

settled vote in this body, 23 of them in the 105th Congress. We continue to be obsessed with choice, though the American people have laid this issue to rest. In this Congress, the Hyde amendment is no longer an appropriation rider, but became law. Shame on us.

Perhaps the greatest disappointment was in contraception, where we had a case study on how victory can be stolen from women. Because both the House and the Senate voted to include the full range of contraceptive coverage for Federal employees in Federal employees' health plans. This, which had the support of this body, majority support of this body, passed by voice vote in the Senate and was stripped out in conference in a move that deserves remark for its profound anti-democratic tactics.

Then there is the one issue we hoped would be passed this year. This should have been the year of the child. Child care would have made it the year of the child. The Women's Caucus put together what we thought was a bipartisan set of principles that would produce child care in this session. Something for each side of the aisle. For Democrats who tend to be concerned about working families, more low-income certificates. Particularly, because the welfare to work is absorbing all of the child care, leaving little for women who want to go to work, for them, for low-income families. And then for stay-at-home spouses, we said we would accept a bill for tax relief for stay-at-home spouses, and then we would accept quality that was State imposed and the Federal Government would assist the States to bring up the quality of child care.

Mr. Speaker, anybody who cannot get a bipartisan bill for our children out of that is not trying hard enough, and we have not tried hard enough in the 105th Congress as long as mainstream issues like choice, contraception, like child care are not done by this Congress.

Whatever we do, including the must-pass victories of the Women's Caucus, will be overwhelmed when the gavel goes down on this Congress. As delighted as I am by the passage of three of our four priorities, we of the Women's Caucus of the 105th Congress will have to answer the question: "What did you do for women in the 105th?" The answer from American women will be: Not much.

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

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

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, an-

nounced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3687. An act to authorize prepayment of amounts due under a water reclamation project contract for the Canadian River Project, Texas.

H.R. 3910. An act to authorize the Automobile National Heritage Area in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4326. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Federal lands located within or adjacent to the Rogue River National Forest and to clarify the authority of the Bureau of Land Management to sell and exchange other Federal lands in Oregon.

H.J. Res. 135. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1222. An act to catalyze restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient financing of projects and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2039. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro as a National Historic Trail.

S. 2276. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate El Camino Real de los Tejas as a National Historic Trail.

S. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the denial of benefits under the Generalized System of Preferences to developing countries that violate the intellectual property rights of United States persons, particularly those that have not implemented their obligations under the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1408) "An Act to establish the Lower East Side Teneament National Historic Site, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1693) "An act to provide for improved management and increased accountability for certain National Park Service programs, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1718) "An Act to amend the Weir Farm National Historic Site Establishment Act of 1990 to authorize the acquisition of additional acreage for the historic site to permit the development of visitor and administrative facilities and to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts for the acquisition of real and personal property."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1754) "An Act to amend the Public Health Service Act to consolidate and reauthorize health professions and minority and disadvantaged health education programs, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2432) "An Act to support programs of grants to States to address the assistive technology needs of individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes."

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

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

There was no objection.

2000 CENSUS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last evening, a meeting was held in my office with two senior Democrats to discuss the issue of the 2000 Census. It is unfortunate that not only was the confidence of this meeting broken, but my position was misrepresented. Obviously, there are those who would betray a confidence for what they believe to be a short-term political gain.

Let me make clear what transpired at the meeting and what my position is on the 2000 Census. The position of these Democrats was that they wanted to remove Congress from the decision-making process for the 2000 Census. I disagree. At no time did I say that there would not be funding for the 2000 Census. As I have said publicly before, the one thing we can all be sure of is there will be a 2000 Census.

What I did say is the simple fact that if the Supreme Court might rule that sampling is legal, it does not automatically mean there will be sampling in the 2000 Census.

Let me explain, as I did last night. The Supreme Court is going to rule on whether or not sampling is legal or constitutional, not if the Clinton sampling plan will work. That issue is very much debatable. In fact, even the National Academy of Sciences which has endorsed the concept of sampling has not endorsed this plan.

Additionally, as I pointed out last night, the administration has been arguing that the Supreme Court case should not be considered on its merits, but rather dismissed because the House of Representatives lacks standing and the issue is not ripe for review. If this were to happen, why would Congress allow the administration to use sampling when the entire census would be invalidated in the future when standing is no longer an issue and sampling is ripe for review? We already have the writing on the wall. Two Federal courts and six Federal judges have unanimously ruled that sampling is illegal. How many judges does it take to get the message through?

The Republican position on this issue is crystal clear and makes the most sense. Here are six common sense reasons why the appropriations language which prohibits the Census Bureau from spending money after March 1999 should remain as it is:

First, six Federal judges have ruled that sampling is illegal.

Two, there is nothing in our appropriations language which prevents the bureau from preparing for both sampling and a non-sampling census. In fact, we have worked with the bureau to make sure that they have more money in the first 6 months than in the second 6 months. We have told the bureau that they will not have any cash flow problems.

Three, in all likelihood, the Supreme Court will have decided this by March 1999. The case is on an expedited track and oral arguments are set before the Supreme Court for November 30.

Four, by March, the information from the dress rehearsal will have been reviewed and available for study.

Number five, by March, the bipartisan Census Monitoring Board will have issued its report on the 2000 Census.

And six, Congress must have a role in deciding how to conduct the 2000 Census. Without the appropriations language, the administration is free to unilaterally decide how the 2000 Census is conducted.

Our position is clear and reasonable. The Democrats fear a ruling of the Supreme Court against sampling will devastate the chances for its use in 2000. They are desperately trying to figure out a way to diminish the importance of the court case.

The common sense approach is to give the Census Bureau the money to function for the year, restrict spending after March, and wait until we have all the information needed to decide how to conduct the 2000 Census.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in the future that these House Democrats can be trusted to negotiate in good faith. At this point, after the misrepresentations of last evening's private conversations, I have grave doubts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

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

There was no objection.

MORE MONEY TO IMF WILL ONLY MAKE WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATIONS WORSE

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my strong objection to the current legislative process in the House. Some day soon, we do not know, maybe tomorrow, maybe Friday, maybe Saturday, eight appropriations bills, which as I understand it will add up to some \$500 billion, will be dumped into one omnibus bill. Members here, with relatively little knowledge as to what is in that legislation, are going to vote for it. I think that is a pretty poor process.

What is of particular concern to me is that within that huge omnibus bill will be, as I understand it, an \$18 billion appropriation for the expansion of the IMF, the International Monetary Fund.

Now, it seems to me that in a time when we are cutting back on veterans' benefits, when 43 million Americans have no health care, when millions of middle-class families are unable to afford to send their kids to college, that maybe, just maybe, we might want to have an open debate upon the wisdom of putting \$18 billion of taxpayers' money into the IMF. Maybe we would like to hear the pros and the cons of that discussion. Maybe we would like to see an up-or-down vote on that issue. But I guess that is not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton wants the IMF. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) wants the IMF. Every large multinational corporation in this country wants the IMF. The corporate media wants the IMF. And, I guess, they are going to get the IMF without any serious debate.

But let me just say a few words about the IMF. I happen to agree with those people who say that the international economy is in a fragile state right now and that the United States has got to act. I disagree with those people who say that the solution is to pour more money into the IMF.

In my opinion, if recent history is any indicator of what might happen in the future, giving more money to the IMF might only make a bad situation, an unstable situation even worse. All we have to do is take a hard look at what has happened throughout the world in those countries which the IMF has "helped" to understand that maybe the IMF path is not the road that we want to go down.

They "helped" the people of Mexico several years ago. Today, as a result or partially as a result of their help, the Mexican economy is in disastrous condition. Wages are down. Unemployment and child labor are up. And their Congress in Mexico is now addressing a massive bailout of their banking system.

But something did happen out of the Mexican bailout of several years ago.

That is that the investors that we bailed out, the large banks and speculators, learned a very important lesson. They learned that the taxpayers of the United States would be there no matter how ill-advised or stupid their investments might be, no matter how much money they might lose. No problem, Uncle Sam was there to bail them out.

They took that lesson to Asia, and they continued that process. They pumped huge sums of money into Thailand and Malaysia and Indonesia and South Korea. And then, when that part of the world began to suffer, no problem, the President, Mr. Rubin and Mr. Summers and everyone said well, we have got to bail them out again, and we bailed them out again.

We bailed out major banks and financial investors because we do not want them to lose any money. Small businesspeople, family farmers, hey, they can lose money. But when it's the Chase Manhattan Bank, they are not supposed to lose money. They only make money, I suppose.

Then the meltdown in Russia began. Poor Russia. It is incredible that a great country with such a tragic history has got to suffer all over again. When communism fell in 1991, the Russian Government received the attention and the guidance of the IMF and all of their wonderful policy advisors. Tragically, the Russian Government listened to them and took their advice. It is fair to say that never before in modern history has a major industrialized Nation experienced the kind of decline in a 7-year period as Russia has under IMF guidance and with \$20 billion of IMF loans.

Mr. Speaker, those people who are asking our taxpayers for \$18 billion in order to expand the functioning of the IMF are telling us that the global economy is in a fragile state, economic contagion is a reality, and that the United States could well suffer if the crisis in the global economy is not addressed.

Well, let me say this, I believe that the global economy is in a fragile state, economic contagion is a reality, and that the United States could well suffer if the crisis in the global economy is not addressed. But I very strongly differ with our friends who believe that another \$18 billion will make the situation better. In my opinion, if recent history is any indicator of what might happen in the future, giving more money to the IMF will only make a bad situation worse. Four years ago when Mexico was in dire economic circumstances Mr. Rubin, Mr. Greenspan, President Clinton, Mr. GINGRICH, corporate America, and all of the Corporate media told us that we would have to pony-up and bail out investors who had lost money in that country. We were told that if Mexico went under the contagion would spread, and there would be an international economic disaster would occur. Well, some of us fought very hard against that bail out, but we lost. Today, the Mexican economy is in disastrous condition, wages are way down, unemployment and child labor are way up, and their congress is now addressing a massive bail out of their banking system.

But something did happen out of the Mexican bailout, the investors that we bailed out,