course of the retreat some of us Members took time to tour the Gettysburg National Battlefield. That is the site

where the northern and southern armies met by chance during 3 days in July 1863 and engaged in the largest military battle in the Western Hemisphere. When the armies marched away, they left behind more than 51,000 dead, wounded, or missing soldiers in a battle that many historians believed determined the fate of the Nation. These were men who in President Lincoln's words gave their last full measure of devotion so this Nation might endure.

I wanted to especially thank National Park Service employee Eric Campbell for his terrific guided tour of the battlefield. In fact, he described in vivid detail the battle over Little Round Top, which many military historians felt was the crucial ingredient to the outcome of the battle. During that battle there was a lieutenant by the name of Joshua Campbell, who was trying to hold the high ground for the Northern army, the strategic high ground. And when his men ran out of ammunition, they had two options that they faced: Either retreat and give up the high ground, and perhaps forfeit the strategic battleground and possibly the entire military conflict; or to charge ahead. And they opted to lead a bayonet charge down the hill, which swept off the Confederate forces and saved the day for the Union Army there.

When we think about the sacrifices that the men gave on that battlefield, what they gave for their country, and then to ask the House to, in a more civil way, conduct this Nation's business, I do not think that is a lot to ask from us as representatives of the country.

Perhaps that is why the institution has become more uncivil recently. We forget this is not about us as Members or as individuals. It is really about the country, about all of us in this Nation, those who came before us, those who will come after us, our children and our children's children.

It is perhaps when we start thinking of it in personal terms that we begin acting aggressive, defensive and rude, all those things that everybody does when we feel threatened. This is not about us as individual Members, it is rather about this great country, everybody, who have come together to fight for the principles this country was founded on.

All of us, I think, crave to be part of something larger than ourselves, which is probably why most of us ran for the House of Representatives to begin with. That is why we have families, why we participate in church, join organizations, just to be a part of something significant, noble, decent, and right.

There is no simple cure for the incivility we see too often in American society, just as there is no simple cure for the rancor and mistrust in the House at times.

□ 1745

Last weekend's retreat is no panacea but it is a start. As Members of Congress, we have an enormous responsibility to the Nation. Our country deserves better from all of us, but we look upon our leaders to set the standard, as we should, and with some luck and good will, what has begun last weekend will help us better meet that great responsibility to the Nation.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF HELMS-BURTON LEGISLATION

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, a plea has gone out by the President of the National Commission, Jose Marti, the National Commission on Human Rights in Cuba, Professor Amador Blanco Hernandez, for three political prisoners who are in a very, very difficult situation right now. They have been on a hunger strike since February 20 because of the brutal, inconceivably inhumane conditions that they have been facing. One of them, and I will read their names, Juan Bruno Lopez Vazquez, Herminio Gonzalez Torna, and one of them, Levin Cordova Garcia, is near death.

Now, Professor Blanco Hernandez is seeking some signs of solidarity and outrage in the international community. I today remember and my thoughts go out to all the Cuban political prisoners, but especially to these three, such dignified representatives of the Cuban people who are facing that extraordinarily difficult situation, and have had to embark on hunger strikes to try to get some attention of the world community so that their conditions will be looked at and pressure will be put on the Cuban dictatorship so that their conditions can improve.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a year since President Clinton signed the Helms-Burton law, March 12, 1996. Sometimes it seems difficult to believe that it has been only a year, considering all that has happened since. Not just Castro but all those who seek to take advantage of the degradation and exploitation imposed by the dictator on the Cuban people received a blow by the adoption of Helms-Burton. With urgency, those who have invested or who are thinking of doing so in Castro's feudal, antiworker, slave economy have had to reconsider their actions or their intentions in light of the risk of being physically excluded from the world's largest market, the United States.

That is why the European Union, in an act that classifies it as an unscrupulous merchandiser, has taken its complaint against U.S. sanctions to the World Trade Organization.

The strongest blow in Helms-Burton against those who seek the definitive consolidation of the degradation of the Cuban people, of the oppression and the humiliation that they have to bear at the hands of the Castro brothers and the handful of their minions who also live the ''dolce vita,'' however, is not what is most discussed and debated about Helms-Burton. It has nothing to do with the exclusion of foreigners from the United States who knowingly traffic in properties stolen from Americans, nor with lawsuits against those traffickers.

What is most painful for those who seek the permanence of the oppression of the Cuban people is that the United States sanctions against the dictatorship can no longer be lifted by the President until there is a genuine Democratic transition on the island.

Castro's defenders and the unscrupulous merchandisers had great hopes for President Clinton. They saw how he, in coordination with some large business interests, lifted the embargo on Vietnam and reestablished diplomatic relations with that country. With normalization of relations, a wide gamut of credits and other financing possibilities are opened to those who seek to do business with a recently legitimized regime.

They sought the same for Cuba. It does not matter that Castro has no money to buy anything from the unscrupulous merchandisers. The financing mechanisms would take care of that. That is what they are there for. That is why those financing mechanisms have money from the United States taxpayer.

Ever since Helms-Burton, the dreams that some had of being able to obtain massive financing for lucrative business deals with the Cuban dictator have gone down the drain. Congress has made absolutely clear that the President cannot lift the embargo and facilitate credits for those who seek to profit from deals in Cuba, nor authorize massive United States tourism to Cuba, until there is a government in Cuba that respects the Cuban people, a government that liberates all political prisoners, that legalizes all political activity and that agrees to hold free and fair elections. That requirement in Helms-Burton, known as the codification of the embargo, is definitive and will be decisive in Cuba's salvation.

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

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

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

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

CERTIFICATION REGARDING FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FOR MEXICO

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House tonight, before an important vote tomorrow, and that vote tomorrow is the question of whether the Congress will vote in fact to decertify Mexico and override the certification granted by this administration and this President.

Certification, and as a staffer some years ago in the other body, I had the opportunity to work on drafting that certification legislation, is predicated on several factors. One is enforcement and eradication and stopping drugs at their source. The other is the cooperative effort of a nation. Then there are certain sanctions and penalties that we impose on countries that do not cooperate, and we either certify them or decertify them.

Tomorrow this Congress will decide on whether we agree with the administration, and I think they made a grave error and a grave mistake. If we take a few minutes and examine the record, look at what has happened with drug flow into the United States, and let us look at heroin, let us look at cocaine, let us look at methamphetamines.

Just a few years ago, most of the heroin came in in very small amounts from Mexico and it was a brown heroin. Today 30 percent of all the heroin coming into the United States is coming in from Mexico. Cocaine, there is no cocaine to my knowledge produced in Mexico. Most of it is produced in Bolivia and Peru, a little bit in Colombia. But 70 percent of all cocaine coming into the United States, and this is by DEA's estimates, is now coming in from Mexico.

Eighty percent of all the marijuana coming into the United States is coming in from Mexico. And methamphetamines, which I spoke of, from mid 1993 to early 1995 Mexican traffickers reportedly produced, and last year, produced 150 tons of methamphetamine, or speed, coming into the United States from that country.

So the record has gotten worse and worse and worse, of drug eradication. The problem is getting greater and greater. What is worse for our country and our children and our neighborhoods and our communities is, it is affecting our children. Heroin use is up by teenagers dramatically. Emergency room visits are also up.

And then we look at the question of whether we should certify Mexico based on cooperation. We asked Mexico to do some of the following things, and let me say in every one of these areas they have dragged their feet or failed to comply with our request.

First, agree to extradition. You will hear them say they extradited 16 people. That is false. Only 3 have been extradited according to our requests and only one who had some record of involvement with drugs, and he was extradited because he had dual citizenship, both American and Mexican. Failed on extradition.

Failed to allow our DEA to protect themselves with firearms. Failed to allow 20 more DEA agents to be placed in Mexico. Failed to share intelligence with the United States. Failed to install antidrug radars in the south of Mexico. Failed to comply or put together a permanent maritime pact. And they failed to arrest and prosecute drug traffickers and drug money in their own country and really enforce their new laundering money laws.

They have failed to take concrete steps to comply. So by no measure do they deserve certification.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I urge my colleagues to come to the floor. Trade is important with Mexico, cooperation is important with Mexico. They are our southern neighbor and an important part of this hemisphere. But when their actions, their lack of cooperation is destroying our schools, our children's future, our neighborhoods and our communities, this Congress must act in a responsible manner to stop that action against us by our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we must come as a Congress and send a very clear message to Mexico, not based on finance or business but on the future of this country and, again, our children and what is happening.

The alternative is what? We have almost 2 million Americans in jail. Seventy percent of the people in our prisons and penal facilities are there because of drug-related convictions. Where is that narcotic coming from, those illegal drugs coming from? They are coming from, I submit, and we have proved here, Mexico. We must send this message and we must do it as a united Congress tomorrow.

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

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

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

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

THE CASE FOR SAVING AMERICA'S FAMILIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, tonight I want to share with my colleagues a project that we have been working on for a number of months. We call it the Case for Saving America's Families.

In this project, we are attempting to build a case for government that does only what government can and should do. Too often in Washington we have begun to ask Washington, this city, to do things that are better done at a State and local level and in many cases are better done not by bureaucracies and bureaucrats in Washington but are better done by families, by nonprofit faith-based institutions or by the private enterprise system. We have asked this city to make too many decisions that it is ill-equipped to make and that could be made much better in other parts of America.

We have to look at this Washington bureaucracy. This street going down over on the right side used to be called Independence Avenue but if you take a look at the buildings that line that street, it is maybe an appropriate time to rename that street Dependence Avenue, because it demonstrates the dependency that the rest of America has developed on Washington, a dependency where we ask bureaucrats to take a larger role in raising our children, bureaucrats and bureaucracies taking a larger role in building our communities, bureaucrats taking a larger role in creating jobs. We have identified and we constantly are on the lookout for specific examples where we can identify what the Washington bureaucracy is doing, whether it is working or whether it is failing, where it abuses power, where it wastes money, where it does things which perhaps to the American citizen, the average citizen, actually makes no sense.

□ 1800

We have begun a project of collecting these real life examples. These are things which the Washington bureaucracy actually do, and we compile these on a monthly basis. These are in your office; we send them to your office each and every month, and it is called, A Tale of Two Visions. The newsletter features actual examples of real life stories of what is happening in Washington and then compares and contrasts what Washington is doing to what successful entrepreneurs, successful individuals, and successful organizations are doing at the local level. It highlights the struggle that many Americans have with the Washington bureaucracy.

Let me just highlight some of the examples that we have in our February issue, and again these are in your offices, where we highlight some things that Washington believes it is best at deciding and it believes that it is appropriate to use American taxpayer dollars to fund these kind of activities.

As many of you know, we fund public housing projects around the country, and when we fund these projects it is

only appropriate that Washington attaches strings to those dollars to make sure that the people who build those buildings build them to the codes that we want established and the criteria that we have established in Washington, that the people that manage those projects manage them the way that we want them to manage them, that the people who live in them live in them the way that we want them to live and that the pets that are in those public housing projects are treated with the dignity and respect that we want them to be treated with.

So in 1996 our Secretary of HUD decided that we had to protect the pets in public housing because this was a national crisis and this is something that Washington had to be involved with. We developed rules regarding pet ownerships by elderly and disabled in public housing. Included in this, and this is section 5.350, paragraph 2, actual language from HUD, Washington saying people at the local level, an individual, cannot make this decision, Washington has to help them, let us write these rules and regulations, let us make sure they are aware of them so that people can listen to this and that they can abide by the rules and regulations that we have established.

Paragraph 2: ''In the case of cats and other pets using litter boxes the pet rules may require the pet owner to change the litter,'' in parentheses, ''but not more than twice each week, may require pet owners to separate pet waste from litter, but not more than once each day, then may prescribe methods for the disposal of pet waste and used litter.''

Thank you, Secretary Cisneros. That is going to help us, and those were Federal dollars well spent.

On a more serious note, back in 1996, we are facing a drug problem in our country, and so what is the appropriate response? It is when a product became available that would enable parents to better gauge and understand if their kids were using illegal drugs, the FDA said, ''No, it's not appropriate that we make this technology available to parents.'' It is not that the tests were unsafe, it is not that they were ineffective. The same tests are used routinely by hospitals, employers and parole officers. It is not that they were too difficult for a parent to understand how to use it correctly. The FDA was fighting to keep this product off the shelves because the parents cannot, and this is quote, ''be trusted to handle the results,'' end of quote. They fear that these tests would have a harmful effect on the parent-child relationships. After intense pressure, hallelujah, the FDA later approved the tests.

We also now are carding 27-year-olds for the purchase of cigarettes. We are taking a look at, and this is probably the most frustrating thing, when we have wise bureaucrats in all of these buildings, and they are good people, but when these people, one bureaucrat working in one office decides what the right thing is to do, and then somebody in another building decides that maybe they have got something that is a little bit different—think about this. The National Institutes of Health required one university to replace all of the school's rabbit cages. This carried a pricetag of $250,000. That may have been the right thing to do for the rabbits. However, less than a year later the Agriculture Department declared that the cages were the wrong size and the university had to once again replace the cages.

Now I kind of like rabbits, but I am not sure that we need two agencies in Washington who are focused and believe that it is their primary responsibility and purpose in life to design and define for people at a local level what the appropriate size and design and construction of a rabbit cage should be. This appears to be a little bit of overkill.

Now let us take a look at the exciting things that are going on. There are things that are going on in the private sector that really indicate that people at the local level maybe actually have a higher degree of common sense, have a higher degree of commitment to their community and their neighbors, that they have a higher degree and sense of responsibility than what we so frequently will give them or give them credit for.

The case of a father, a Catholic priest, working on job training: This is a case of Father Ronald Marino, and he took a look at what was going on in his community and said, ''This isn't good enough.'' He took a look at how government job training programs worked, and he found that this was not working. So on his own he began teaching English to immigrants, and once they had successfully mastered it he taught them a skill with on-the-job training through an apprenticeship, the participants either in pay and advancing from their salaries. They got advances on their salaries. They were teaching them things that would enable them to get a job, and this is an individual in the community going out and taking a look at government programs and saying they do not work, I can do better, and I have got a sense of commitment to my community, I am going to improve my community.

A grandmother helped 70 kids after school, takes no Federal funds. A 57-year-old grandmother in southeast Washington, DC runs an afterschool program which provides hot meals, homework help, computer instruction, Bible study, and a safe place to play for at-risk children. Miss Hannah Hawkins founded a nonprofit organization called Children of Mine after her husband was murdered in 1970.

Margaret Alasky writes Hawkins insists that social progress comes not when professionals take on needy children as clients, but when ordinary people treat the semi-abandoned children of others as their own. People have an intense concern and love for their community, and they demonstrate it in much more effective ways than what we so often do here in Washington.

These are just a few of the examples. We continue to build this litany of examples of where Washington, well-intentioned, goes out and tries to solve problems, but in many cases does not do it very effectively, and when you take a look at the alternatives that are available: local organizations, faith-based institutions, individuals, the free enterprise system, it is kind of like why are we sucking dollars out of the community and bringing them to Washington when if they were left in the community we might be able to deliver better results and have a better impact on solving some of these very difficult problems if we just let communities have the resources for themselves.

This is our vision. Our vision is of a government which costs less so that families can survive on one income. Our vision is of a government which does not compete with or attack parents or families but builds them up. Our vision is of a stronger, more vibrant private sector which is creating jobs free from the excesses of burden of taxation and regulation.

I think it is time for us to step out here in the House and, as Republicans, to more clearly articulate our vision for what we want America to be, and one of the projects that we have been debating today and one of the things that we have been talking about is the President's budget, a President's budget which increases spending, which does not reach balance, and we are talking about whether that is good for America, whether that is good for our citizens, and whether that is good for our kids.

But I think we ought to outline a vision about what we would like to see in a budget.

The President has laid down a benchmark. I am not satisfied with it. I do not believe it meets some criteria that are very important to me. I believe that in the long run we should be working toward a Federal Government, a budget, that can be funded by a one-wageearner family. We have way too many families today where one person is working to support the family and the other person is working to support the Federal Government. We need to move back to the point where a two-wageearner family is an option and not a requirement.

We have to have a budget that is in balance with and protects the core institutions of our society: families, private enterprise and faith-based and nonprivate institutions. We have to have a budget that is based on the assumption that the dollars that come to Washington are the American people's dollars and that they are best equipped to make the choices about how to spend them. We have to have a budget that respects the needs and the interests of today as well as future generations.

We need a budget that protects our kids. We need a budget that reflects a

learning from the long 29-year experience of deficit spending, deficit spending that developed out of an overexuberance about what people believe government could do and what people believe government could do better than what local institutions could do.

Do we really want to do for our kids in education what over the last 30 years we did for the needy and welfare and public housing? No, I think we can do a whole lot better than that, and we need to do a whole lot better than that.

Why does not the President's criteria, or why does not the President's budget, meet this criteria? The President's budget does not meet this criteria because what he wants to do is to continue to move dollars and spending to Washington rather than leaving the money back home.

This is not about a budget that is level, that gets to balance because revenues are increasing. This is about a President who wants to grow spending in one key category. Take a look at what happens to discretionary spending. This President wants more money to fund Washington bureaucrats and Washington bureaucracy. This is a $165 billion increase in discretionary spending between 1998 and the year 2002.

Now I just did a little figuring, and I come from a small- or medium-sized town in west Michigan, and I am not used to numbers this big, and I used to work for a company that finally, shortly after I left, finally got to be a billion-dollar company. A billion dollars is a lot of money, $100 million is a lot of money, but if you divide $168 billion by 5,000, which maybe is about the average tax that a family of four pays each year, you divide that 5,000 into 168 billion; do that at your own offices; and you find out that it is a lot of families who are going to have to pay for this increased spending.

□ 1615

If we run the numbers, and then if we divide it by the 5 years, it is about, on average, to fund the increasing spending that this President wants, about 6 million families each year, or 6 million more American families are going to have to send about $5,000 to Washington.

Does that move us closer to a budget that could be funded by a one-wage-earner family? I do not think so. I think asking for $165 billion more of spending in Washington is going to create more two-wage-earner families, not because of a choice, but out of necessity.

Does this protect our core institutions of our society, families, private enterprise, faith-based and nonprofit institutions? No. This is Washington sucking money away from those agencies.

Does this say we believe that the American people are best equipped to make the choices that they would like to make? No. It says the American people are not equipped to make choices; Washington can make better choices of this $165 billion than what the American people can.

Does this respect the needs and the interests of today as well as for our kids? Does this protect our kids? We could get to balance and surplus a whole lot sooner for our kids.

Most of this money in increased spending we are going to have to borrow. We are going to have to borrow it, so our kids are going to have a higher debt that they are going to have to pay back. Each and every year they are also going to have to pay interest on this. No, this does not save our kids, it does not protect our kids, it puts a bigger burden on our kids.

Does this learn the lessons of deficit spending? No, it continues the overexuberance of believing what Washington can and cannot do.

This is a bad budget for a number of reasons. It does not respect the family, it does not clarify choices, and it does not reflect the lessons that we should have learned. Those are the kinds of criteria that we need to establish as we move forward and create a new budget.

As Republicans outline what we want, and what we want to do, it is a matter of it is time to stop increasing spending; it is time to recognize that the most important thing is to start developing a surplus budget so that we can start protecting our kids, so that we can start moving power and authority and control to the places where the best solutions are, which is at the local level.

I now want to move on to another project that we have been working on which we call Lessons in Education. We have been working, a number of us, my colleagues, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], we are working on a project which we call Education at a Crossroads. Education at a Crossroads: What Works and What is Wasted.

The purpose of our effort is to really find out what is going on in education today. The paper that we developed is lessons in education. It is a series. What are we learning as we go through this process of having hearings around the country, as we have parents, students, teachers, principals, entrepreneurs, innovators, as they testify, what have we learned about education?

We have learned, not surprisingly, although I sometimes think when we try to develop programs here in Washington we forget some of these basics. The first lesson we learned: Parents care the most about their children's education. We go around to a charter school in Los Angeles and a parent gets up and says, you know what I really like about this school? We finally have been able to take back our school. The people who are running this school no longer have to look to the L.A. unified school district about what they can do.

One of the testimonies of the person running the school, she said: ''You know, when I ran this school and I was part of the L.A. unified school district, I worried about the three Bs.''

You would think as a principal she would be worried about the three Rs, but no, the three Bs. She said: ''I was always measured and the people at headquarters did not ask me how well I was doing with my kids. They wanted to know what was happening with busing, what was happening with my budgets. And then I would always run into the third B, which is the bucks.'' What do you mean, the bucks? She says: ''Every time I had a good idea that I thought would benefit the kids in my school and I would go to my rules and regulations and I would find out, I cannot do that; but I wanted to do it because it is what I needed to do for my kids.''

I would go to the headquarters of the L.A. unified school district and I would say: This is what my kids need. This is what the parents of my kids want. That is what we have jointly decided is best for the kids in our school to make sure that they have the learning environment that enables them to get the most effective learning.

I would go to headquarters, and the answer would be: Well, that is not a bad idea, but you cannot do it, because this and that, or that. Sometimes: It may be a good idea, but if we let you do that, we would have to let everybody else do that too. We cannot have that happen.

Successful education, as we are struggling with education and the educational issues around the country, let us not forget the fact that the person who knows the kid's name and the person that named the child probably cares the most about their education and about their future. And they care more than the bureaucrat at the State bureaucracy or at the Washington bureaucracy who do not even know the name of the child. Let us not lose sight of that. Too often we are losing sight of the fact that parents care most. We have also learned that good intentions do not equal good policy.

Lesson No. 2: We care about kids in Washington. We care so much about the education that our children receive in Washington that we have created program after program after program after program so that the end of 20 to 30 years of Washington having good intentions and Washington caring about our children that we now have 760 different programs running through 39 different agencies, spending $120 billion per year, and the education system is in crisis.

Mr. Speaker, good intentions do not equal good policy. Just because we care does not mean that the answer has to be a new program with a nice sounding title and a few dollars associated with it, does not mean that we are actually helping our children.

Lesson No. 3: More money or more does not always equal better; 760 programs probably is not better than 700 programs, and 600 programs probably is not better than 5 hub programs. More money in a failed system may sound good, but more money into a system

that does not work does not do anybody any good and it does not help our kids one bit.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is we have developed 760 programs. There is now a cottage industry, a cottage industry that you would think would be going to schools and saying: Here is some of the research that has just been done; and this is the most effective way for kids to learn how to read; or these are some of the really interesting new tools that we have developed to help teach children math or science. Here is the latest technology that, as you get these computers into your classroom, here is what you do with them.

No. The cottage industry is here: Here are two binders that tell you about 500 different education programs; they tell you, these booklets tell you what programs exist, who is eligible, and they tell you how to write the grant to get the money.

They do not tell you how to write the grant to reflect and answer the questions in a way that is honest and truthful; they tell you how to write the grant so that you have the highest probability of getting the money. So now we have school districts all around the country not hiring instructional specialists, but they are hiring grantwriters to kind of go through these 500 programs and to see if they can strike gold by finding some grants that a local school district may qualify for. Wrong priorities, wrong decisions, and a bad way to spend our money.

Mr. Speaker, we have created such a maze of programs that we now have to have specialists to go through this maze to figure out, this money that we sent through the IRS, how that money can get back to the local school district.

Do not worry about it, we do it very efficiently. When you send a dollar to the IRS and when you send a dollar to Washington for education, you can be sure that we get about 60 to 65 cents back to the teacher and back to the classroom. That is not a bad investment.

The bureaucrats in Washington, the bureaucrats in your State education association, they only steal 35 cents of that dollar from our kids. They are sucking away 35 cents that could be used in the classroom. The issue in education is not finding more money to spend in a system that sucks 35 cents out. The question is, how do we get more of that dollar that we send to Washington back to the classroom. It is not about spending $1.10 so we can get 70 cents to the classroom. It is about finding a way to get this dollar and getting 80 cents, 85 cents, 90 cents, 95 cents, back to what the purpose is of education. The purpose of education is not to make and hire bureaucrats, it is to educate kids.

Education needs to be child-centered, is the lesson that we are working on now.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many programs today where the focus is on the bureaucrat, it is on the bureaucracy, and it is not on the student. The system today, the students way down there at the end, there is a bureaucrat at the State level, there are some other bureaucrats through this process that work at this bureaucracy in Washington, and the student is not the focal point. The system today is about Government, it is about bureaucrats, it is about bureaucracy.

The system really should be not the student at the end of the process; the student needs to be the center of the process. The people most influential on that student are the teachers in the classroom and the parents. These are the people that know that student's name, they know where they live, they know the problems and the concerns that this student faces, the special problems. They care about them. These people care.

The bureaucrats care, but do they really care and know if they cannot give you the name of the student that they are trying to help? The resources and the dollars have to be focused on the student. These bureaucrats today, they are worried about writing the rules and the regulations for 760 programs here, not all in one building. Seven hundred sixty might be OK if they were all in one building in this town, but think about it. Some of the programs are in a building called the Education Department. Other programs come out of the Defense Department. Other programs come out of HUD. Other programs come out of the Agriculture Department. It is not one building, it is not 5 buildings, it is 39 different buildings, 39 different bureaucracies spending $120 billion a year.

□ 1830

We had a great hearing yesterday in the Committee on the Budget. I asked Secretary Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury, I asked the Secretary, who is the focal point? Who is the person that is setting education strategy at the Washington level? Who is focused on coordinating this effort and making sure that these different entities come together? The answer was, the President.

I am sorry, Mr. Rubin, I do not believe that the President is actually spending a whole lot of time trying to coordinate 760 programs through 39 different agencies. I think he has a few other things to do. I know education is important to him, but I believe that there are some other things on his mind.

What has been the result of this ever-increasing bureaucracy? I look at this, and coming from a business standpoint I think there is some reason to be concerned about this. I do not really think this is the best way to do it. But maybe in Washington this works. Maybe this really works in Washington. It does not work in the business world, but maybe in government all these pieces somehow magically come together.

What are the results? One-half of all adult Americans are functionally illiterate. Fifty-six percent of all college freshmen require remedial education. In California, we had a hearing and we had some of the chief officers and the key people in higher education in California come and testify. They said, please, please, as you are taking a look at the budget, do not cut our funds for remedial education.

We would say, explain that a little bit more. These are students that you have accepted into your university. What kind of remedial education are you looking for? What are these dollars exactly being used for? Remedial seems like a pretty serious term.

The answer is, well, one out of four students entering higher education in California, one out of four students cannot read or write at an eighth grade level. Excuse me? One out of four students in California entering higher ed, and this is not going into high school, this is going into higher education, one out of four cannot read or write at an eighth grade level? This is not remedial, this is a crisis. This is a big problem. Why are you not going down to the high schools, the middle schools, and the grade schools and talking to the teachers there and taking a look at what is going on in the classroom?

Remember, these teachers are graduating from your universities. They are now going into the classroom, and the children going through this system are now coming to you and they cannot read or write at an eighth grade level. Are you maybe failing the students that are going through your college that are becoming teachers? Are we failing the kids who are in grade school? Absolutely. They cannot read or write when they get out. This is a big problem. Sixty-four percent of 12th graders do not read at a proficient level. SAT scores have dropped by 60 points in 3 decades.

There are two ways to look at what we are going to do as a result, as we face what I think are some disappointing results in education, something we should all be concerned about. We can continue this Washington-centered approach. We can continue saying, you know, just a few more programs and a few more dollars, a few more bureaucrats and a few more buildings and a few more bigger buildings and we will be all right. We will solve this problem.

No, I do not think so. It is time to start maybe rethinking what is going on in these buildings, but it is not a time to add more buildings, more people, and more dollars.

We need to think in this way: How do we empower parents and teachers, the people closest to the students, closest to the kids, how do we empower them to make sure that this child gets the kind of results that we need? It is about teachers, it is about students, and it is about parents. It is not about bureaucracy and bureaucrats who have the student at the end of the system.

We ought to take a look at what the President is proposing: $165 billion

more spending. The President has not learned our lessons.

This assumes that we need more money in Washington and that Washington bureaucrats care more about our children than parents do. That is lesson one. This does not assume this. Much of this spending is going for education, $55 billion more of spending for education over the next 5 years in Washington. This does not demonstrate a lesson learned; that parents care most. This also does not meet the criteria.

He did not learn lesson two. The President's programs are well-intended, but come on, do we really think that 770 programs spending $130 billion per year going through 30 or 40 agencies is going to work better than 760 programs, spending $120 billion? I do not think so. This does not recognize that more money in a failed system is not good policy. This is pouring more money into the same bad system that we have today.

The end result, if we pass what the President wants to do, if we give him more spending, what will these bureaucracies and bureaucrats do for our children?

Think about it. The President wants a building program, so it means that bureaucrats in Washington will now do the building, they will build our buildings at a local level. When we build in Washington, we apply lots of rules and restrictions.

Think about just one thing. when we build buildings and we put Federal dollars in construction projects, in Washington we apply a little-known law called Davis-Bacon. People may recognize that as prevailing wage, which means we have to pay probably higher wages. It means bureaucrats at the local level, individuals at the local level, have to come to Washington to find out the salaries they have to pay their contractors, rather than through competitive bidding.

But another little-known feature of Davis-Bacon, and think about this as we go through the process, Davis-Bacon prohibits the use of volunteer labor. So if you are going to build your school or if you are going to renovate your school, and you say, hey, this would be kind of nice, maybe the government can buy the paint and some of the materials and volunteers can paint our classrooms; if we are going to redo the playground, maybe the government can buy some of the materials and the parents can come and clean up the playground and do some of the construction; sorry, they cannot do that anymore.

Davis-Bacon Federal building laws prohibit the use of volunteer labor on these projects. Not a smart thing, especially when we consider some of the other things the President wants to do.

But we will have bureaucrats who build our buildings. These bureaucrats will then decide about what kind of technology goes in because we are going to put in money for technology, so bureaucrats will decide the technology that goes into the buildings. The President wants to set standards at a national level, which means that he will have a strong role in developing curriculum. He wants to do national testing, so he will test our kids. He wants to certify our teachers, so the bureaucrats in Washington will be certifying our teachers.

We already have programs that teach kids about safe sex, about appropriate or inappropriate drug use. Bureaucrats in Washington are going to continue doing those types of things. Bureaucrats in Washington already decide what our kids can eat for breakfast, what our kids can eat for lunch. We are going to have after-school programs. We are going to have midnight basketball. But other than that, it is your school.

We are going to build the buildings, put in the technology, develop the curriculum, test your kids, certify your teachers, feed them breakfast, feed them lunch, teach them about sex, teach them about drugs, after-school programs, midnight basketball, but hey, other than that, it is your school.

This is an approach that is Washington-centered, making these buildings bigger and more powerful, and we are moving away from parents and teachers and local control. Make no mistake about it, this is a massive shift of power and control to a Washington bureaucracy, away from parents, away from teachers, away from the students, and moving it to people who could not even give you the names of the kids going to the school.

I want to highlight just one other thing that happens here. Remember, our kids cannot read. So rather than going into the classroom and saying our kids are spending 7 to 8 hours in the classroom or 6 to 7 hours in the classroom per day and they cannot read, reading is kind of a fundamental thing, let us take a look at what is going on in the classroom. The student-centered approach would say let us take a look at what is happening with this student, with that teacher in the classroom, and why can this kid not learn to read? We would focus on the classroom.

The Washington approach says, now, let us develop another Band-Aid. Let us develop another program, and let us have tutors. Let us fund the Corporation for National Service to the tune of an extra $200 million. Let me get my pen out. That is $200 million per year. That is how many families paying $5,000 in taxes? That is a family of four. For the next 5 years let us have 40,000 American families pay, not to improve what is going on in the classroom, but to put a Band-Aid on a broken system through the corporation, so they can develop and get what? So they can find volunteers.

Wait a minute. Davis-Bacon and construction, we are going to discourage volunteers; but now for reading, we are going to encourage volunteers. Boy, Washington sure sends some mixed signals. Actually, we are redefining the role of volunteers. We are now redefining volunteers as people who make up to $27,000 per year. That is the Washington bureaucratic definition of a volunteer.

Now, let us go one step further. We are not fixing the system, we are applying a Band-Aid to a system. The only thing that I can say is the President did get one thing right, maybe right in this process. The President had to make a choice. If he believes in doing volunteers in this approach, through a bureaucratic approach, he at least made the right decision, that he was going to use the Corporation for National Service to teach our kids reading. It may or may not work, but we know that they cannot teach our kids math.

The Corporation for National Service, this bureaucracy in Washington with these bureaucrats, the model organization a few months ago had an independent auditing firm come in and say, you know, can your books be audited? Can you tell us where roughly $500 million or $600 million per year is spent, where it goes, how it is spent? It is kind of like the auditors came back and said, sorry, Congress, sorry, oversight subcommittee, asking the kinds of questions we should be asking about where this money is spent, the Corporation for National Service, its books are not auditable.

That is very frustrating, but the President has decided to pour $200 million more into that. We know they cannot teach our kids math. That is a sad enough story as it can be, but we know how AmeriCorps works. Students work, they get paid a stipend. Then they go to college, because they have built up a reserve that says, you know, if you are part of AmeriCorps we are going to set aside money for you to go to college. That money is set aside in a trust fund. This is fairly straightforward. You are part of AmeriCorps. We set aside money. You work, you fill out and complete your time of service, you go to college, AmeriCorps sends a check to the college to help pay your tuition, a fairly straightforward transaction; started from scratch, no new programs, nothing to corrupt the process, it started from scratch.

Bring in the accountants and say, okay, this program has now been working for 3 years. What is the state of the trust account? Are the trust funds auditable? Can you tell us with any sense of integrity who the people are that worked, that actually fulfilled their obligation to receive the college tuition grant, and have we set the money aside, and do we know with any sense of surety that when these people ask for this money, that the right people will be getting the money?

□ 1845

This is not complex math. Fortune 500 companies, a small business person, the little entrepreneur, all of their

books have to be auditable each and every year. If they are not, I do not think the IRS would be very happy with them. The Corporation for National Service, not only are its regular books not auditable; the fund that it started from scratch, the trust fund, is also not auditable.

But you can be sure of a couple of things. Under this model, even though it is absolutely miserable performance, where the books are not auditable, it is a first level of integrity that you have to have in any organization that, even though the books are not auditable, that the trust funds are not auditable, you can be sure that the bureaucrats will receive their salary, that the people who administer these programs at a State and local level will receive their salaries. And that is just a sad example that, even though when we do not get the results at the level of the student through these 760 programs, we do not get the level of performance or results that we need at a student level, bureaucrats and bureaucracy will continue to be paid. And under the current model that we have today, where people, some people believe that more is better, not only for miserable performance but the Corporation for National Service, when they cannot keep their own books, is going to, the President wants a $200 million increase, somewhere in the neighborhood of a 33- to 50-percent increase in their annual funding. That is the reward for not meeting the basics. Think about it. That is in Washington, that is the reward for doing a lousy job. We go back and ask you to do more.

Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we rethought the model and went back to parents and teachers. The difference here in Washington is when we cannot keep the books on an $800 million program, now in my home town the mayor invited my wife and I to a dinner. And we went to dinner and saw that many of the other council members did not have their spouses along.

After a few minutes I kind of asked him, I said, why is my wife here and there is a couple of other wives, but why aren't some of the other spouses here? The answer was, well, every dinner costs us $11 and we really do not have it all in our budget.

At a local level, people are worrying about dollars, $10, $100, $1,000; $1,000 is a lot to many people at the local level. In Washington when a $400 million, $600 million agency cannot keep its books, remember what that means. It means that we cannot tell where the money is going or whether the money has been used for the intended purpose that Congress allocated that money to that institution for. When an organization in Washington says we cannot tell you where the money went, our response is: Great job, we need your help, we are going to expand your role, and we are going to give you $200 million more.

Mr. Speaker, that is why this system feeds bureaucracy, feeds bureaucrats and has at the end of its system, way down at the end is a student. That is why in Washington today, when the dollar comes into Washington, the bureaucracy sucks up 35 to 40 cents of every dollar and never lets us get it back to the student.

I just want to give one more anecdote about why we do not need a million new tutors in Washington. It is already being done. The State of Delaware had a hearing in Delaware, has one Congressman. There are 434 of us, 435 of us. In one congressional district, the State of Delaware, they already have 5,000 volunteers. And do you know what? It is because parents and teachers wanted to help students, and they made the decision all on their own.

What we now have in Washington is saying, they cannot do that. They need a bureaucracy to tell them. Let us spend $200 million doing that and we do not. In my hometown, churches are embracing schools. They are sending tutors in, professionals are going in and helping children. It is already happening. We do not need to move $200 million. We do not need to move $5,000 from 40,000 American families to Washington to get tutors to our kids. It is already happening.

Mr. Speaker, if we take a look at some of the other things that we learned about what the President is proposing from our hearing in Delaware, Delaware had some problems with education. They are making a turnaround. The Governor talked about and many other witnesses talked about what is enabling Delaware to make a difference. Now no, it is not more Federal programs. Like I said, with tutoring they made the difference on their own without any Federal help. Local ownership is what enabled them to produce excellent standards. They worked on developing standards.

They do not need a Federal mandate. They do not want national standards. Federal standards, the President wants to establish standards and work on curriculum and wants to do it in a Washington bureaucracy. What did we learn about standards? Think about what a standard is. A standard is what we are going to tell and teach this student in a classroom. It is one of the most important things that we have in education.

What do we expect this student to learn during this period of time in the classroom, working with that teacher and this parent? There are some that believe that we can develop these standards in Washington, funnel them through some bureaucrats and put it to the student. Sorry. Delaware's experience says, this is a very important issue. When you are talking about this student, when you are talking about this parent who knows the name of this student and that teacher who cares about that student, they are not real interested in a standard coming from Washington. They want to be an active participant in designing the standards for what that student will learn. They may want some help from outside agencies talking about what other people are doing, but they want to work through that process.

Mr. Speaker, in Delaware they went through it. They took 3 years to develop standards. But at the end of that 3-year process, parents, students, and teachers are brought in and agree with much of what was developed because they were involved in the process. A parent understands why there are certain criteria. They understand what is going on be taught and how it is going to be taught. It is a difficult process, but when you are dealing with education and you try to cut the corners and when you try to cut out parents and when you try to cut out teachers, it just does not work.

There is no way a Federal mandated standard will ever work, and, if the Federal mandated standard does not work, Federal testing will never work because what parent is going to feel good about a national test based on a national standard that they do not buy into. We need parents involved in this process, and we cannot short-circuit this process through a bureaucracy.

Mr. Ferguson, the acting State superintendent, said, regarding their standards, the important thing about these standards is that they are our standards. They are the standards of this community. They are the standards of this State. They are the standards of this parent and these teachers, and they were not given to us, they have a sense of ownership.

We have gone around the country. We have taken a look at all different kinds of innovations. We have seen that the wonderful thing about working on this project is on a national basis you hear some of the horror stories about what is going on in education and we are concerned about that.

The other thing that we are seeing is whether you are in New York City, whether you are in LA, whether you are in Phoenix, whether you are in Chicago in a public housing project, whether you are in Cleveland or whether you are in Milwaukee or Detroit, or whether you are in west Michigan, we are seeing some great schools. The thing about these great schools is that in most cases, if not all cases, in those communities parents, students and teachers have been given the flexibility to design the school and the system that works for them.

Mr. Speaker, they are not facing a mandate. This is the kind of school that you need to have. They are working on designing things because in each of those areas the schools need to be different because the needs of the students in each community are different. Not the need for what they are going to learn, they need to learn the same kinds or similar things, but where they come from, the environment that they come from, and so each school has different challenges. Each school has different opportunities and communities need the flexibility.

That is why you see charters. And the charters in Delaware are different

than the charters in Delaware, which are different than the charter schools in Phoenix and these choices in local communities. The choice in Delaware allows full public school choice so a parent can choose the program and the school and the curriculum that best meets the needs of their child. It is enabling parents to become consumers of education. It is empowering parents. It is empowering students and it is empowering teachers.

One of the most exciting things that is happening is that the National Education Association, the National Education Association, the organization that represents teachers, they are going to get involved in the charter school effort. They are going to start I believe four charter schools in different parts of the country. If anybody should be establishing charter schools, I want our teachers to do it. They should be more knowledgeable and better equipped about what needs to go on in the classroom than almost anybody else in our society, those front-line teachers. I am excited about the opportunity and the learning that we can achieve when the National Education Association sets up its charter schools and how that may be a catalyst for learning and for change that can just go throughout our entire public school system, unleashing teachers from the rules and the regulations and the bureaucrats and the bureaucracies that have been defining for them what they need to do, rather than empowering them to do what they want to do and how they can best help their kids.

Can you imagine empowered teachers working with consumers of education, parents, all focused on what the student needs? What a wonderful opportunity to improve education in America and what a much better picture and what a much more optimistic picture that is for America and American education than one which focuses on bureaucracy and bureaucrats.

ARTS AND EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GEKAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about one of the best things that we can do in education for our children. It has been proven over and over again what a wonderful effect it has on them.

Would it surprise you to know that a child in a school in the United States that has 4 years of arts programs, the verbal scores on the SAT's go up 67 points and the math scores go up 45? Would it amaze you to know that the most important thing we can do to cut the dropout rate and the absenteeism is to have children participate in art, proven over and over and over again.

One of the most important ways that we can give a child self-esteem, and so many of them need it, is to give them the ability to create. And once again, we have learned over and over and over again that children who create do not destroy.

All this is done in simple programs in schools all over the United States. And every parent that has ever put on the refrigerator door the drawing brought from home or the little plaster cast of the hand, the things that we keep forever, I think probably everything that my children ever touched is stored away in a box somewhere where I like to take them out and look at them for my memories, every parent who has ever experienced that knows the wonderful feeling that that child has of being able to create and to express.

We are losing whole generations of children these days to violence, to absenteeism, to disinterest, the inability to learn.

□ 1900

What happens? A country faced with problems like that, that says at the same time we are going to turn our back on the one simple cheap thing that we can do to benefit these children. Does it work? You bet.

I wrote legislation to educate homeless children in the United States. It is an astonishing fact that every day in this country between 750,000 and 1 million children are homeless. It is not their fault. Their parents used to work; they just do not anymore.

A lot of people do not understand what homelessness means to a child. They can go to a shelter, but they can only stay there a certain number of days and then they have to move. Or they can live in a State park or a local park maybe 2 weeks, and then they have to move. It is in every respect a nomadic existence.

So we have these numbers of children in the United States unable to get their education, because many times they do not have their birth certificate. It was always a very important thing for us in the United States. No child went to school without their inoculations, their birth certificate, and a permanent address.

This was not an indigenous population in the United States. We had never really took any plans or even discussed any plans on what we would do about kids without a permanent address or who maybe lost their birth certificate in one of those many moves they had to make. So a family that is confronted, let us say, with putting food on a table or duplicating a birth certificate for $10, logically and sensibly is going to opt for food on the table for the children.

So we wrote a little piece of legislation here that said we do not care whether they have their birth certificate or not. We know they are born, they are standing in front of us. We want them educated. The United States cannot go into the next century with children who are unhealthy, untrained, and uneducated.

One of the most important things, again, that has been important to this population and consequently to us is the arts programs, is that we were able to provide these children with the ability to be able to express themselves, to be able to deal with what had happened to them, for the first time to be able to open up to a stranger as they discussed the work that they had done.

So the United States over the years has decided that art may not be too important to us, or that maybe it is only for the rich people who want to go to the museums or the art galleries, and for the rest of us it does not really matter. Well, we could be meeting here in a Quonset hut but we are not.

We are here in a work of art that every day makes all of us who work here not only understand how lucky we are to have been elected, but how blessed we are to work in this building with the American eagle overhead and our first President's wonderful portrait by Stuart over there that every schoolchild knows. The first thing that occurred to me when I got here was that was the original. We have Lafayette over here on the other side and all the wonderful carvings of people who have come before us.

What is it that really tells us what kind of a nation, one that has disappeared off the earth, was like? When we excavate, how do we determine whether they were enlightened, whether they were civilized? Simple. By the art they left behind.

How do we explain to children growing up in the United States what it was like for the pioneers, the people in Conastoga wagons, the people who opened up the West, the patriots? By the art left behind. This Capitol is full of it. This city is full of it. This city is in many ways a work of art.

Can this country afford to be the only industrial country on the face of the earth that determines that art is not important? I do not think so. There is not an industrial country anywhere on the planet that does not have a national budget for the arts; sometimes 1 or 2 percent of their total budget.

What do we do? President Nixon started the National Endowment for the Arts because he thought the United States ought to make some statement as well. And over the years we have whittled away at the money and whittled away at it until now, this year, we are being asked to pay $136 million for arts programs in every nook and cranny in the United States, $136 million, which is a great deal less than the United States spends every year for military bands.

It does not amount to a whole lot in the scheme of things when we think about what it does. Let me give my colleagues some idea of what happens there. Let us talk not about the beauty of it but the economy.

The arts support 1.3 million jobs. The nonprofit arts community generates $36.8 billion annually in economic activity. The arts produces $790 million

in local government revenue and $1.2 billion in State government revenue. And for the $136 million that we hope we can vote this year to put in, we will get back almost $4 billion in taxes paid into the Federal Treasury.

This is not an idle piece of work. I know of no other thing in this Government, and I have served three terms on the Committee on the Budget, I promise my colleagues I know of no other expenditure that we make that brings back that kind of monetary return. It just does not happen.

So if we add to that what we can do for the children in school, something that we struggle every day with, and we just heard the previous speaker talking about children not being able to read or to talk and all these kinds of things, we can see that some of these programs can open them up and help them to do that. Why would we not want to?

Now, I am not going to ask anyone to take my word for it, because I do not altogether understand it myself. But there is a direct correlation between dance and math. No two ways about it. Today, classical music is supposed to stimulate some part of the brain and that then that individual will have a better idea of spacial concepts. That is wonderful.

We do not know how all this works, but we are right now in the decade of the brain. All these wonderful studies have been taking place and we see how certain parts of the brain light up under certain stimulation and we have found out so much.

We have found out, for one thing, that we have to begin at birth, with a baby, to stimulate it, to educate it. We have a short window of opportunity, really, to open up that little mind to be everything that it can be.

It is critically important that we look at the United States and whether we are going to be a participant in this, in this decade of the brain, or are we again going to turn our backs on it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]; and then we will next be joined by my colleague from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and my good friend from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] for holding this special order.

Mr. Speaker, in 1965, Congress established the National Endowment for the Arts. The idea behind the endowment was to create a climate for freedom, freedom of thought, freedom of imagination. Congress found that while no government can create a great artist or a great scholar, it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to encourage freedom of thought, freedom of expression. I believe that we must provide the resources to support these freedoms.

Since that time, our Nation has changed dramatically. We have witnessed what I like to call a nonviolent revolution with the civil rights movement. We have seen a technological revolution in all areas of society. We have seen our Nation grow and really change.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in rural Alabama, in an area without a telephone, without running water, without power. My father was a tenant farmer, a sharecropper. He was not allowed to vote or sit in some public places. But today we can fly through the air like a bird and swim through the water like a fish. We put a man on the Moon. We communicate by satellite, by computer on the Internet.

These revolutions are social revolutions, our cultural revolutions, our revolutions in science and technology, are the results of our collective imagination as a Nation, our sense of direction and our need for growth and change.

Throughout history, as the Nation has grown and changed, it is imagination, it is art, that has uplifted us and guided us and defined us. It is imagination that has made our dreams come true.

Just 2 weeks ago I had a great experience, a wonderful experience. I visited an elementary school in Atlanta called Mary Lin Elementary. I was impressed and amazed by all of the students at this little school. Children as young as 4, in kindergarten, 4 years old, but also children of all ages had drawn pictures of what they understood to be the civil rights movement. These young students, these young bright minds, had decorated every hall in every building with their colorful vision, each drawing different, each drawing unique. Every student was involved. Every student understood something about history through their imagination, through art.

Just yesterday I had lunch with an art teacher from the Atlanta public schools, Ms. Deborah Laden. She told me that she received less than $100 for each student in her class for art education. It is a shame and a disgrace that in a Nation as rich and as powerful as the United States, in a Nation, yes, that has put a man on the Moon, we do not invest more in our children, in their ability to dream dreams and to share and express those dreams.

In the same way children learn through art, we all are inspired by professional artists and others who have taken time to explore human existence and human history. It was President John Fitzgerald Kennedy who once said,

> Behind the storm of daily conflict and crisis, the dramatic confrontations, the tumult of political struggle, the poet, the artist, the musician, continue their quiet work of centuries, building bridges of experience between people, reminding man of the universality of his feelings and desires and despairs, and reminding him that the forces that unite are deeper than those that divide.

President Kennedy went on to say,

> I see little of more importance to the future of our country and our civilization than full recognition of the place of the artist. If art is to nourish the roots of our culture, society must set the artist free to follow his vision.

Today, more than 35 years later, these words are more important than ever. We are in the midst of the information age. Our workers must be able to learn quickly. They must be imaginative thinkers and creative individuals. They must handle the tools of technology with a sense of philosophy, a sense of history, a sense of vision, a sense of community.

With a modest investment, just a little bit, a modest investment, we can help fill in the gaps of American education and encourage art education in our schools. With a very modest investment, we can help decorate every hallway of every school in every State with creative vision of our youngest minds, uplifted and inspired by their own imagination and the imagination of each other.

These young children, because of art, because of their imagination, may grow up to be visionaries, to be scientists, artists, doctors, lawyers, ministers. These young children will lead us into the 21st century.

Some of my colleagues today may ask if we can afford to invest in the arts. Our answer must be, how can we afford not to? Free the artists, provide the necessary resources, let the imagination, the minds run wild. It is what our country, it is what our society is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman again for holding this special order on the arts.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his participation. That was wonderful and I appreciate that very much.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would yield to my colleague from California, [Mr. FARR] and we will have a few discussions here on this same subject.

□ 1915

Mr. FARR of California. I thank my distinguished colleague from New York for yielding, and the Speaker tonight. We spent a wonderful weekend in his beautiful State of Pennsylvania.

Walking over to the Capitol tonight to join in this colloquy on the arts, I could not help but think as I looked up at the sky and saw the crescent Moon up there, just the wisp of a crescent Moon over the Capitol, how this building is indeed a living museum of art. It is a living museum of history, a living museum of democracy in the United States. Yet more than ever what this building demonstrates is the creative talent, the historic talent of this country displayed in paintings, displayed in photographs, displayed in works of sculpture in Statuary Hall, displayed in the architecture of the building, displayed as a symbol to the greatest democracy in the world.

And yet Members who serve in Congress like to think that there is an option in this country, that arts are essentially a disposable commodity, that it is something frilly. I cannot help but

think, as we talk so much about the need for this country's underlying security and its economic creativity, that the most creative aspect of America is in the diversity of its arts. It is the engine of our economy, and where that begins is in schools. It also begins in the home. It also begins in the political families that we live with.

This weekend when we went on the retreat, the bipartisan retreat to talk about how we can bring more civility to Congress, to this House, to this very Chamber we are in tonight, I could not help but think that as the families engaged in this discussion with their children there, that what the leadership of this House provided was essentially a weekend of arts for the children. That is what they chose, as we discussed among ourselves. They chose to give the children art so that the children could be very creative, and every parent blessed that.

And yet some of those parents come here at the same time the next day or this next week or the next month and will do everything they can to discourage the funding of arts through the public sector. What we are about is education in America. What education is about is an educated work force. And what a work force is about is building an economy. And what that economy is about is in a global, competitive society, is being a little bit more creative. It is not just the creative mind. It is the creative fingers, it is the creative toes. Therefore, if we really want this country to be strong and independent, we have got to invest in the arts.

When I was in the State legislature in California, I cochaired the Joint Committee on the Arts. We invested in the arts in California. Why? Not because it was an optional thing to do; it was because industrial development in California demands it. The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce demands that we invest in arts because they sell arts very well in Los Angeles. San Francisco demands that you invest in the arts because San Francisco is known for its arts.

New York, where you come from, what would New York be without the arts? What would the city of New York be? Look how much money the city puts into it, private sector and public sector money. And yet again where we fail to really commit ourselves to the arts is in our public school education program.

In California we have made it so important that we require that in order to graduate from high school, every student must take at least a year of arts, or we give them the option of a year of foreign languages. Both of those are, we think, skills necessary to compete in the 21st century.

We are here tonight to remind our colleagues that the arts are not a frivolous, disposable commodity in America. They are essential not only to our cultural well-being but to our economic well-being.

I applaud the gentlewoman for her dedication to the arts, for forming the Arts Caucus, for allowing high school children from all over the United States to be in competitive contests in their districts and hang their art here in the Capitol so that they can be role models to the thousands, to the millions of students who walk through this Capitol and see children their own age being able to promote the arts.

I thank the gentlewoman for allowing me to join in on her colloquy on the arts, and I would remind all our colleagues that the arts are some of the most essential products of American freedom in a democratic society, an expression of one's self, of community and of nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the importance of the arts in our Nation and our communities.

The National Endowment for the Arts, the NEA, and the National Endowment for the Humanities, the NEH, serve important educational, cultural and economic roles in our society. The benefits of the Endowments for the Arts and Humanities have often been overlooked. While much attention has been paid to a few controversial grants, most NEA money goes to support important community programs such as museums, libraries, schools, and orchestras. The NEA is a great investment in the economic growth of every community and country. The nonprofit arts industry alone generates $36.8 billion annually in economic activity and supports 1.3 million jobs and returns $3.4 billion to the Federal Government in income taxes.

In terms of dollars and cents, the United States spends only 64 cents per person to support the arts each year, a level 50 times lower than other industrialized countries. The arts industry attracts tourist dollars, stimulates business development, spurs urban renewal, and improves the total quality of life for our cities and towns.

Additionally, the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities broaden public access to the arts so all Americans can participate in and enjoy and learn from the arts, improving the quality of life of our children and families. The NEA supports educational programs such as teacher institutes, museum exhibitions and advanced study grants that enrich the cultural livelihood of our communities and our Nation.

Not only do these programs ensure accessibility to our museums, universities and libraries, but they also serve as a vital link to our children's education. These programs are an integral part of our comprehensive education that help broaden the horizons of our children and instill in them a love of learning. They represent our Nation's cultural heritage, creativity, and pride.

Without the assistance of the NEA, various programs vital to my district would not be possible. The Museum of Fine Arts of Houston, the Alley Theater of Houston, the Dance on Tour Program and the Houston Grand Opera would be in jeopardy.

Young Audiences of Houston is another valuable organization which works in my district, that demonstrates the beneficial impacts and contributions the arts have in our communities. Celebrating its 40th anniversary this year, Young Audiences of Houston is 1 of 32 independent chapters of Young Audiences, Inc. that form the Nation's largest nonprofit arts and education organization and the only arts organization to be a 1994 recipient of the National Medal of Arts. Young Audiences is dedicated to educating children through the arts and to making the arts an integral part of the school curriculum.

Young Audiences' highly participatory, curriculum-related arts programs reinforce classroom instruction, foster creative thinking skills, awaken interest in learning and broaden student understanding of world arts and cultures. Emphasis is placed on multicultural programming and on serving children at risk in schools with high need. The arts provide positive role models, enhance self-esteem, foster academic achievement, encourage students' sense of ownership in the educational process and help young people elect to remain in school. Furthermore, Young Audiences contributes to the economic vigor that a healthy cultural climate brings to the city and helps keep Houston in the forefront of arts education reform.

I congratulate Young Audiences on their 40th anniversary and commend them for their dedication to educating children and communities through the arts. The NEA and the NEH are at the forefront in the preservation of our historical and cultural heritage, encouraging the use of technology, strengthening education, and broadening access to the arts for all Americans to participate in and enjoy. Our continued support of the arts will enhance our children's future, their educational development, economic growth and their quality of life.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] for coming and joining us this evening. That was a very important message. We are trying to reinforce what art means to children in making better students, cutting out the dropout rate, all the wonderful things we want for the children at risk.

I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], the co-chair of the Congressional Members Organization for the Arts.

Mr. HORN. I thank my colleague from New York. She had done just a splendid job when she chaired the arts caucus a few years ago when I first came here in 1993, and I am delighted that she is reinvigorating it, because there are many Members in this Chamber that have strong support for the arts.

Increasingly in our communities, there is stronger and stronger support for the arts. One of the reasons there is stronger support is that the National Endowment for the Arts has done, on the whole, a splendid job. So has the National Endowment for the Humanities. So has the Institute for Museum Services. These are minusculely funded by the Federal Government, but they make a difference, because we have the opportunity to engage with partnerships at the local level. The match money is very effective in involving people.

I am fortunate in my district, which includes Long Beach to Downey in southern California, Los Angeles County, that we have vigorous arts groups, and we have had excellent support from the NEA. That is very important to our museums. The Long Beach Museum of Art, the California State University Art Museum. All of those have been recognized as having high quality, that involve people, involve young people.

The symphonies in several of the cities in my district go out and reach out into the schools so young people can see what I had the opportunity to see when I was 5 or 6 years old. I did not know much about music at the age of 5 and 6 except the piano and singing around the table with everybody else. But one night in Hollister, CA, population 3,500 at that time, in San Benito County whose total population even though it was 60 miles long was about 13,000 people, to the high school came a wonderful musical organization, a symphony. Everybody dressed in the magical black tie and their instruments shiny. How did they end up in Hollister, CA, where there were not too many people? It is because the Works Progress Administration, the WPA, had funded them to go into the rural areas of our State where all of us were growing up pretty much on ranches, a few grew up in the towns, and they performed some of the great music that night. It made a difference in my life. I decided I wanted to be a music major, which I was through high school. I did not pursue it that much in college because I realized I did not have the world's greatest talent on the French horn. I was OK, but not the greatest talent, and that my desire to be a conductor would probably be a dubious desire, although I had been the conductor of all the student orchestras. But that made a difference in my life, and that has made a difference in millions of young people's lives.

A dean I had at California State University Long Beach when I was president, I made her Dean of Fine Arts, Maxine Merlino. She is in her eighties. She holds the world's swimming championship for her age group. She was doing murals here in Washington, DC in what we know as the Old Post Office down a few blocks from the White House, and those murals are still here, and they are bringing joy to people as they look at those murals.

We can replicate that, in towns, in communities, in rural areas, in mountain areas, and in our great urban areas. It is tremendously important to continue these endowments. We have got a few critics. Yes, they object to 10 grants out of the 100,000 made. That is not bad. That beats baseball's scoring. It beats football's scoring. Obviously when you are in the arts, some things are going to be controversial. That does not mean we need to approve them. Just do not go see them. Go look at something else. Art has different tastes for different people. We have got to remember, this is a country of great diversity, and we need to bring out in the various immigrant groups, as we have in Long Beach with the Cambodian group, the groups from Laos and their beautiful work that is on display in the various museums in the city of Long Beach.

Arts are also increasingly entrepreneurial. Yesterday my colleague from New York and I had the pleasure of sponsoring with several of our colleagues the visit of Bill Strickland from Pittsburgh. He has been awarded the Genius Award of the MacArthur Foundation, and he truly is a genius. He was a young man who could barely read, who dropped out, who took up ceramics and from that artistic career he gained the self-esteem that he needed, and by one chance after the other, he incrementally has built one of the major centers of not only the arts but a number of other things, because one thing led to the other. And he has worked with out-of-work members from the steel mills, welfare mothers and others, and, as we all know, we are talking about the welfare bill in here and how do you get people into the job market that have never had an opportunity to be in the job market? He has shown it can be done.

□ 1930

What has he developed? As I say, he started with ceramics, and pretty soon people sold some of the ceramics work. He trained them as artists. Then he worked with industry, and he had pharmaceutical training, he had television training, he had a whole series of things: flower gardens, horticulture, a catering service developed to feed the students that came to his school, an integrated thing, a small community in one of the worst districts in Pittsburgh where people would often be afraid to even go to an event at night. And in his beautifully designed buildings, which have been the work of both corporations, individual philanthropists and just plain knowing how to make the money in your food operations and your sale of art he has developed a marvelous pinnacle and vista where young people and young and old can come and appreciate what has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the time she has given me, and I wish her well in this endeavor.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. HORN, you know one of the things that he told us yesterday that really stuck with me was that he has this wonderful building and all these students who come there, and they have been there for 10 years, and 2 blocks away is the school that he went to as a youngster, and it has bars on the windows and police cars outside and people patrolling the perimeter. But in his facility two blocks away he said that he needs no guards in the daytime, there has never been any graffiti, and despite all of the important and expensive equipment and things he has inside that building nothing has ever been touched.

Mr. HORN. That is right, and he also said that since he happens to be African-American and the African-American black students that go there, and white students go there, there has never been one incident, not one.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Once again we just find that arts brings people together and does the kind of thing that we want for human beings, and it really would be dreadful if we made a statement here on this floor that it did not matter to us.

Mr. HORN. And it seems to me that whether it be the WPA Orchestra in 1935 that I saw or the hundreds of orchestras that have benefited from grants from the endowment and their outreach into schools they can change people's vision, and we all know about the books.

One of the professors at California State University Long Beach wrote a best seller called ''Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain''; Dr. Betty Edwards of our department of art, and another one on ''Drawing on the Artist Within.'' A million copies of the first book, half a million copies of the second.

People can learn to be artists not necessarily for the commercial aspects but for their own enjoyment, and I have felt for 30 years at least that if we stress the right side of the brain in the schools, not just the left side of the brain, important though that is with mathematics and all the rest, we would build self-esteem in these children, and we would then transfer them into success in some of the mathematical, history, whatever subjects, languages, all the rest. But we need to help people develop their creative talents, and it has made a difference.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. And we find that once that right brain is developed it spills over on to the left-hand side, and, as I pointed out earlier, that just 4 years of art, the verbal scores on SAT's will go up 65 points, and math, 45, and I know of no other thing we can do for these students to get that kind of result.

Mr. HORN. I happened to go to a high school where we had an outstanding music department. We had a 100-piece concert band, a 60-voice choir and a 60-piece orchestra. Now that was in a school of 500 where only maybe 10 out of the 110 graduates went on to college, but it made a difference in peoples' lives to hear Tchaikovsky, to hear Brahms, to hear Beethoven, to have

tears come to your eyes. It makes you a human being, and that is what we ought to be encouraging in this country.

Think of this king of this or that country had not been funding money to Beethoven or to Mozart. Those were the patrons of their day two centuries ago. What a difference their music has made in our lives. Mozart died, as we all know, at a very young age, in his thirties, and Tchaikovsky and others had patrons.

Well, there are still patrons for our symphonies, and some large symphonies frankly I do not worry about; they can get the money in a major city. But it is those middle-sized cities and those very small cities that are just beginning in a musical adventure that we need to give encouragement and stimulus to.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. That is the best thing about the NEA. It wants to make sure that every nook and cranny from sea to shining sea has the same opportunity.

I yield now to my colleague, CONNIE MORELLA, from Maryland.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York, my good friend, Mrs. SLAUGHTER, for yielding to me and for the special order on an issue that we all believe is so very important.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to express my support for the arts and to highlight the important world of the arts and the educational development of our children and the economic growth of our country.

The arts and humanities have absorbed their fair share of budget cuts over the past 2 years. Funding for the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities has been slashed by 40 percent. I oppose any efforts to eliminate or make further cuts in funding for the NEA and the NEH.

I wholeheartedly believe that Government should support the arts, and according to a Lou Harris Poll I am in sync with most of the Nation. The latest Lou Harris public opinion poll concludes that 79 percent of the American public favors a governmental role in funding the arts. Sixty-one percent would pay $5 more in taxes to support the arts, and 56 percent would pay $10 more in taxes for the arts.

Mr. Speaker, 86 percent of America's adults participate in one or more of the arts. Frankly you know that is 33 percent more than participate; by that I mean vote in Presidential elections. Cultural funding is a mere two one-hundredths of 1 percent of our multi-billion-dollar budget. We spend 70 cents per person on the humanities, 64 cents per person on the arts, on history, English literature, foreign languages, sociology, anthropology, and other disciplines. Seventy cents a person buys teacher training programs. These programs provide professional development opportunities for our teachers to increase their knowledge in their field and pass it on to their students. It is estimated that the 1,000 teachers who participate each summer in NEH-funded summer institutes directly impact 85,000 students per year.

In Maryland the arts are an important part of the economy. In 1995, for example, the arts contributed $634 million to the State's economy through direct spending by arts organizations and audiences. More than $21 million was generated in State and local taxes paid by arts organizations and audiences, and 19,000 jobs were generated. On our National Arts Advocacy Day, March 11, 1997, members of the Maryland Citizens for the Arts visited Capitol Hill and brought with them a special message: ''The arts stimulate economic growth.'' For every dollar the NEA invests in communities there is a twenty-fold return in jobs, services and contracts.

The arts invest in our communities, the arts develop in our citizens a sense of community, and they contribute to the liveability for families in that community.

The arts are basic to a thorough education. Student achievement and test scores in academic subjects can improve when the arts are used to assist learning in mathematics, social studies, creative writing and communication skills, and I am particularly proud that the chairman of the Maryland Citizens for the Arts is Eliot Pfanstiel who is a constituent of mine.

Mr. Speaker, our legislative agenda could have far reaching implications for the cultural vitality of our Nation. Art is the symbolic expression of who we are. It is how we remember. It is important, even vital, that we support and encourage the promotion of the arts and humanities so that the rich and cultural story of our past can be made available to future generations.

I have often liked the expression that the arts are the border of flowers around the pot of civilization, but I would say they are more than the border of flowers. They really are also the border of nutrients, what we really need for our subsistence and for our cultural vitality and for the greatness of our country.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York again for arranging this special order, and I know she is so important to all of us.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank you so much for being here, and I appreciate your message.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close with two very brief examples of what we were talking about with the revitalization of towns' economy through art. The Northeast has suffered out migration, as you know, over a number of years, and one little town in New York State called Peekskill was really in very bad condition. The downtown area was basically dead, theatres had closed, restaurants closed. It was not much happening there until a sort of spillover from New York City. A famous artist came into Peekskill, and a well-known sculptor took over the old movie theater. It was perfect for his massive work, and galleries began to open, and then there was a massive change in Peekskill. People began to come in droves. The restaurants opened up again because people needed someplace to live, they needed a place to stay, they needed a place to buy gasoline, they needed a place for snacks, they needed things for souvenirs for their children, and that economy was brought back because of the art that was in Peekskill.

Providence, RI has just recently embarked on the same kind of an adventure in their downtown area. They have turned parts of abandoned factories and other buildings into places where performing artists and other artists can work in a group in one square mile of downtown Providence. It has been absolutely an amazing revitalization. It has brought back that city of 160,000 people to life and has stopped the out migration to other parts of the State and to the country.

Art speaks for itself, but I do think it is important for me and for my colleagues to say to you that we are not asking here for anything that is frivolous, for anything that does not pay its own way, for anything that does not help our children in incalculable ways.

So, Mr. Speaker, when art reauthorization comes to the floor of the House, I urge my colleagues to support it, and I hope that everybody in America will as well.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to celebrate the arts in America and to call on my colleagues to fully fund the National Endowment for the Arts [NEA], the National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH], and the Institute of Museum and Library Services [IMLS].

Whether it is visual art, performance art, music, poetry, literature, or historical preservation, the NEA, the NEH, and the IMLS have all served our Nation well, and America is stronger because of them.

I am proud that my district includes most of the Broadway theater and many of the nonprofit theater institutions, including Lincoln Center and the New York Shakespeare Festival. It also includes the SoHo art galleries, museums, radio and television studios, record and film companies, and hundreds of individual artists, writers, dancers, and musicians. The positive economic impact of this arts community has long been documented. The contributions they make to the economy and to the quality of life in New York is immense. In fact, when people nationally and internationally think about New York City, they often think about its cultural richness.

Other cities are beginning to realize that the arts draw people into the city and provide a valuable economic boost to the local economy. As a result, mayors across the country are rushing to build arts and cultural centers in their own cities and are seeking national support for their efforts. Just as the arts community in New York receives a portion of Federal support, so too should these newly emerging artistic centers. That is just one reason why we will need to increase arts funding to expand the reach of the arts to people throughout the Nation.

Another reason to support the national endowments is the nature of the projects they fund. Let me give you some examples. The NEA supported a consortium project to expand Alvin Ailey's summer dance camps for inner-city youths in Philadelphia and Chicago; the NEA supported a program to create a national model for an integrated kindergarten through sixth grade arts curriculum to improve learning in all subjects and offer new ways to engage students; the NEA supported an initiative to provide music instruction for financially disadvantaged minority children in New York City public schools; the NEA supported a program to teach playwriting to young people ages 9 to 13 in one of New York City's toughest neighborhoods; and the NEA supported a project to produce and broadcast telecasts of the public television series ''Live from Lincoln Center.'' Now it is possible for folks in Wyoming and Indiana, not just New York City, to enjoy Lincoln Center performances. Helping children learn, reaching out to disadvantaged communities, boosting the economy, and providing national access to great performances—this is what the NEA is doing in 1997 to support the arts and to improve America, and that is why we in Congress must continue our bipartisan support for the arts. In fact, more projects like these deserve to be supported by the Federal Government to inspire our young people, to encourage them to nurture their natural talents, and to live up to their potential.

Therefore, not only must we preserve our cultural agencies, but we must increase their funding substantially, so that they can better serve our people.

Without these cultural agencies many beneficial projects would not exist, and America would be weaker without them. Think about how the arts touch and improve all of our lives. One way to do this is to imagine what the world would be like without art. Some have suggested to me that we ought to have a national arts awareness day. A day when we try to live without art. When we wake up without music, when we work in offices without wall hangings, when TV's don't work, when the theaters and opera houses are closed, when museums and libraries don't open their doors, and when even the reading of books is not allowed. A day when all of our national monuments are cloaked in black and art is taken out of our public spaces. The Capitol building itself would have to close down, because in every corridor and on every wall there are examples of public support for the arts—statues, paintings, and historic documents all serve to enrich this building and those of us who work here. Even the thought of a day without art is frightening. So, we must all recognize how integral the arts are to our life experiences, how they serve to improve the lives of Americans, and how they enrich us as a people and as a nation.

The Congress must continue its support for the arts if America, as President Clinton noted in his State of the Union Address, is to remain as a beacon, not only of liberty, but of creativity.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to denounce the shameful war being waged on the arts and humanities. The National Endowment for the Arts [NEA] and National Endowment for the Humanities [NEH] have had fundamental impacts on our lives and our children's lives over the past 30 years. It is difficult to comprehend reasons behind vicious attacks on the very things that enrich our lives through music, art, dance, history, and other means of celebrating culture.

The appropriations process of the 104th Congress severely cut funding for the NEA and NEH. The NEA suffered a cut of 39 percent from $162 million in fiscal year 1995 to $99.5 million in fiscal year 1997, and the NEH, a cut of 36 percent from $172 million in fiscal year 1995 to $110 million in fiscal year 1997. These cuts have forced the NEA and NEH to reduce staff and grants to States, which has hurt local communities in every congressional district.

Some would have gone farther and had these agencies slated for termination—the NEA by September 30, 1997, and the NEH by September 30, 1998. Fortunately, such proposals were eliminated before final passage of the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act of 1997. We must keep them from ever becoming law and prevent the NEA and NEH from being eliminated.

Legislation to reauthorize the NEA and NEH—only to have them phased out—was rushed last year through the formerly named Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. The arguments used then against both agencies were skewed. Those wanting to eliminate the NEA overemphasized a few, select projects believed improper for the Government to fund. Efforts to typify these projects which make up a very small percentage of all projects handled by the NEA jeopardized all other educational and meaningful theater, dance, orchestra, literature, folk arts, arts education, and many other activities enjoyed in our communities. The NEH was likewise brought into the mix.

Such tactics are still being employed particularly by NEA opponents, despite several changes in the operation of this agency under the leadership of its Chair, Jane Alexander. Throughout 1994, the NEA performed a comprehensive review of grant review and monitoring procedures, tightened guidelines, and eliminated subgranting to third party entities which had allowed projects to bypass strict NEA application review. In 1995, the NEA conducted a reduction-in-force by 40 percent, while being threatened with further restrictions by Congress to eliminate grants to individual artists and abolish seasonal operating support to organizations. These additional restrictions became law in April 1996, following weeks of an unprecedented Government shutdown, included in the omnibus appropriations bill. At the end of 1996, the NEA released its first round of grants under a newly revamped grant structure, approving more than 300 projects totaling almost $18 million.

The NEA has clearly been responding to direction from Congress to rework the way it operates. It is wrong for this agency to be further subjected to unreasonable scrutiny and criticism.

Similar hostility toward the NEH is unwarranted and unjustified.

This Congress must approve President Clinton's request to restore funding for the NEA and NEH to adequate levels at $136 million for each agency. Many State budgets are already strained and cannot substitute for Federal support from the NEA and NEH.

In fiscal year 1997 in the State of Hawaii alone, the NEA funded the Hawaii Alliance for Arts in Education at $50,000 for Hula Ki'i—a complex of Hawaiian traditional arts to be integrated into school curricula on the islands of Moloka'i, Oahu, and Kaua'i. The NEA has also funded the State Foundation on Culture and the Arts in Honolulu to support a 2-year statewide traditional arts apprenticeship program and production of a radio series featuring documentary interviews with apprenticeship participants. I find these and other projects given grants in the past to be very worthwhile and valuable to residents of Hawaii, as well as tourists visiting my State.

The NEH has, since 1977, approved challenge grants to Hawaii totaling $910,700, which has allowed humanities institutions to raise more than $2.7 million in private funding.

For example, Hawai'i Pacific University is using a $575,000 NEH challenge grant to raise more than $1.7 million in private gifts for a self-sustaining endowment that will support a visiting professorship in the humanities, a senior chair in world history, and information technology acquisitions. NEH also helped in the wake of destruction caused by Hurricane Iniki by making eight emergency grants to damaged libraries, archives, and museums totaling $202,000.

We must continue to support the NEA and NEH on the merits of positive impacts these agencies have in our local communities. I urge my colleagues to support restoration of funding for both agencies, and continued dedication to arts and humanities.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my support for continued Federal funding for the arts, which play a critical role in our communities and our schools. I would like to thank my colleague from New York, Congresswoman SLAUGHTER, for scheduling this special order.

As a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, I take a special interest in protecting the future of art programs. Because most cultural programs cannot survive solely on private funding, we must continue to ensure they receive adequate public support.

The arts play an essential role throughout our Nation, in both rural and urban areas. In my district of Queens, I am pleased to represent a number of theaters, museums, and dance groups who enrich our neighborhoods with their talents. Funding cuts would be devastating for these organizations. In fiscal year 1997, I was pleased to see 12 cultural groups in my district received Federal grants for their projects. In addition, I have been pleased to participate in the congressional art competition, where one of my young constituents, Ji Mi Yang, was the most recent winner from the Seventh District. I look forward to participating in this competition again in 1997.

Art programs play a vital role in our communities and in our schools. By enhancing art programs in our schools, we encourage the creative side of students while producing more well-rounded, self-confident individuals. Art programs enhance our communities. People of all social classes enjoy music, theater, art, and dance. Bringing these enjoyments to our neighborhoods strengthens the local economy while enhancing cultural understanding.

President Clinton articulated his strong support for the arts and humanities during his State of the Union speech. Recently, the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities released a report, ''Creative America,'' which reemphasized the need to support

art programs and made several recommendations for strengthening cultural support in our society.

During the 105th Congress, we will continue to debate the future of Federal funding for the arts and I urge my colleagues to join me in continuing to support funding for vital cultural programs.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, what I have found to be most inspiring in my life is the act of giving from people and organizations that have very little for themselves. This exemplary behavior is often exhibited by citizens in our nonprofit groups who, despite serious budget constraints, seem to be able to reach down deep and come up with a little more for those around them. The NEA and NEH are two such agencies.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has again written a letter urging the President, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, and Speaker LOTT to consider that,

> The arts and humanities serve as an essential and forceful vehicle to educate our citizens, help our struggling youth, spur economic growth in our communities, and bring us together as a nation.

And I could not agree with this sentiment more.

As a proud Representative of one of the world's most celebrated cultural centers, I am appalled that this body would consider zeroing out funds for two of the most judicious and economical organizations by any business' standards. The fact is, that since the 40-percent reduction in arts funding, the American public spends only 38 cents per person to fund the largest cultural voice in America. The fact is, all other developed nations spend more than 2 to 10 times as much as the United States. The fact is, through its public-private partnerships, the NEA draws roughly $12 for every $1 in Federal funding it is awarded. The fact is, the arts have generated billions of dollars through many of our industries and return over 10 percent of what it earns through taxes. The fact is, the nonprofit arts industry represents nearly 1 percent of our work force.

There are many, many more economic reasons to support the NEA and NEH—we all know them, and yet the Republican leadership is still on the warpath to kill Federal sponsorship of the arts. As far as I am concerned, the fight to end our Federal arts institutions is yet another assault on children. These are not the children of the privileged as the Republican leadership would have us believe, but the kids who are, at their best, culturally deprived, and at their worst, at-risk youth with little in their life to keep them going.

I am extremely honored to serve and be served by what I consider the single greatest arts region in the world. New York City is not only revered for its famous collections and prosperous operas and dance productions, but because it has a rich tradition of sharing these treasures with those less fortunate within the community and throughout the United States. The wealthy will most likely always have their cultivation, but Federal dollars through the NEA and NEH provides access for those who would not. And even though Harris polls still show that Americans want higher investment in the arts, I think that we have no idea how these agencies touch our lives.

We can find so much waste in our Government departments, not least of all Defense, but the NEA and NEH have the most flawless budgetary records. The radical right has been very clever in distorting small glitches in NEA grants and have purposely misled the public. In reality, the NEA and the NEH are the greatest gifts we can offer our children and future generations and one of the most generous outreach services we can provide to the public.

I think it is important to remember that only positive energy comes from these programs. We cannot lose when we invest in the arts. This meager investment helps us to learn more about our history and ourselves and conveys to us our common humanity and I would loathe to see the dying of this outstanding legacy.

I fully stand by the President's decision to restore funding to these agencies to what they were a few years ago and am pleased to stand with my colleagues from across the aisle who understand what the value of these agencies is to the greatest Nation in the world. I would also like to thank my friend and colleague, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, for her tireless efforts in defending the arts and for her most recent undertaking in rejuvenating the Congressional Member Organization for the Arts.

Please support including the arts in our national agenda by fully funding the NEA, NEH, and IMLS at the President's suggested levels.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, we often lose sight of the positive effect that music, painting, theater, and dance have on our lives and the lives of our children. With that, I rise today as a reminder of the importance of the arts.

Beyond the metropolitan theaters and museums, the arts touch our remote suburbs and rural areas through dance troupes and local choirs. Folk art festivals across the country provide an arena for creative expression that might be overlooked by the commercial arts industry. These local initiatives, in turn, spur the economy through increased tourism, and encourage a sense of community.

In my home county of Suffolk, NY, approximately 100 arts organizations employ 400 full-time employees and over 2,000 part-time employees. The arts generate nearly $150 million in revenue for that county alone.

However, exposure to the arts does much more than expand the job market. Support for the arts carries over into the classroom and the workplace. Recent studies have shown higher SAT scores among high school students with an art background and stronger math skills among children who study music at an early age.

Perhaps more important are the analytic and creative skills developed through involvement with the arts. These skills not only help children excel in our classrooms, but help adults excel in the workplace. Think of your own office. Just as we in Congress expect innovative thinking from our staff, all industry relies on resourceful and imaginative workers to remain strong.

The arts have the potential to enrich the lives of all Americans. Without our support, they may simply become the privilege of an urban elite. I urge my colleagues to consider the many benefits of the arts.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior will receive testimony on fiscal year 1998 appropriations for the National Endowment for the Arts. These are very important deliberations. I believe they will provide a very important barometer as to whether the 105th Congress will return this body to a course of bipartisan sanity and civility.

I believe those who pursued a strategy of defunding and dismantling the NEA in the 104th Congress made a mistake. I believe those who seized upon a few questionable grants to attempt to undo what has been achieved in 31 years, with consistent bipartisan support, were misguided. I hope that this Congress will reverse that course and support the President's proposal to strengthen the NEA.

I believe efforts to defund the NEA in the 104th were bad public policy. It was bad public policy because it was indiscriminate in its effort to correct a perceived wrong. If indeed the peer panel review system, in a few instances, made decisions of questionable taste with regard to what the American people would want to support with public funds, that was not a sufficient reason to reduce the NEA's appropriation by nearly 40 percent.

When we reflect on what the arts mean to this society, I think we will all see that supporting the NEA is something on which we should all agree. We need to reflect on the power of the arts to bring the many ingredients of the American melting pot, or as Marc Morial, the mayor of New Orleans, recently called it, the American gumbo, together in savory harmony.

This harmony is not always easy or obvious. Nevertheless, I can't think of anything else that is more in the national interest than the promotion of understanding and the exploration of the complexity of our identity. As the agency best equipped and most directly tasked to encourage the purposes of art, the NEA should be treated as a budgetary priority, not as a budgetary luxury. The NEA should not be viewed as expendable because it is, in fact, essential.

Do we really want to jeopardize programs like the Mosaic Youth Theater of Detroit, an afterschool program that develops young theater talent in a multicultural setting? Through this program young people receive movement and voice training. They are instructed in scriptwriting and technical production. They create original works and apply what they have learned in performances at community centers, hospitals, and nursing homes. Through a 1-week residency at a college campus, these youth are exposed to university life. I submit to you that this program is far more typical of what the NEA supports than the handful of grants that were used to shock the 104th Congress into reducing support for that agency.

The American people have made it clear that they want change, and that they expect this change to spring from bipartisan efforts. Americans want thoughtful change. In the 104th Congress, NEA funding came under indiscriminate attack. Fortunately, these attacks were moderated, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in the 105th Congress to further show our support for the arts.

As a result of NEA funding cuts in the 104th Congress, my district, the 14th District of Michigan, received exactly zero in direct funds for fiscal year 1996. NEA funding for Michigan went from $697,000 in fiscal year 1995 to $520,000 in fiscal year 1996, a reduction of 25 percent. By the way, these levels of funding demonstrate just how specious the budget-busting argument is when applied to the NEA. One needs the most powerful of electron microscopes to find such amounts in a Federal

budget that has topped $1.5 trillion in the last several fiscal years.

As many of you know, I have had a longstanding and deep commitment to American music, especially jazz. The downsizing of the NEA, dictated by the 104th Congress, led to an elimination of the NEA's music program and of all individual grants to jazz artists, with the exception of the Jazz Masters Awards.

How does that sound? The world's greatest democracy eradicates its music program? The world's greatest democracy eliminates funding for individuals who travel the globe as cultural ambassadors, demonstrating in their very art the superiority of the democratic form of government? I would say it sounds like the Nation's leading arts agency was forced to virtually abandon what the 100th Congress, in House Concurrent Resolution 57, which ''designated as a rare and valuable national American treasure * * *.''

I am sure that there are thousands of artists and creative workers of all disciplines who feel similarly abandoned. I hope that the 105th Congress will be remembered for many positive achievements, foremost among them, the restoration and strengthening of the NEA.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF THE JAMES GUELFF BODY ARMOR ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK] is recognized for 13 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, before the gentlewoman from New York retires from the floor I would just like to add that as a member of the congressional arts caucus I certainly do support her position here tonight, and I enjoyed listening to her special order, and I would just like to add that I think that the arts signify the heart and soul of a nation and its people, and the U.S. Congress should continue its funding of the arts and humanities, and I join with you in that effort.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to announce that last week I reintroduced legislation which would prohibit the mail-order sale of bulletproof vests and body armor to all individuals except law enforcement or public safety officers. My legislation, H.R. 959, would require that the sale, transfer, or acquisition of body armor to anyone other than law enforcement or public safety officers be conducted in person. In essence, what my bill does, it prevents the mail order of body armor. You can still purchase it, but you would no longer be able to purchase it through the mail.

My bill is entitled the James Guelff Body Armor Act of 1997 and is named for a San Francisco police officer named Guelff who was killed in 1994 by a gunman wearing a bulletproof vest and Kevlar helmet. More than 100 police officers of the San Francisco police department were called to a residential area where the gunmen fired in excess of 200 rounds of ammunition. Several officers actually ran out of ammunition in their attempt to stop the heavily armed gunmen and heavily protected gunmen. Mr. Guelff, who was killed, was raised in my northern Michigan district in Marquette, MI.

□ 1845

As a former law enforcement officer, I know all too well the challenges confronting those who serve to protect public safety and fight crime. We all saw the vivid and terrifying film from the botched California bank robbery last week, demonstrating that body armor gives criminals an unfair advantage during gunfights with police. Eleven Los Angeles police officers and six civilians were injured in that gunfight. Thousands of rounds were fired by two criminals, both of whom were wearing full protective body armor.

Witnesses from the crime scene reported that the bullets fired from the police officers' guns bounced off the bank robbers and mushroomed as they fell to the ground. Had my legislation become law in the 104th Congress, it would have made it more difficult for those criminals to obtain body armor that protected them during the gunfight with police.

We just do not have to look to California for examples of the way criminals use body armor. Last year in Michigan a 14-year-old driving a stolen car in the early morning hours was dressed in body armor from head to toe. You do not need body armor to steal a car, and police believe that the youth was going to kill an individual. It was a contract murder.

I have heard from law enforcement officers all across America about the increasing occurrences of drug dealers and other suspects who possess and use body armor in their confrontations with the police. Criminal elements are being transformed into unstoppable terminators with virtually no fear of the police or other people who are trying to apprehend them. These heavily protected criminals are capable of unleashing total devastation on civilians and police officers alike, and the increasing availability of body armor in the wrong hands portends a future of greater danger to America, greater danger to the American people, and a growing threat to our institutions.

For the past 3 years now I have advocated the passage of this legislation. Despite some verbal assurances, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, the gentleman from Florida, has not allowed a hearing on my bill. I hope he will now reconsider.

So tonight I urge my colleagues and the folks listening at home to support and urge their Members of Congress to cosponsor my new bill, H.R. 959. It is a good step toward making our streets safer for America and the law enforcement community. Let us quickly pass my new bill, H.R. 959, and prevent these kinds of gunfights from happening in the future.

I would like to give special tribute tonight to police officer Kurt Skarjune for his continual efforts in helping me in our effort of trying to ban the sale of mail-order body armor. I hope the U.S. Congress will join with me and Officer Kurt Skarjune in this 3-year fight, and hopefully we can have the mail-order body armor banned so no one can obtain it through the mail.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILCHREST). The Chair would remind the gentleman that his remarks should be confined to the Chair and not to the listening audience.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KAPTUR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for March 11 and 12, on account of personal business.

Mr. COBLE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today until 3 p.m. on account of Committee on the Judiciary business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKAGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAMPSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on March 13.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes each day, on March 13 and 18.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAPPS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. BENTSEN.
Mr. HILLIARD.
Mr. VISCLOSKY.
Mr. SMITH of Washington.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Ms. SANCHEZ.
Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
Mr. WISE.
Mr. ACKERMAN.
Mr. DOOLEY.
Mr. PASCRELL.
Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
Ms. NORTON in two instances.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. DUNN of Washington.
Mr. RADANOVICH.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. STEARNS.
Mr. PAUL.
Mr. DEAL.
Mr. GEKAS.
Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.
Mr. HERGER.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mrs. NORTHUP.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 5. A joint resolution waiving certain provisions of the Trade Act of 1974 relating to the appointment of the United States Trade Representative.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 13, 1997, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speakers table and referred as follows:

2209. A letter from the Department of Defense, Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to conduct a cost comparison study of all Department of Defense Education Activity [DoDEA] finance, accounting, and disbursing functions, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

2210. A letter from the Department of Defense, Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, transmitting the annual report detailing test and evaluation activities of the Foreign Comparative Testing Program during fiscal year 1996, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a; to the Committee on National Security.

2211. A letter from the Department of Defense, Director, Test, Systems Engineering and Evaluation, transmitting a letter notifying Congress of the intent to obligate existing fiscal year 1997 Foreign Comparative Testing [FCT] funds for an out-of-cycle FCT project designated ''Digital Voice and Data System,'' pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g)(3); to the Committee on National Security.

2212. A letter from the Department of Defense, General Counsel, transmitting a letter informing Congress of a delay in the establishment of a panel to review the various authorities for court-martial and nonjudicial punishment for the National Guard, when not in Federal service, and the use of those authorities; to the Committee on National Security.

2213. A letter from the National Skill Standards Board, Executive Director, transmitting the report to Congress on the activities of the Board from October 1995 to January 1997, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 5936; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2214. A letter from the Department of Energy, General Counsel, transmitting the Department's final rule—Policy and Planning Guidance for Community Transition Activities—received March 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2215. A letter from the Federal Communications Commission, Managing Director, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Revision of Part 22 and Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilitate Future Development of Paging Systems and Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding (Second Report and Order, WT Docket 96–18 and PP Docket 93–253) received March 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2216. A letter from the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Chair, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' final rule—Promoting Wholesale Competition Through Open Access Non-discrimination Transmission Services by Public Utilities and Recovery of Stranded Costs by Public Utilities and Transmitting Utilities (Order No. 888–A) and Open Access Same-Time Information System [OASIS] and Standards of Conduct (Order No. 889–A) received March 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2217. A letter from the Securities and Exchange Commission, Secretary, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Anti-manipulation Rules Concerning Securities Offerings (Release Nos. 33–7375; 34–38067; IC–22412; International Series Release No. 1039; File No. S7–11–95) (RIN: 3235–AF54) received March 5, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2218. A letter from the Defense Security Assistance Agency, Acting Director, transmitting the quarterly reports in accordance with sections 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, the March 24, 1979, report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the seventh report by the Committee on Government Operations for the first quarter of fiscal year 1997, October 1, 1996—December 31, 1996, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

2219. A letter from the Agency for International Development, Senior Deputy Assistant Administrator, transmitting a report on economic conditions prevailing in Egypt that may affect its ability to meet international debt obligations and stabilize its economy, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2346 note; to the Committee on International Relations.

2220. A letter from the Department of the Treasury, Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, transmitting the Department's final rule—Narcotics Trafficking Sanctions Regulations (Office of Foreign Assets Control) (31 CFR Part 536) received February 27, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

2221. A letter from the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Director, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1110; to the Committee on International Relations.

2222. A letter from the CoBank, Human Resources Manager, transmitting the annual report to the Congress and the Comptroller General of the United States for CoBank, ACB retirement plan for the year ending December 31, 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2223. A letter from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Administrator, transmitting a report that during calendar year 1996, the NASA Contract Adjustment Board did not meet to consider any cases and granted no requests for extraordinary contractual relief under Public Law 85–804, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1434; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2224. A letter from the Federal Election Commission, Chairman, transmitting 56 recommendations for legislative action, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(2); to the Committee on House Oversight.

2225. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled ''Saving Law Enforcement Officers' Lives Act of 1997''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2226. A letter from the Office of Government Ethics, Director, transmitting the Office's final rule—Executive Agency Ethics Training Program Regulation Amendments (5 CFR Part 2638) (RIN: 3209–AA07) received March 6, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2227. A letter from the Federal Aviation Administration, Acting Administrator, transmitting a report to Congress on the feasibility of offshore platforms for terminal Doppler weather radars to serve John F. Kennedy International and LaGuardia Airports, New York, NY, pursuant to Public Law 104–264, Section 1217 (110 Stat. 3285); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2228. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 1996 annual report of the Visiting Committee on Advanced Technology of the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST], U.S. Department of Commerce, pursuant to Public Law 100–418, Section 5131(b) (102 Stat. 1443); to the Committee on Science.

2229. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor, transmitting the quarterly report on the expenditure and need for worker adjustment assistance training funds under the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2230. A letter from the Federal Reserve System, Chairman, Board of Governors, transmitting the Board's monetary policy report to the Congress pursuant to the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 225a; jointly, to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Education and the Workforce.

2231. A letter from the General Services Administration, Administrator, transmitting the annual report regarding the accessibility standards issued, revised, amended, or repealed under the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968, as amended, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4151; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Education and the Workforce.

2232. A letter from the General Services Administraton, Acting Administrator, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled the ''Pennsylvania Avenue Development

Corporation Authorities Correction Act of 1997''; jointly, to the Committees on Resources, Government Reform and Oversight, and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 94. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 412) to approve a settlement agreement between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Oroville-Tonasket Irrigation District (Rept. 105–19). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 95. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 58) disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1997 (Rept. 105–20). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 1. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; with an amendment (Rept. 105–21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 437. A bill to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes referred to the Committee on Science for a period ending not later than April 28, 1997, for consideration of such provisions of the bill as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(n), rule X. (Rept. 105–22 pt. 1).

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. TALENT):

H.R. 1031. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the designation of renewal communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WISE, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FROST, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. SNYDER):

H.R. 1032. A bill to prohibit certain abortions; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DUNN of Washington (for herself, Mr. HERGER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, and Mr. BARR of Georgia):

H.R. 1033. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide all taxpayers with a 50-percent deduction for capital gains, to increase the exclusion for gain on qualified small business stock, to index the basis of certain capital assets, to allow the capital loss deduction for losses on the sale or exchange of an individual's principal residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARR of Georgia (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. MICA):

H.R. 1034. A bill to approve the determination of the President that Colombia is a major illicit drug producing country and/or a major drug-transit country and has failed to fully cooperate with the United States in its anti-narcotic efforts, and to provide for a waiver of the requirement to withhold United States assistance for Colombia for fiscal year 1997 pursuant to that determination; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1035. A bill to provide for modification of State agreements under title II of the Social Security Act with respect to certain students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYWORTH (for himself, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KIM, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TALENT, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 1036. A bill to require Congress and the President to fulfill their constitutional duty to take personal responsibility for Federal laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CRANE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. DREIER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MCCOLLUM):

H.R. 1037. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the amount of receipts attributable to military property which may be treated as exempt foreign trade income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINCHEY (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1038. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified acupuncturist services under part B of the Medicare Program, and to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for coverage of such services under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KANJORSKI:

H.R. 1039. A bill to reform campaign practices for elections to the House of Representatives by limiting contributions from political action committees, establishing tax credits for individual campaign contributions, providing matching funds for individual small contributions, limiting the use of personal funds in a campaign, offsetting independent expenditures, encouraging the use of longer campaign commercials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H.R. 1040. A bill to promote freedom, fairness, and economic opportunity for families by reducing the power and reach of the Federal establishment; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, for period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:

H.R. 1041. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide grants to States to stabilize and remove large tire piles that are near drinking water sources and sensitive populations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By By Mr. LIPINSKI:

H.R. 1042. A bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to extend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Commission; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LUTHER (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FILNER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 1043. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to temporarily expand the Department of Defense program by which State and local law enforcement agencies may procure certain law enforcement equipment through the Department; to the Committee on National Security.

By Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD:

H.R. 1044. A bill to promote the fitting of firearms with child safety locks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat a portion of welfare benefits which are contingent on employment as earned income for purposes of the earned income credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1046. A bill to allow each Member of the House of Representatives to hire one additional employee, if the employee is hired from the welfare rolls, and to provide that, if such employment is in the District of Columbia, the jurisdiction represented by the Member may count the employment toward its welfare participation rate requirement; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and

Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PORTER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. YATES, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 1047. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to improve the safety of handguns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself and Mr. LEVIN):

H.R. 1048. A bill to make technical amendments relating to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut):

H.R. 1049. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide financial assistance to support the assessment, cleanup, and economic redevelopment of brownfield sites; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage the cleanup of such sites by allowing the expensing of environmental remediation costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELLUMS (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATERS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 1050. A bill to establish a living wage, jobs for all policy by instituting overall planning to develop those living wage job opportunities essential to fulfillment of basic rights and responsibilities in a healthy democratic society; by facilitating conversion from unneeded military programs to civilian activities that meet important human needs; by producing a Federal capital budget through appropriate distinctions between operating and investment outlays; and by reducing poverty, violence, and the undue concentration of income, wealth, and power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, National Security, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SKEEN (for himself and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1051. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1910, to protect the permanent trust funds of the State of New Mexico from erosion due to inflation and modify the basis on which distributions are made from those funds; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Con. Res. 46. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that investigations of campaign fundraising practices should be left to the Federal Election Commission; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. FOGLIETTA (for himself, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MANTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FROST, Mr. WOLF, Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. WELLER, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. STUPAK):

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to designate a flag-pole upon which the flag of the United States is to be set at half-staff whenever a law enforcement officer is slain in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H. Res. 92. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Bureau of Labor Statistics alone should make any adjustments, if any are needed, to the methodology used to determine the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 93. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Bureau of Labor Statistic alone should make any adjustments, if any are needed, to the methodology used to determine the Consumer Price Index; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. YATES, Mr. OLVER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. GEJDENSON, MS. HARMAN, and Mr. PAYNE):

H. Res. 96. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Senate should ratify the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

23. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Senate Resolution No. 13, memorializing the President of the United States to effect the immediate transfer of the ground communications-electronics workload from the Sacramento Air Logistics Center to the Tobyhanna Army Depot; to the Committee on National Security.

24. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 1006, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation providing election campaign finance reform; to the Committee on House Oversight.

25. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 18, to memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the enforcement of the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 2, requesting that the balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution be submitted to the States for ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1: Mr. JONES, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. PAXON, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mrs. CUBIN.

H.R. 29: Mr. DIXON, Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. VENTO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FROST, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. CARSON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. MCNULTY, AND Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 58: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUMP, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DICKS, Mr. COOK, Mr. SHAW, Mr. WISE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GOODE, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky.

H.R. 69: Mr. EVANS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 147: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 148: Ms. CHRISTIAN-GREEN and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 155: Mr. CLEMENT and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 173: Mr. KIND of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. CALLAHAN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 216: Mr. CAMP, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CAPPS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 234: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 240: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. FAZIO of California.

H.R. 304: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 306: Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 407: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 423: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 437: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 446: Mr. COYNE, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 450: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 466: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. MCHALE.

H.R. 475: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. SAXTON, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 484: Mr. GRAHAM and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 491: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. YATES, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 493: Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 498: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 500: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 533: Mr. QUINN and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 556: Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 586: Mr. CAPPS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 600: Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 612: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. GANSKE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. PARKER, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 616: Mr. YATES, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mrs. CARSON.

H.R. 625: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FAZIO of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 633: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 635: Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 643: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 647: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 659: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 667: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 686: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 693: Mr. CANADY of Florida and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 710: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 716: Mr. BAKER and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 722: Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 737: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 740: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 752: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 755: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 766: Mr. THOMPSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. JEFFERSON, AND Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 774: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 816: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 845: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 852: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 857: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. QUINN, AND Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 875: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 879: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 880: Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SOLOMON, AND Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 883: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 900: Mr. STOKES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CAPPS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 907: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 934: Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 956: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 979: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FROST, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 983: Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 993: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. RYUN, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.J. Res. 54: Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. UPTON.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. QUINN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SANDLIN, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H. Con. Res. 15: Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 37: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. QUINN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. STARK.

H. Res. 45: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. TORRES, Mr. YATES, Mr. EVANS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Ms. FURSE.

H. Res. 64: Mr. SANFORD.

H. Res. 89: Mr. PICKERING.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 600: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.