

only in this institution but in our country. He has chosen to leave this body and this body will be a lesser place for that decision.

I wanted to take, Mr. Speaker, this short, brief minute to stand and say to him, thank you. During the 5½ years that I served as chairman of the caucus, VIC was my vice chair, and I was proud to have him serving with me. During his time as chairman of the DCCC, I was one of his strongest supporters.

During the decade that he headed the Subcommittee on Legislative of the Committee on Appropriations and served this institution and its Members and the citizens of this Nation so well in ensuring the effective operation of the people's House, I was proud to be his strong supporter.

During the last four years he has chaired the Democratic caucus. One of the hallmarks of his leadership was a partisan commitment to the issues and principles for which our party stands. But I know that my colleagues on the majority side also found in VIC FAZIO a gentleman who was interested in the interests of America and was willing and able and desirous of working with the other side in a collegial way to effect progress in this House on behalf of this country and its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise to say to one of the closest friends I have that we are going to miss you. I am going to miss you. This institution is going to miss you.

The good news for all of us is that VIC FAZIO will be around. He hopefully will stay in Washington. I know he will go back to his beloved California frequently, but hopefully he and his beloved wife, Judy, an extraordinary individual in her own right, will be here, and we will see him frequently and have the opportunity to benefit from his advice and counsel and his leadership.

VIC, you have been one of the extraordinary Members of this House. The House is a better place for your service, and our country is better for your service.

□ 1615

#### TRIBUTE TO VIC FAZIO

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

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the best benefits of holding public office is to meet colleagues who have integrity, who work for consensus, who are bridge builders. VIC FAZIO is that type of person.

I was very sorry that I could not be on the floor when the California delegation saluted him. We worked together in Sacramento and we worked together on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct here, and for 20 years on the Committee on Appropriations.

The sad thing is that he is leaving this institution, but he leaves a great

deal of friends here and we are very pleased that he will remain in Washington. He will now have the time to spend with his family, to regulate his own schedule, and I know that all of our colleagues wish he and Judy very well.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues first for their very gracious remarks, and I appreciate the Speaker's latitude in allowing them to make them.

At this time I ask the chief deputy whip, my friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), to enter into a dialog with me about next week's schedule.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California, and we, too, want to extend our best, Mr. FAZIO, for your future.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that we have concluded legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet on Monday, October 5, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and at 2 p.m. for legislative business. We do not expect any recorded votes before 5 p.m. on Monday.

On Monday, October 5, we will consider a number of bills under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices this afternoon.

On Tuesday, October 6, and through the balance of the week, the House will consider the following legislation:

H.R. 3694, the Intelligence Authorization Act, which is a conference report;  
H.R. 4274, the Labor-HHS Appropriations Act;

H.R. 4570, the Omnibus National Parks Act;

H.R. 3789, the Class Action Jurisdiction Act; and

H.R. 4259, the Haskell Indian Nations University Act of 1998.

Mr. Speaker, we also expect a number of appropriation and authorization conference reports to be ready next week. As we head into the final days of this session, Members should be ready to work late throughout next week in order to finish work on important conference reports.

Mr. Speaker, the target adjournment is still October 9th, but of course Members should be prepared to stay through the weekend, if necessary.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I do have a couple of questions I would like to pose.

First of all, it looks increasingly as if we may need another continuing resolution, or CR. I know a good deal of effort will be put forth next week to

avoid that, but I also do not see any provision on the schedule that would allow us to have additional time should the October 9 deadline pass.

Is the gentleman aware of a time when we might have another, hopefully short-term, CR?

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, obviously, our goal is October 9. The date on the CR that we have under action right now is October 9, and we will have to take that into assessment next week as bills move along, and especially the conference reports. We would be ready to move such a bill, if necessary.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Could the gentleman indicate what the tentative time frame for that would be? I realize that we would be running into the Columbus Day holiday and possibly into the next week, and I am moved to ask what the gentleman thinks the time frame of that might be.

Mr. HASTERT. As I repeat it, it is our hope we will be able to adjourn by October 9. If there are signals that that will not be able to happen, we will take that under consideration later next week in a timely manner.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Well, it is not my intention to fail to keep hope alive, but I think we all realize it is going to be difficult. So we are not expecting to be in that next week.

Is it the intention of the majority to complete the Labor-HHS appropriations next week? And what day would the gentleman understand that might come up?

Mr. HASTERT. Well, as the gentleman knows, we passed the rule on that bill today and it would be the intention of the House, after passing the rule, to act on that legislation. Hopefully, as that bill would come back, we could act on that as early as Tuesday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. One more question, if I could reclaim my time and yield again.

Obviously, at some point next week the Committee on the Judiciary will bring us their best efforts on the decision regarding impeachment. Is there any time at this point that the majority would point to as the day and time when we might anticipate taking that very important issue up?

Mr. HASTERT. As the gentleman knows, the Committee on the Judiciary would either act on Monday or Tuesday and, depending on what the parameters of the rules are for that particular measure, we would take that bill up probably later in the week, possibly Thursday or Friday.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Thursday or Friday. I appreciate the information of the majority and the good work of my friend from Illinois, and I yield back the balance of my time.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1998

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR  
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON  
WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

CALIFORNIA RACIST MAILER

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, once again the Republicans are showing their true colors. In this recent mailer, the California Republican Party urged citizens to vote Republican by using a photograph of four Latino lawmakers in order to scare white voters.

Mike Madrid, director of the California Republican Party, said that the mailer was targeted at liberals, not Latinos. If this is true, then why did not Mr. Madrid picture any one of several white liberals currently serving in the State legislature? First LORETTA SANCHEZ and now this. How many times will the Republicans use racist tactics to divide America?

Mr. Madrid asserted that the mailer is not racist because he designed it and he is Latino. Well, if that is the case, then I have a suggestion. Rather than Director Mike, perhaps he should be known as Uncle Tom.

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

Liberal Democrats in the Assembly have an agenda for California:

- Higher taxes to pay for more social programs.<sup>1</sup>
- Welfare without work requirements for able-bodied adults.<sup>1</sup>
- Weakening our 3-Strikes Law.<sup>1</sup>
- Legalizing same-sex marriages.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Actual bills introduced or positions taken by Assembly Democrats during the 1997-98 legislative session.

Assembly Democrats are celebrating because they think Republicans won't vote in the upcoming election. And if you don't vote, they win. That spells disaster for California. You can foil the liberal's plans by applying to vote my mail. Every citizen has the right to vote-by-mail. Just sign your name and return your application today. Your postage has already been paid.

Here is your Republican Vote-By-Mail Application.

Please check the information and sign and date in the colored boxes.

Thank you.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

uary 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 Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HULSHOF 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. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CONYERS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMF REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, today the President called for a further expansion of the International Monetary Fund. He repeated the audacious request that Congress provide \$18 billion to the IMF with no conditions and without first requiring IMF reform.

It is time for some presidential accountability, Mr. Speaker, in this area as well as others. We need to recognize that it was the Clinton administration's own policies that accelerated the financial collapse overseas that is threatening the United States' economy today.

For Congress to simply endorse those policies through the full funding of an unreformed IMF would be recklessly irresponsible. If the President will not, or, as yet another consequence of his diminished leadership, cannot bring about real changes in international financial institutions, then Congress must supply leadership in his place.

The IMF proposal actually illuminates a major policy departure that has developed largely unnoticed by Congress, the press and the public. Unnoticed, that is, until it was too late. I call it the Clinton Doctrine. It is a policy under which virtually any groupings of bankruptcies anywhere in the world is eligible for a bailout by American taxpayers.

This has inflamed what economists call "moral hazard". By covering bad investments, the administration has encouraged irresponsible behavior. The financial disasters overseas are in large part a direct consequence of this "moral hazard".

To make matters worse, once the financial collapses occurred, the IMF, presumably with the President's blessing, imposed catastrophic contractionary policies on the affected countries. Even Keynesians, Mr. Speaker, know not to raise taxes in a recession, and yet that is exactly what the Clinton-guided IMF often proposed. As Larry Lindsey put it, these policies

have become our own era's equivalent of the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

In fairness to the President, he did not initiate this policy of global bailout which we have been drifting towards for some time. His role has been to sanction it, legitimize it, and to take it to new and unprecedented levels. Beginning with the 1995 bailout of Mexico, continuing with the multiple bailouts of Asia, and reaching its inevitable culmination in the farcical bailout of Russia this summer, the administration has undermined market discipline and helped to create the very crisis it was ostensibly trying to prevent.

The IMF, under the direction of the Clinton administration, helped cause the problem. Then the IMF made it worse. Now it is making it more difficult for the world to recover. The IMF, Mr. Speaker, has the Midas touch in reverse. Virtually every country it has tried to help has become worse from the experience.

In Korea today, children made homeless by the continuing recession are bitterly referred to as "IMF Orphans". Our friends in Korea know, as many in the Clinton administration do not, that the IMF is largely responsible for their continuing economic difficulties.

Congress must reverse this Clinton Doctrine that has helped bring the world economy to its current state. A positive step would be to restrain the IMF by deferring a decision on providing the huge \$14.5 billion quota increase. This is essentially the House position contained in the foreign operations bill.

Delaying a decision on the IMF money would allow us time to hold an international conference and other meetings to improve the world financial system. The disasters we see overseas are clear evidence that the current arrangements have failed. Rather than pump more money into them, we need to redesign them. We need nothing less than a new Bretton Woods conference. Only then can we make an informed decision on giving away \$14.5 billion of our taxpayers' money for those purposes.

Now many, including many in this House, say that we should give the IMF money up front in exchange for "real IMF reforms". What they do not understand is that the administration and the IMF are adamantly against any U.S.-imposed reform. As the French director of the IMF arrogantly put it last week, "The U.S. must bring its contribution and no country is entitled to impose conditions." That from the head of an agency that imposes conditions on each and every country to which it brings its money, and all too many times, as I have cited, conditions that do harm rather than good.

The most the administration and other IMF supporters will accept are weak suggestions from us. The reform provisions in pending IMF bills, for instance, are a little more than sense-of-Congress resolutions.