HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Thursday, March 12, 1992*

The House met at 11 a.m.

The Reverend James Allen Milner, Sr., pastor, Chapel of Christian Love Missionary Baptist Church, Atlanta, GA, offered the following prayer:

Our Father and our Lord, it is with humble submission and deep gratitude that we bow before Thy holy presence. We thank You for allowing us to be in this land of liberty, freedom, and hope. We thank You for this House of Congress and the role it has played in the framing of this Nation. Be with each Member of this House and their supportive staff members, that their labor will be pleasing in Your sight. Give them insight and compassion that transcends the interest of their particular district. Give them a global view of the needs of all Your people as they approach their task of the day. Give them the wisdom of Solomon, the courage of David, the tenacity of Abraham, and the determination of Moses. Let their efforts be pleasing in Your sight that the world might be better for all. In the blessed name of all that is holy I pray.

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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. KLUG 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2344. An act to improve the provision of health care and other services to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

THE REVEREND JAMES ALLEN MILNER, SR.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to say a few words about our guest chaplain, the Reverend James Allen Milner, Sr.

Reverend Milner is the senior pastor and founder of the Chapel of Christian Love Missionary Baptist Church in Atlanta, GA. He is also president of the Concerned Black Clergy of Atlanta.

A true leader, Reverend Milner serves on numerous boards and committees of community organizations. He has received several awards for his achievements, including the Outstanding Ministry Award from the Atlanta University Interdenominational Theological Center.

Several years ago, Reverend Milner led his congregation to establish Odyssey III, a community center and ministry for the homeless in downtown Atlanta. Since 1984, the Odyssey III ministry has served more than 500,000 free meals to the hungry and homeless.

A native of Atlanta, Reverend Milner did his undergraduate study in the University of Georgia system. He received his master's of divinity degree from the Interdenominational Theological Center in Atlanta.

Today, let us welcome Reverend Milner to the House of the People.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO ENHANCE AMERICAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

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

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, during the cold war our Nation was involved in a crushingly expensive space race with the Soviet Union. The cold war is won, and we are facing unprecedented opportunities for cooperation with our former adversaries.

Just about every piece of Soviet space hardware and technology is on the block at fire sale prices, but because of bureaucratic redtape, NASA is not allowed to do anything but window shop.

Yesterday, I introduced legislation to give NASA immediate access to a storehouse of some of the world's finest space technology. We stand to make substantial gains in our civil space capabilities, and we can avoid the enormous cost of reinventing technology already developed by our former adversaries.

Gaining access to Soviet technology could allow the United States to achieve its goals in space far more cheaply than duplicating what the Soviets developed during the technology race of the cold war. By allowing the aerospace industry to tool up rapidly for the manufacture of products based on the best of both American and Soviet technology, we can put Americans back to work.

This legislation gives the American taxpayer an opportunity to get something tangible and valuable in return for the large amount of American aid going to the former Soviet Union.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 4447.

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION CLEARINGHOUSE ACT OF 1992

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

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, as keepers of this planet, we have every reason to be concerned about our deteriorating world environment. Ancient forests, disappearing coastlines, CFC's and the ozone layer, and wetlands protection are just a sampling of the environmental issues that are before us.

I am sure we all agree that actions are needed to combat the further deterioration of our diverse surroundings. I believe education gives us a great opportunity to prevent further degradation of the environment. That is why I am introducing the Environmental Education Clearinghouse Act of 1992.

My bill would establish an environmental education clearinghouse division within the office of environmental education at the EPA. The task of this division would be to consolidate all the existing environmental education programs throughout the Federal Government into one data base to be housed at EPA and encourage State and local governments to contribute information on any programs that they have developed and implemented in their State or town.

In creating this central resource at EPA, any individual, school, or community who seeks to establish an appropriate environmental education program of their own could consult this data base.

By educating the public, we are using the best resource at our disposal to preserve our environment. I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

(Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, later today or tomorrow I, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL], my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], will introduce a privileged resolution that will have the effect of amending the privileged resolution introduced by the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to resolve the problems with our House bank.

The privileged resolution that we will introduce will require full direct disclosure of Members' and former Members' names and the pertinent account information associated with their names. This full disclosure privileged resolution I am introducing as a House resolution today, and I invite my colleagues to cosponsor. Many of my Republican colleagues have cosponsored because they had the information this morning.

I extend the same invitation to my Democrat colleagues. I know there is strong sentiment on both sides of the aisle for full disclosure. Please contact my office if the Members would like to cosponsor this resolution, which will go in, in about 4 or 5 hours.

WE MUST DENOUNCE AND ANNOUNCE THE BOUNCE

(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, there are payors and payees. There are vendors and vendees. Now there are bouncers and bouncees.

That is right. In the House bank there are those individuals that are bouncers and they bounced checks to take advantage of short-term noninterest-bearing loans.

The tragedy is there are innocent bouncees that may get bounced because of the bouncers' bouncing ways.

I think Congress has only two choices: No. 1, denounce the bounce; No. 2, announce the bounce, and let those bouncers go home and explain whether or not they had a malice aforepay in their relationship with the House bank.

RESOLUTION OFFERED BY DISSENTERS ON COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT DESERVES MEMBERS' SUPPORT

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, later today those who believe in full disclosure in the matter of the House bank investigation will have exactly that opportunity by supporting the resolution to be offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and her three Republican colleagues on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct who dissented from that committee's recommendation to release only the names of the 24 most egregious abusers of the House bank check-cashing privileges.

Their resolution would cause to be released within 10 days the names of the egregious abusers and within 20 days the names of all those House Members who at one time or the other during that 39-month period may have bounced a check while also allowing those Members within that 20-day time period to challenge the accounting of the House bank.

□ 1110

Anything less than supporting this resolution will be a vote to deny the public's right to know. And all other mitigating considerations, sloppy management and accounting practices in the House bank, political considerations have to be set aside so that we can do the right thing and affirm the public's right to know.

The Gang of Seven, the seven Republican freshmen who have kept this issue alive since last summer, is now the gang of millions. I invite my colleagues to vote for full disclosure and join the gang of millions calling for full disclosure and affirm and uphold again the public's right to know.

DEMOCRATS WILL LEAD AMERICA BACK TO PROSPERITY

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

Mr. BUSTAMANTE. Mr. Speaker, America's families cry out for help in the middle of these difficult economic times.

We Democrats want to provide help. We want to provide education, health care, and the opportunity to work.

This is not too much for the American people to expect of its Government and leaders.

But where is the leadership coming out of the White House or from the other side of the aisle?

Where is a budget from the President that has any support from within his own party?

Where is the House Republican budget proposal?

We hear lots of recriminations and accusations from our Republican colleagues and the White House, but we hear nothing constructive.

We hear accusations of being obstructionist, of political posturing, of engaging in a political exercise.

I am here today to say that is bunk. Democrats are acting on the important economic issues that face us today.

Democrats are leading the fight against the Bush recession. And we will win this fight.

We will help put Americans back to work. We will see this economy get back on its feet. We will chart a course for this Nation's future.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats are in the business of leading and doing. That's why we're here in Congress. And that's what will beat this recession.

A NO VOTE URGED ON BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, no, I did not bounce a check, and I am for full disclosure. But today, I should comment this House will take up a bill eliminating one of the few remaining constraints against additional deficit spending. In the face of a $400 billion deficit, that is a frightening prospect.

Eighteen months ago Congress passed legislation capping discretionary spending for defense, domestic and international programs until fiscal 1994, and prohibiting the transfer of unspent funds from one category to another. This constrains spending, and safeguards against raids on the defense budget.

Now, we are being asked to cast these budget firewalls aside. If we do, the doors will open to a doubling of the President's defense cuts, another 20 percent cut in Navy ships on active duty, and premature weakening of our overall military capability.

Not only that, but if this bill passes, there will be no defense savings and no deficit reduction. Just more of the same old deficit spending that got us into this budget mess in the first place.

I urge a no vote on H.R. 3732.

FULL DISCLOSURE IN HOUSE BANK SCANDAL

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise again today to request that the House vote for full disclosure. It looks like that is what is going to happen, and I want to commend the minority view report out of the House ethics committee and the minority for the work they have done in bringing forth hopefully this resolution to the floor today or tomorrow for a vote, and hopefully a positive vote.

I have been calling, as a lot of my colleagues have, for full disclosure for

quite some time. And I have been listening in the last few months to what I think is probably the worst conduct of all. That is the administration of this House of Representatives, the House bank and the people who are really the folks who I think are to blame more, even more than the abusers, the people who ran this institution and knew what was going on with all of the abuses that were happening down there. It was mismanaging accounts so that what we are going to have in these 355 names that are going to be released are Members who had no idea what was going in their accounts and were not informed. The deposits were mismanaged and were delayed sometimes for weeks.

This was a horribly managed bank, very similar to the rest of this institution.

GETTING BACK TO ADDRESSING THE REAL ISSUES THAT FACE AMERICA

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

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, once we get this check bouncing out of the way I hope we can get back to the real issues that face America. That is rebuilding this country and bringing back good American jobs, putting money back into Americans' pockets.

This country is being povertized by bad fiscal policy and sending our jobs overseas. We have 9 million people out of work and we have tens of millions of people in this country who are unemployed, cannot put food on their table, cannot educate their kids, cannot buy health insurance, and we are talking about who bounced a check. I have 12 percent unemployed in my district. I have steelworkers, coal miners, I have farmers, pottery workers who face a bleak future.

I hope that when this check bouncing thing is out of the way that somebody does not find some other issue to hide the bad fiscal policies that are going on, and get down to addressing the real problems in this country. I am telling you, folks, this one ain't going to go away.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 100-321

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would add a rare form of cancer to the list of diseases presumed to be service connected for radiation-exposed veterans.

In the early days of the cold war, Mr. Speaker, many of our service personnel were exposed to deadly radiation and nuclear fallout during nuclear weapons tests. At the time, improper care was exercised to protect these soldiers, sailors, and airmen from the hazards associated with the tests.

When illnesses invariably arose, unfortunately the law could not accommodate their service-connected disabilities. However, recently the Federal Government, and this was at the behest of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] the previous speaker, wisely recognized that certain diseases which occur among service personnel who participated in these nuclear tests were likely to be caused by radiation exposure.

Public Law 100-321, however, left out a very important type of cancer, a very deadly form of cancer, bronchioloalveolar carcinoma, and that ought to be rectified. My legislation would include that. It is a nonsmoker's cancer, and my legislation would include that among those that are presumed to be service connected, and I urge its prompt passage.

□ 1120

MEMBER NOTES ANNIVERSARY OF HIS ARRIVAL IN UNITED STATES, DELIVERY FROM HOLOCAUST

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, we may have difficulty remembering other dates and anniversaries but all immigrants to this great country recall unfailingly the date of our arrival here. I do so today with great pride and gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, 54 years ago today, on March 12, 1938, I arrived in the United States aboard the S.S. *President Warren G. Harding* with my mother, of blessed memory, and my sister, Claire. The ship berthed at the Chelsea piers in New York harbor, where we were met by Samuel Weiss, my new stepfather-to-be, and other members of our new family. We were driven to their home in South Amboy, NJ, and became part of a large combined family of eight children one of whom was already married while the youngest, Claire, had not yet started grammar school.

I will be eternally grateful to Samuel Weiss who, from the moment we met him, treated us with the same love and concern that he gave his original family. He literally saved our lives from the holocaust which Hitler shortly thereafter visited upon the Jews of Europe, slaughtering in the process most of the family which we left behind in Hungary.

My gratitude extends too, to the people and Government of the United States for providing me a safe haven not only to survive but to grow and flourish—permitting me to achieve and occupy this exalted place in the American political system as a Member of the people's House of Representatives.

Thank you, America.

A WARPED VALUE STRUCTURE

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

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in this House we voted overwhelmingly yet once again to condition MFN trade with the People's Republic of China on significant changes in China's policies on human rights, weapons proliferation, and trade. Our vote was an overwhelming 357 to 61.

But unless things change in the Senate, we will not have the two-thirds necessary there as we do have here to override the President's veto of H.R. 2212.

Mr. Speaker, the President refuses to influence China's reprehensible and unacceptable policies, through economic pressure. Yet, at the same time, his Secretary of State insists on linking loan guarantees for Israel to provide the necessary substance to bring the remnants of the Russian Jewish community to Israel. He insists on linking them with a change in Israeli settlement policy.

On the one hand, President Bush fights to the last to attain leniency for the world's only remaining major ruthless totalitarian state, one which sells missiles to our and our allies' enemies, one which runs up a $10 billion trade surplus through unfair trade practices, using child, prison, and slave labor; one which slaughtered its own people in Tiananmen Square.

And yet, on the other hand, he turns the economic screws on the Middle East's only democracy, our ally Israel, with whom he has some policy differences but a democracy with which, on the broad range of issues we share identical views and values.

Mr. Speaker, I am bewildered and saddended by the President's warped value structure.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Member are reminded to refrain from references to future actions by the other body.

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS THE ANTICRIME BILL

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, conventional wisdom says that in election

years Congress will pass anticrime bills. I hope we do, despite the fact that the crime bill conference report we sent to the other body last autumn is still there and has not been acted on.

I supported that conference report. It weakened to some extent the exclusionary rule which bars introduction of evidence in certain kinds of trials; it weakens habeas corpus to put some reasonable limits on endless death-row appeals.

One aspect in the bill I was very much devoted to was the Brady bill, which puts a 5-day limit on handgun purchases.

This is one time, Mr. Speaker, where conventional wisdom should come to pass and be made correct by our actions, and so I would certainly hope that before the end of this year conventional wisdom again proves accurate that Congress will pass an anticrime bill in an election year.

WHERE WAS THE AMERICAN PRESS?

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

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at a time when the world is changing in extraordinary fashion and the American people are feeling economic and social misery and unprecedented terms, demanding leadership, Members of this Congress across race, across sex, and across geography assumed the responsibility, after 3½ months of work and 8 hours of diligent debate on the floor of this Congress, to put before the American people a proposal to address the issue of jobs, employment, education, health, and other significant issues, asserting leadership, not one word of that 8 hours of debate was printed in the American press, not one word, Mr. Speaker.

You tell me: How is it not news when a significant portion of this Congress attempts to put a significant proposal before the American people, willing to expose that idea of 8 hours of debate and not one word? Was it because the Members of Congress were black that wrote the budget? Was it because progressive Members associated with us? Was it because distinguished women who came before this body to debate these issues were not qualified enough?

I challenge the American press: Why were they not there to say to the American people that there are some Members of Congress who are willing to get beyond demagogery, willing to get beyond absurdity, and try to lead this Nation? I challenge the American press to answer the American people why a significant band of groups who are black in this Congress offered a proposal to the American people that they would not dignify.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENERGY TECHNOLOGY GROWTH ACT

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce, with all six ranking Republican members of the Science Committee, the Energy Technology Growth Act—aimed at bolstering the President's national energy strategy and supporting the goal of 4 percent real economic growth by maximizing technological development, both Federal and private, and emphasizing market forces. This is the Science Committee Republican leadership's contribution to the energy package expected on the floor later this session.

The authorizations contained in this bill track the Science Committee Republican views and estimates signed by all 20 members and submitted to the Budget Committee. In total, the bill authorizes $5.413 billion in fiscal year 1993 for the Department of Energy research and development programs. This is $240 million over current funding, but $76 million under budget. We made tough choices and set hard priorities.

This bill also allows the Secretary of Energy to transfer up to half a billion dollars each year through the year 2001 to increase research and development on energy technologies with great commercial potential by requiring a 75 percent non-Federal match. This potential $5 billion energy R&D enhancement would be derived from lower priority DOE civilian activities.

Most bold, however, is a 15-percent investment tax credit to spur the use of advanced energy technologies. Increased use of oil and gas enhanced recovery and exploration equipment would qualify. Private sector spending on equipment to increase the accessibility and uses of natural gas would also earn the credit, as would clean coal technology equipment, renewable and nuclear generating equipment, and equipment used to make alternative fueled engines. Finally, the credit could be earned for increased energy efficiency in manufactured products.

This bill is for those who would say let's invest in our future. We have a vision to get technology to the market place sooner and an answer for those who say let's invest more in America. However, it doesn't do this by busting the budget or raising taxes—something I keep hearing suggested much too often around here.

Mr. Speaker, I submit with my statement a summary of the highlights of the bill for the Members' consideration.

ENERGY TECHNOLOGY GROWTH ACT

Supports the President's national energy strategy.

Supports the goal of 4 percent real economic growth through technological development by emphasizing market forces.

Authorizations track the Science Committee Republican views.

Represents an 11 percent increase for renewables ($19.7 million over the request).

26 percent increase for conservation ($2.3 million over the request).

8 percent increase for fusion ($5.9 million over the request).

Includes enhancements to the President's budget.

$33 million for enhanced oil recovery.

$3 million for certification program in standard light water design program.

$28 million for space power.

Nuclear R&D is still 8 percent lower than current funding.

Total authorization is $5.413 billion for DOE, $240 million over current funding, but $76 million under budget.

Ten year transfer authority. Allows the Secretary of Energy to transfer up to five hundred million dollars per year through 2001 to increase R&D on energy technologies with great commercial potential (requires 75 percent non-Federal match). This R&D enhancement would be derived from lower priority DOE civilian activities.

15 percent investment tax credit—to spur the use of advanced technology increased use of oil and gas enhanced recovery and exploration equipment would qualify. Private sector spending on equipment to increase accessibility and use of natural gas would also earn the credit, as would clean coal technology equipment, renewable and nuclear generating equipment, and equipment used to make alternative fueled engines. Finally, the credit could be earned for increased energy efficiency in manufactured products.

Contains no added fees, charges, or new taxes or tax increase proposals.

OBSERVANCE OF SHABBAT ZACHOR

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advise my colleagues that this Saturday Jews around the country will observe Shabbat Zachor, a Sabbath of Remembrance for four Jewish women who were brutally murdered while seeking to flee from Syria. I urge my colleagues to take this opportunity to reflect on the plight of the 4,000 Jews who live today in Syria, a small remnant of an ancient community with thousands of relatives and descendants around the world. There are around 30,000 Syrian Jews living in New York City, and in my own district in Brooklyn, they have established a thriving, successful community.

I wish that the Jews still in Syria were as fortunate. In the already hostile atmosphere of Hafez al-Assad's dictatorship, Jews are singled out for discrimination, and forbidden to leave. As I speak here today, Jews who have sought to leave Syria languish in prison without trial or sentence. I am thinking of the Swed brothers, who have been held without trial in underground cells since 1987, where they have been beaten and tortured.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress must raise our voices against these trav-

esties. Last year the Congress adopted House Concurrent Resolution 188, which condemned the treatment of Syrian Jews, and yet President Assad remains unmoved. Now is the time for President Bush and Congress to draw the line and insist on freedom for Syrian Jews. Let us think of this Shabbat Zachor as the year that Americans resolved to seek freedom for Syrian Jews as we have for so many people around the globe.

□ 1130

A NEW BUDGET PROPOSAL

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, everyone in the country knows by now that the fiscal year for the Congress of the United States and the Federal Government ends every single year on September 30 and the new one begins the very next day; yet for as long as I have been a Member of Congress, and as I understood many years prior to that, the Congress has failed to meet its own deadline for the finalization of the budget by September 30. What chaos that brings on is borne out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, by the history books and by the memories of those who watch what the Congress does on a day-by-day basis.

I have introduced for several Congresses now and most recently before the Committee on Rules working in the present session of the Congress a simple resolution of that problem. My bill says that if the Congress of the United States has failed by September 30 of the given fiscal year to enact a budget, that the next day, October 1, automatically should be adopted the previous year's budget. That will enable sanity to come into the budget process.

WE NEED A BUDGET TO PUT PEOPLE TO WORK

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, the silence from the administration about American workers who have lost their jobs is astounding. As the President comes back from the South, still reeling from Buchanan's obvious incursions into his Republican base, it seems to me what the Republican President needs is not a rose garden strategy to hide, but one to come out and engage the problems we face as a country.

I have some 40 Electric Boat workers and people from the community here today trying to get Congress to do what the administration should do. We should find a way to make sure that we do not dispose of those people who gave us the technology that brought us victory in the Persian Gulf and victory over the Soviet Union.

There are tens of thousands of defense workers in my community and across this Nation with skills and abilities that could enrich this country.

Mr. Speaker, we need more than just a good-bye letter from the President or a line in the budget that takes away their jobs. We need diversification and conversion. We need an opportunity for these people to work so they can pay their mortgages and build a stronger America.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the first half hour of the 1-minute speeches this morning. I assume some people spoke about the check scandal.

I think this is a big problem of perception here, not only outside but inside this Chamber about what is going to happen here this afternoon and all day tomorrow on the check kiting scandal. The reason that Americans are focusing in on this and are angry about it is because obviously the news media, this is their job, are going to take the list of check kiters and see who serves on the Ways and Means Committee, the Appropriations Committee, chairmanships of other committees. They are going to see who touches in any way, shape or form, taxpayer dollars in the Treasury of the United States.

During the budget debate last week, because we wanted our freshmen on this side to share in that fascinating discussion, I saved a speech for this week or next that is going to take some of my distinguished friends, like the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN, the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi who came here a month before Pearl Harbor, and discuss how big the deficit is, the national debt and all the fiscal problems of this country during the tenure of our senior leaders.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the minority over here. We do not have to take responsibility for that.

CBO NEEDS TO REGAIN ITS CREDIBILITY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to some egregious errors committed by the Congressional Budget Office. Unfortunately, both the Democratic leadership and the media have ignored these errors and continue to pass bogus information to Members of this body and the public.

Our distinguished colleague from Texas, Congressman ARMEY published a study showing that the CBO had erred in its prediction of 1989 capital gains income by $75 billion. The study also maintained that this error would be built into the CBO's annual baseline figures, amounting to $375 billion in error over 5 years.

Several weeks ago, Congressman ARMEY revealed that the CBO admitted its forecast for capital gains income of $254 billion for 1990 missed the mark by $134 billion—an error of more than 105 percent.

Mr. Speaker, these errors undercut the premise of the Democratic leadership's class-war argument. They demonstrate that the data used to defeat the President's efforts for a job-creating capital gains tax cut are faulty. It is also important to note that the CBO never acknowledged these errors until Congressman ARMEY had the courage to expose them.

Currently, the CBO's personnel are appointed by the Democratic leadership with no Republican consultation or confirmation.

To bring some credibility back to Congress, I suggest we cleanup the CBO and make it a truly bipartisan organization.

PEOPLE OF THE COUNTRY CONCERNED AND UPSET OVER ACTIONS OF THE CONGRESS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are concerned and upset because of things that are going on here in the Capitol. There is an investigation going on right now dealing with drugs at the post office. There is an investigation going on down there that deals with the stealing of some money. There are other things that are throwing mud on this Capitol, that cause mud to be cast on this Capitol, and now we have the check bouncing issue.

I just would like to say to my colleagues, I was back in my district this week and my constituents are concerned about that. They want to know who the abusers are around this place and they want it cleaned up. They want them cleaned out. So all I can say to my colleagues is that we should make a clean breast of this. There should be full disclosure, no hiding, because it only discredits this place more and more.

The American people want to know. They want the facts. They want it all out in public and we should give it to them just as quickly as is humanly possible. That is the only way there is

going to be credit brought back to the Capitol of the United States.

ONLY FULL DISCLOSURE SOLVES THE PROBLEM

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know if Members of Congress were abusing the privileges afforded to them by the House bank. What is at stake today is the credibility of our institution, or what is left of it. This information will reach the public sooner or later, as well it should.

The real issue before us is whether the House has the courage to release this information itself, rather than waiting for pressure from the press and the public to force the issue.

Let us not compound the embarrassment of this incident by giving the appearance of covering up the truth. Let the public sort out the abusers from the merely careless or unlucky.

BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 1992

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 394 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 394

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3732) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into 3 categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed three hours, with two and one-half hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations and one-half hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, during consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

This House resolution is the first rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992. A rule for further consideration of the bill and amendments to it will be considered sometime next week.

The resolution before us now provides 3 hours of general debate time, with 2½ hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, and one-half hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and by the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has recommended this procedure so that the House may begin debate today on H.R. 3732. After general debate, the Committee on the Whole shall rise without the need of a motion, and no further consideration will be in order except pursuant to a future rule or other order of the House.

For the information of Members, the Rules Committee intends to meet next week, as I've said, to recommend another rule dealing with the consideration of amendments to the measure. In addition, the committee has extended the previously set deadline for filing amendments with the committee until noon on Monday next, March 16.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3732 would consolidate all Federal discretionary spending under a single spending cap in fiscal year 1993, in effect eliminating the so-called firewalls between the defense, domestic, and international categories. The bill would not change in any way the overall deficit limit imposed by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. The levels of spending in each of these categories are established through the annual appropriations process.

Mr. Speaker, to repeat and in conclusion, House Resolution 394 provides for general debate only. I urge the adoption of the resolution so that we may begin the consideration of H.R. 3732 today.

□ 1140

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am more than a little ambivalent about this rule. All it does is authorize 3 hours of general debate on the so-called Budget Process Reform Act of 1992. That is the bill that tears down the spending firewalls and breaks all our promises.

Next week the Committee on Rules and the full House will consider a second rule that structures the amendment process for H.R. 3732, a very unusual procedure.

The chairman of the Committee on Rules yesterday announced the third deadline for filing amendments to this bill, the third deadline. This latest deadline is noon next Monday, March 16.

I guess all the Members have a chance now to put in more amendments. But we have to be clear that those amendments that have already been filed are still relevant and are still alive and do not have to be filed over again. I know that the ranking Republican on the Government Operations Committee was concerned about that.

Mr. Speaker, next week will be the third week this bill has been scheduled for floor consideration. The majority leadership is still not sure how it will scrape together enough votes to pass this bill. Presumably, the purpose of this third amendment deadline is to permit the majority leadership to file an amendment to their own bill that will somehow buy off enough votes to pass it. That is really what this is all about.

So I think my colleagues can understand why I am concerned about debating a bill that might be completely changed after we finish debating it, after we use 3 hours of general debate. We are liable to come back here next week and be asked to vote for something we have never seen, something that has never gone through a committee.

Mr. Speaker, our 3 hours of filler time today while we await a vote on another matter, which we all know about, may prove to be totally irrelevant to what we are eventually going to be asked to vote on next week.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, adopting this rule is like buying the proverbial pig in a poke. In fact, the further changes the Democrat leaders make in this bill, no matter how we slice it, still come out pork, pork, pork. That is what this whole firewall demolition debate is really all about: How the Democrats can break the budget agreement to buy more pork.

Mr. Speaker, the title of this bill is the most blatant example of false advertising I have seen in my 14 years here in Congress.

One thing this bill is not, Mr. Speaker, is budget reform. If Congress were subject to the Truth in Labeling Act, this bill should be entitled "The Budget Agreement Nullification and Betrayal Act," because that is what it is.

That is what the bill and this debate are all about here today. If we pass this bill, we are walking away from the budget agreement that was struck just 16 months ago. That agreement raised taxes, $140 billion in taxes, on the American people and imposed discretionary spending caps for one reason and one reason only: To bring down the deficit. That is what every one of the Democrat press releases said.

Now, instead of abiding by that agreement, which also requires that any savings in any discretionary categories go exclusively to deficit reduc-

tion, Democrats are calling for tearing down the spending firewalls and for increasing spending and increasing the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, how can those Members who voted for the 1990 budget agreement now turn around and support this bill to trash it? Do they tell their constituents that they really did not mean the part about spending controls and deficit reduction? Do they tell them that all they were really interested in was raising taxes and spending those revenues from those increased taxes?

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we heard all the excuses in the Committee on Rules yesterday as to why we should turn our backs on the American people and on that budget agreement. Yes, the cold war is over and we can begin to reduce our defense expenditures. Yes, we have all kinds of unmet social needs that cry out for increased spending on domestic programs. But, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, the fact is the cold war was already history. It was already history at the time this budget agreement was struck back in 1990. The Berlin Wall had already been down for almost a year; the two Germanys had already been reunited earlier that month; and economic and political reform was already beginning to transform the Soviet Union.

We knew in October 1990 that there would be a peace dividend, but we still made a commitment in that budget agreement to apply any defense savings, any defense savings—that is what we voted for—to deficit reduction.

Has the deficit since then become so small that it no longer matters to Members? Of course it has not. The very fact is that the deficit has practically doubled since the House voted for the budget agreement, from $220 billion in October of 1990 to practically $400 billion today. Talk about bank overdrafts and fiscal responsibility, the deficit makes the House check-kiting scandal look like penny ante.

Congress decided in 1990 that the growing deficit was the No. 1 problem confronting the country, and that goes double today. That is what the deficit is, double today what it was then. Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear people claim that passing this bill will not increase the deficit by one penny. That is what they testified about yesterday before our Committee on Rules. Not one penny, they said.

I suppose technically they are right; it is not going to increase the deficit by one penny. It is going to increase the deficit by billions of dollars because the savings from defense will be going, instead, directly to new spending programs and not to reducing the deficit.

That is a fact that is already reflected in the Democrats' plan A budget, which was adopted last week. That plan A budget assumes enactment of this bill. That is right. Pass this bill and the plan A budget, which contains no firewalls, goes into effect and there is no deficit reduction.

So, do not listen to those who try to claim with a straight face that this bill is deficit-neutral. They are the same people who would have you believe that this bill is a budget reform act when, in truth, it is an act of budget busting.

Mr. Speaker, I have filed a real budget reform amendment to this bill that would give the President of the United States veto recission authority for this coming year. My amendment would reverse our present recission process which requires congressional approval of such Presidential recissions. That is the law today. If the President does not want to spend the money, then we have to take action and vote to give him the authority not to spend it.

My amendment, by requiring enactment of a disapproval bill instead, would force the Congress to act on recissions instead of sitting on our hands and doing nothing.

□ 1150

Mr. Speaker, according to a General Accounting Office report just this past January, if the President had had line-item veto power between 1984 and 1989, we could have reduced the deficit by $70 billion. The amounts ranged from $7 billion in 1985 to $17 billion in 1987.

For those of my colleagues who are truly interested in spending control and deficit reduction, my amendment should appeal to every one of you. But I suspect that the Committee on Rules will not allow me to offer that amendment next week, and that is a shame, my colleagues. It is just one more sign about where the Democrats in this House really stand on the issue of spending control and deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will reject this firewall demolition bill so that they can keep the commitment made by the Democrats in 1990. There were 228 Democrats who voted for the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act and who promised their taxpayers back home that budget savings would be applied to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we can vote this rule down so that we will not have to vote for a pig in the poke when the bill is considered. At the appropriate time I am going to ask something of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] whom I have a great deal of respect for, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. With the understanding that my request is supported by the Republican leadership and by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], the ranking Republican member on the Government Operations Committee. I am going to ask the chairman if he will reserve some of the debate time, this 3 hours today, to be laid over until next week so that we can see what kind of bill we are going to be voting on.

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

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I did talk with the chairman the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], who I do not see on the floor at the moment, and he indicated his willingness to reserve time, and I have also indicated my willingness to reserve time. So, I am sure we can reserve at least an hour of time so that we will have additional time for debate when we come back next week to consider the amendments.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the ranking member, "Do you have an agreement with the chairman that he will come to the Rules Committee?"

Mr. HORTON. We did not say anything about the Committee on Rules. We just said we would reserve the time today.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, it was this gentleman's intention, I would say to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], whether or not such an agreement were arrived at today that it would be this gentleman's intention when the Committee on Rules meets again next week to urge at that time, along with making decisions available as to which amendments may or may not be in order, to again provide for some time of general debate that would be acceptable to our friends on the other side because I think the gentleman is quite correct. We are not yet sure perhaps. We do not know what the form of the bill will be at that time, and certainly, if the bill is in any different form at all from what it is or from how it appears before us today, both sides would be entitled to some additional general debate I would think.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] is one of the most respected members of the Committee on Rules, and I appreciate his assurance. If that is the case, it would seem to be that we might be able to save the membership some time. We could not use the entire 3 hours today, and we could reserve some time knowing that we are going to be able to debate possibly a revised bill next week. I really do thank the gentleman from California [Mr BEILENSON] for his assurance. That is very helpful.

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

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS].

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, let me express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] for yielding this time

to me, and, before I get into the discussion further, let me just emphasize the fact that there is nothing in this resolution, nothing in the underlying legislation, which in fact provides for an increase in the deficit. The legislation still maintains the ceilings. All it does is to break down the walls so that in fact we are allowed to shift money from one of three categories to another of the three categories. Anything to the contrary that has been said is totally and absolutely false.

Now, as to the debate, in 1932, when we were deep into what turned out to be the greatest depression this country ever had, the then-incumbent Republican President, a gentleman named Herbert Hoover, kept on arguing that there was no such thing as a depression and that the thing to do was to deal with the underlying deficit and to get the budget into balance. America was in the greatest pain in history, and yet they were still looking backward.

Mr. Speaker, today we have a repeat of that same situation. It is not Herbert Hoover. It is Herbert Walker Bush who is the President, a Republican incumbent who denied until just a bare couple of months ago that there was even such a thing as a recession, when all the world knew it, and certainly many millions of Americans. Estimates are that there are about 16 million who are unemployed and underemployed, who are without jobs, who have lost their jobs. They know that there is a recession, and yet the Republicans and the President keep on talking about deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, need I remind anyone that, when Ronald Reagan a dozen years ago came into office, that the annual deficit was under $60 billion a year, that the total national debt was under a trillion dollars, and today we are running deficits under this Republican administration of $400 billion a year, and the total national debt has run to $4 trillion. That is under a so-called conservative, prudent, budget balancing, Republican incumbent President.

The only way that we are going to have any chance at all of reducing that deficit and cutting back on the national debt is to put the millions of Americans who are out of work and who desperately want to work back to work, and that is going to require, when the private sector cannot do it, for the Federal Government to provide some of the infusion of those funds. God knows our infrastructure, both physical and social, desperately needs that infusion. Everyone knows the condition of our roads, and bridges, and rail systems. Everyone knows the problems with our health system and our education system. We need America to be spending money on itself, to be reinvesting in itself.

Mr. Speaker, what this legislation does is to take note of where we are, where America is today and where the rest of the world is today. In 1990, when that agreement was entered into, that summit agreement, which was not imposed upon the President; he was a willing, encouraging participant in that event; the Soviet Union was the great threat to the United States. There is no Soviet Union anymore, never mind threat. There is no Soviet Union. We refer to the "former" Soviet Union because it has been broken into 16 different republics.

Yes, this legislation is desperately needed at this point so we can go about the business of America, of reinvesting in America and the American people.

I hope that the Committee on Rules will make in order an amendment, which I have offered, which will make this legislation apply not just to fiscal year 1993, but also to fiscal year 1992, because the pain is on us now, and the people of this country want relief now. The legislation does not say how we are going to spend that money. It simply allows the Congress to work its will.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is good legislation. I hope the Members will support it. I thank again the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], my colleague, for yielding this time to me.

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

Mr. Speaker, before yielding 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], let me just say that I do not know if I heard right or not. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] who just spoke said there is no threat. As my colleagues know, there are at least 10,000 nuclear warheads still aimed at American cities, including New York City where he comes from. There are at least 3 million Soviet troops still in uniform. Does the gentleman know that there are no less than ten hostile, anti-American countries right now which are working on developing nuclear warheads? Libya right now may have two submarines with the kind of capability to launch sneak attacks at American targets both at home and abroad. And there is no threat?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I must admit that, as I stand here, I am very confused, and I am very concerned about where we are headed. This sounds to me like another phony process from a gang who cannot shoot straight and from leadership that cannot run the House right.

Now we have got literally millions of people across this country that are waiting for this House to debate the issue of check kiting because they are very concerned about the fact that this Congress has lost its moral compass.

□ 1210

What are we doing? We are evidently going to engage in a totally phony debate about a bill that does not even have a chance of coming to the floor for a vote. At least that is what I now understand, that the leadership over there has now taken a look at their whip counts and figured out, "Oh, my goodness, we may lose. This bill has been reported out of committee. It is a terrible piece of legislation. It can't get enough support from the Democratic side, there are no Republican votes for it, and we are going to lose this turkey. So, my goodness, what we have got to do now, we have got to retrench and we have got to get back to the Rules Committee and extend the time for amendments so that maybe we have got a chance of coming up with something that will win."

And guess what? That bill will not even have been before any committee. Whatever it is they come up with, and who knows what it will be, it will not have been before any committee, so we are going to be asked basically to vote blindly on it.

We on the minority side are used to voting with our hands tied behind our backs. All the rules that have been brought forward recently have just tied the minority's hands behind their backs in terms of debating bills. We are used to being gagged. We no longer have open rules in the Congress. On every rule that comes out here, we are told in advance what we are allowed to offer. So we are used to operate being gagged. I guess now we are going to have to operate with a blindfold on because this rule suggests we are going to have 3 hours of phony debate today, and maybe next week sometime we will come with another bill that has never been before any committee and maybe we will get some more time.

I think the gentleman from California is very honorable. He says we are going to have some more time to debate whatever it is they come up with next week. Good. That is wonderful. I say, "Thank you." It is nice that at least we might be able to find something out about the bill we are going to vote on.

But this is a horrible process. What amendments are going to be made in order? We have no idea what amendments we might be able to offer because we have no idea what the bill may be that we are going to vote on.

What a stupid process. What a phony process we are going to engage in. And what is it we are doing? We are trying to make certain we do not get around to debating check kiting. We are going to save that maybe until tomorrow so that we can have more caucus meetings about how we can cover up that issue.

Then they are talking about bringing forward another bill, the House administrator bill, that again the minority

has not even been consulted about. We are going to create a House officer. The Speaker signed off on this, and we are going to have debate out here about creating a whole new scheme for the House of Representatives that the minority has not even been consulted about. So we are going to engage in 3 hours of phony debate so we do not get to the real debates.

This place has not only lost its moral compass, this House has totally lost its collective mind. We cannot even get to the real issues before the American people. I heard colleagues today talking about the fact that we ought to be debating jobs. Absolutely, we should be. This economy is in terrible shape. Yet what are we talking about here with this bill? We are talking about figuring out a way to spend more money. I love it when these gentlemen come to us and tell us, "Oh, we will break down the fire walls, but that doesn't mean more spending."

Look, who are they kidding? The American people know that every time we touch something it ends up spending more money. The American people are tired of pork barreling. They are tired of Government spending that has gone completely out of control. Then they look and they figure out that "These guys not only can't run the Federal budget, they can't even run their own budgets. They can't even run their personal checkbooks."

They are absolutely disgusted with what they see. Yet what do we do? We engage in a series of phony processes that are designed primarily to get the House off the hook. I am sick of it. I think the American people are sick of it. There are more and more Members on our side of the aisle who are growing sick of it, and it is about time we came to this floor with something a little more presentable than this particular rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that Members would vote against this rule. This is a phony rule, and it ought not be supported by anyone.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for this time.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. DELLUMS. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I only need about 30 seconds, and I really appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had suggested a moment ago that we are still facing a great threat from within the former Soviet Union. So I would ask him where he thinks that threat is coming from, from Russia or from the Ukraine?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California will yield, I would just like to ask the gentleman from New York: Can he tell me who is in power over there right now? Can he tell me who is going to be in power next week, next month, or next year? What happens if that whole Commonwealth arrangement falls apart?

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I thought I had asked a fairly simple question.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Members of the House that first I rise in support of the rule and, second, I would like to try to bring us back to the substantive issues that are before the House, and that is the proposition of whether or not we should bring down the so-called firewalls.

Let me for a moment recall history. This body adopted a 5-year budget proposal in 1990 that said that for 3 years the military budget would be protected from cuts that could be transferred to domestic programs for 3 years. We are now debating fiscal year 1993. As a matter of fact, this is the last year that so-called protection is there. Next year the wall would not be there, so we are really only debating 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, to bring the walls down is a very important proposition. Reasonable Members of this body can disagree on that matter. I have no problem with that. That is what this process is all about. I certainly would hope, as I have said on more than one occasion, that we would address the historic significance of this moment rather than, through partisan or political advantage, challenge each other on the issue. Let us come to grips cerebrally with what we are talking about.

Why do I support bringing down the walls? My reason is twofold. We adopted a budget in 1990, and No. 1, world events have overtaken the budget and, No. 2, the American people are feeling economic and social dislocation in unprecedented terms.

It seems to me that it is foolish for a society to keep walking in lockstep with the process when world events and national events have overtaken it. Reasonable people should step back and say that that was 1990 and the world and the Nation have changed significantly enough that we can now deal with that proposition.

Let us go to the first issue, that the world has changed in significant fashion. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York, correctly points out that the Berlin Wall had come down and that the cold war was defined as over when we debated the 5-year budget resolution in 1990. But we are now in a post-Soviet Union environment, and this is an unprecedented moment in American history.

Most recently we had the President of Russia here saying not only that he was no longer interested in being our enemy but he wanted very desperately to be our friend, and he said parenthetically, "If you have any food, help us, because our people are starving."

The world has changed, I say to my colleagues, and we must change with it. The old thinking must now be abandoned. We have been spending $300 billion a year each year for the last 10 years for what purpose? Two major threats—the Warsaw Pact, which has now vanished from the radar screen, and the Soviet Union, which has significantly dissipated. Those two threats in the aggregate have caused us to spend between $150 and $210 billion per annum. Those threats are now gone or are significantly reduced. So what we are saying is, let us now bring down this so-called firewall because we do not need a $300 billion budget any longer.

□ 1210

Yes, we are prepared to put some of the money into the deficit. We are responsible people.

But what is the second part of my argument? It is that American people are suffering economic and social dislocation in unprecedented terms. People are unemployed in America in significant numbers. People who never thought that they could support welfare now find themselves in welfare lines.

Children are killing children on the streets of America. Babies are having babies in America. Senior citizens are concerned about health care in America.

There are American people who are afraid to walk the streets because our social and economic fabric is so thoroughly falling apart and violence is rearing its ugly head. These are the issues we need to be addressing.

So we are simply saying that a reasonable society, a reasonable group of people, yes, we came together for a 5-year budget agreement, but that was in 1990. The world has significantly changed and the pain in this country is extreme.

We have ripped off the dreams of our children. When you can pick up a newspaper and the newspaper says that children in this society do not believe that they will have a sufficient future, that should bring tears to the eyes of every human being in America. We have stolen the future from our children, and we are not addressing the issue.

Yes, reasonable people can differ about whether the walls go up or the walls go down. But let us not burlesque this moment. This is a real moment. It is disingenuous to suggest in some way that this is fraudulent.

For the last several months this gentleman has argued that we ought to get ourselves out of the straitjacket of the 1990 budget agreement. That is my

right and my prerogative as a Member of this body. If you disagree, fine. But let us stop burlesquing each other. I believe American people deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important moment. The question of bringing down the walls is very real.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we keep talking about this check scandal in relationship to what we are talking about here. Frankly, I think that whole issue is a fraud, and a phony, politically motivated issue that has nothing to do with reality.

The American people ought to be demanding that we get beyond that. But we have got a People magazine mentality in this country. So we do not even begin to deal with the substantive matters, while we play games, wearing bags over our heads in a body that should be distinguished for its diligent work.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is bizarre. We are probably going to spend more time debating that matter than debating the substantive issues of our time.

As I said earlier in the proceedings, members of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus were the only people that were willing to put their budget on the floor in the full light of day for 8 consecutive hours of debate. A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle participated in that discussion, and I respect that fact.

But nobody wanted to put President Bush's proposal on the floor for 8 hours. No one wanted to put the other alternatives on the floor for 8 hours.

We said that after 3½ months of diligent work, we would put the proposal on the floor. The hallmark of that proposal was that we must bring down the walls so that we would not have to spend money on B-2 bombers, but spend money on better schools; we would not spend so much money building new weapons systems, but rather building an economic infrastructure in America that would generate millions of jobs. We said that we would get away from all this exorbitant spending on defense as we chase some shadow threat that no longer exists, when the real threat in America is economic and social insecurity, the fact that our children feel there is no future, and our people have no jobs.

So, yes, I stand here proudly in support of this rule. Second, I stand here, yes, as a defender of the proposition that the wall must come down. If the world had not changed until now, then, fine, let us continue to walk in lockstep. But if the world has changed, it seems to me for both reasons, substantial change in the international community and tremendous pain in America, it requires us to bring that wall down, to significantly reduce the military budget, and get on with enhancing this economy, stimulating the economy, protecting the environment, creating health, and expanding education.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment my fellow Californian [Mr. DELLUMS] for his remarks and say the gentleman remembers very well last week I stood here with him and argued in behalf of his right to have 8 hours to debate that budget when it came forward. If the gentleman recalls, I also argued for some of us to have the same right to offer the kind of proposals that we wanted to amendments that frankly were coming from his side of the aisle on that budget, by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT], and others.

So I supported the right of the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] to have 8 hours, and I think it should be made clear that we also wanted to give the right that we gave to the gentleman to every other Member in this House. But, unfortunately, that rule denied us that chance.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond for a moment to the question posed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS], who was asking the very important question where in the Soviet Union is this threat coming from?

Well, I think that every single Member in this House recognizes the fact that we have seen tremendous changes. There are cuts that are being made in the area of defense. We are now 3 years into a 5-year program to reduce by 25 percent the defense expenditures.

But, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said, we do have a great deal of uncertainty as we look at the former Soviet Union, now the Commonwealth of Independence States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] asked the question, is it from the Ukraine or from Russia?

Well, the fact of the matter is we all know, and the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and most every Member of this House, are aware of the fact, that there are still today 27,000 nuclear warheads pointed at the United States from the Soviet Union.

I think we need to realize that one of the greatest threats is in fact from the Ukraine, because that is where over 4,000 nuclear warheads are today. Kazakhstan is another place where they are located. I think we need to recognize that point.

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

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman support the effort that is emanating from the former Soviet Union Republics to in fact cut back drastically on their possession of nuclear weapons as well as ours?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would say we are helping them to do it.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say absolutely. That is a priority item. I want to ensure that we play a role in making sure that those nuclear physicists who have the capability to involve themselves with other Third World countries are not going to do that. We are expending a great deal of resources right now trying to ensure that that threat is lessened.

One of the other things that President Bush included in his State of the Union Message here was to proceed with a strategic defense initiative, which is, again, a priority. The goal, of course, is to ensure that no nuclear warhead ever enters the atmosphere.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] acknowledge that the recession is more severe today than it was in 1990?

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the question is, is the recession more severe today than it was in 1990? Yes. We are clearly emerging from a recession.

Mr. Speaker, we had this exchange in the Committee on Rules yesterday. I was trying to point out the fact that we have in fact seen improvement in the economy in the past several months. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEISS] referred to the depression that we are now in when he was in the Committee on Rules. I have to say that I do not agree with that. We have seen some very positive economic signs which have emerged.

But the problem we have in the 1990 package that was put together, the goal was to eliminate the Federal deficit, to try to dramatically reduce it, as other legislative goals such as Gramm-Rudman and other items have tried to do. Unfortunately, we are today in a position where that deficit has continued to grow dramatically.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe that if we are going to see a lessening of expenditures in defense, it should be utilized for deficit reduction. Yes, the domestic problems that we have, as outlined by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], are very serious. They are exacerbated in large part because of the irresponsible spending pattern which emanates from this House of Representatives. That is why I believe we have got to do everything that we can to turn the corner on that.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to subscribe to the belief that if we are going to continue to break down these walls and make other modifications of the budget summit agreement, we should in fact do something about what President Bush said he thought was a mistake in that summit agreement, incorporating that massive tax increase on the American people there.

Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment which when we come back next week I am going to try to get adopted here in the House, which would, as we look at changing the scoring process from the Office of Management and Budget to the Congressional Budget Office, that was a violation of the agreement. As we look at reducing the fire walls, that was clearly breaking that summit agreement.

My friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS], said he is in favor of unshackling that budget summit agreement. So I say yes, let us do it, with the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] on the line item veto, and I would like to see us do that when it comes to the tax increase question.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious problem. I happen to believe that the recession, which today may be worse than it was in 1990, is in large part because of this budget summit agreement.

□ 1220

So that is why I support repealing the tax increase which has been imposed on the American people.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield briefly to me?

Mr. DREIER of California. If I have any time remaining, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, just quickly, the gentleman mentioned on several occasions the issue of the deficit. What has contributed to the deficit? A rapid rise in the military budget. We are trying to turn that around. Unequal distribution in our tax system with greater tax benefits going to the wealthy. We are trying to turn that around.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I happen to disagree with that.

Mr. DELLUMS. The gentleman may disagree.

One other contributing factor to the deficit has been the recession itself. When people are unemployed they cannot pay taxes. It does not go into the coffers.

Mr. DREIER of California. The recession came about because of the 1990 summit agreement.

Mr. DELLUMS. If the gentleman would continue to yield, we are arguing we have to have a program to turn around the recession.

Mr. DREIER of California. We do have a program to end the recession. The President asked that we, by March 20, get it to his desk. I hope very much we will do so.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

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

What I was simply trying to say to my colleague is that there are those of us on this side of the aisle who are willing to contribute cash to try to bring down the deficit.

No. 2, because the military budget went up quickly it contributed to the deficit. We believe bringing the military budget down helps to deal with that.

No. 3, we said that providing major tax breaks, to the wealthy and the corporate elite contributed to the deficit.

No. 4, we said that the recession itself contributed to the deficit. Many of us had a program to try to turn around the recession.

There are two other remaining significant contributors to the deficit. One of them is the S&L crisis. I hope that is temporary. I hope that someday we will get beyond that. But what is the fourth and most significant contributor to the deficit that all of us know about is that we are spending in excess of $800 billion on skyrocketing costs of health, because health care costs are uncontrollable.

Many economists and many health professionals have suggested that if we do not get a handle on the costs of health, even if we find $1 trillion in peace dividends it would be soaked up by just trying to deal with that.

Mr. DREIER of California. If my friend, the gentleman from California, would yield on that point, I think it is important to realize that the second highest item in the budget is paying interest on that debt, so it gets right back to my point of trying to reduce this horrendous deficit.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make one very simple point here today. That is that Congress, by that resolution that we passed in the fall of 1990, has crippled our ability to deal with the realities of life, today with the realities of the threats that face us now and the dangers that face us in the future.

We cannot afford to limit our choices and limit our options as we face each day's challenges. That is highlighted by the fact that with these limitations we are totally incapable of meeting the realities of today's challenge in a way that is sensible.

Since that agreement was made in the fall of 1990, the real threat to us, the reason we spend $300 billion a year, has disappeared, the existence of another superpower.

That does not mean there are not threats out there. There are. There is the threat of regional wars. There is the threat of a Saddam Hussein, of an Idi Amin, of the Khomeini, of an Assad. Of course there are regional threats out there, but there is no other superpower threat. That means that there is absolutely no justification for continuing to spend $300 billion a year on defense.

Now, nobody is talking about unilateral disarmament, nobody is talking about dismantling our present defense establishment. What we are talking about is the option that we have now not to spend additional hundreds of billions of dollars in creating new systems, new missiles, new ways of defending ourselves against another superpower.

We have a vast ability to meet with the regional threats that face us around the world today. I must say to my colleague, the gentleman from New York, when he enumerated the threats that faced us, I thought that was some kind of Kafkaesque synopsis that was facing us, some kind of Alice in Wonderland upside down world.

The elements of the former Socialist republic, the individual republics, the Ukraine, the Warsaw Pact, they are all rushing toward democracy.

Yes, they do have a legacy of the U.S.S.R., the now nonexistent U.S.S.R. They do have the legacy of those missile installations that were installed during that cold war spell.

If the Russians did not let one of those missiles loose on us during almost half a century when we were involved in a bitter confrontation, does anybody think that now in an era of peace, when they are asking us for food, when they are asking us for science and technology, when they are asking us for development aid, does anybody really think that those Russians, who are very conservative people, are going to loose a nuclear missile on us now? That is preposterous. It is utterly preposterous.

We cannot limit our choices. We have domestic needs of every kind that are pressing in on us. My colleague, the gentleman from California, articulated that.

Let me say one final word. It is time we started facing our real choices. We have to stop saying that we cannot afford to do this or do that when all we mean is that we cannot afford it within the rules of the game that we have arbitrarily established and agreed to play.

"Let us liberate ourselves to do what has to be done considering all the options out there." My friends, these are not my words. These words are words, testimony from Herbert Stein, the conservative Republican economist who served as President Nixon's chairman of his Council on Economic Matters. What has to be done is to educate America's kids, to make America more productive. That is the challenge of today. We should liberate ourselves from these chains of the past, to use our resources, to deploy today's resources in a way that makes sense for Amercia.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a very distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs with whom I served for many years.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Lest we be confused, the issue here right now is not defense. It is what we do with the savings from defense. When we passed the budget summit agreement in 1990, there was a firewall erected and it said in the budget summit agreement that the moneys saved from defense were to go for deficit reduction, because we were running huge deficits. They were running about $220 billion a year.

In 1990 we raised the American people's taxes $181 billion to get control of the deficit. We erected these firewalls so that the defense spending savings would go into deficit reduction.

What happened? Because of the tax increase, the recession was exacerbated, and we do not have a $220 billion deficit anymore, it is $400 billion a year.

One of my colleagues over here said, "What are we doing to the kids of this country?" I want to tell the Members, we are really doing a lot to them. The deficit is $400 billion a year and going up. Now they want to blow the savings from defense on more pork barrel projects. That is not going to solve the problem. It is going to exacerbate the problem. The deficit continues to go up.

Ten years ago the national debt was $1 trillion. Now it is $4 trillion. It took us 200 years to get to $1 trillion and 10 years to quadruple it to $4 trillion. They are killing the future of the kids of this country.

The interest on the national debt is running well over $300 billion a year because we continue to spend ourselves into a terrible, terrible hole. We are not going to pay for that, the future generations are.

□ 1230

So we are borrowing today from our kids, and the kids are going to have to pay that back, and they are going to be unable to do so.

So what is going to happen? Their standard of living is going to go right down the tubes.

So what do we do? What should we do? We should not tear down these firewalls. What we should do is use the money from defense for reducing the deficit. In addition, we should cut taxes and put people back to work.

When we cut taxes under Ronald Reagan we created 21 million new jobs. They say the deficit was caused by Reagan. The fact of the matter is, when Reagan took office revenues coming into the Treasury were $500 billion a year. Do my colleagues know what they are now? They are $1.3 trillion, almost triple the revenue coming into the Treasury.

The problem is not that we do not have enough tax money. The problem is they are spending too much, and they want to spend more. They want to tear down those firewalls so that they can get at those defense savings that are supposed to reduce the deficit, that will help the future generations of this country not have to deal with more and more debt.

So I would just like to say to my colleagues, if they are concerned about the kids, if they are concerned about the future, if they are concerned about the future well-being and economic health for our kids, then let us get control of spending around here, not just raise more taxes and spend more, and spend more, and spend more. Get control of the spending if Members really care about the kids.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TRAXLER].

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by telling Members that as chairman of the HUD-VA-Independent Agencies Subcommittee, this is a matter of considerable interest to me, because the outcome will affect very dramatically the kind of bill that the subcommittee will be bringing to the floor in the months to come. I can state very candidly and very forthrightly that unless we get some relief from breaking down the walls from the defense and foreign aid categories, and nobody knows where the money will come from, why not take it from foreign aid, we do not have to take all the money from defense, take it from foreign aid. That is what we are looking at and that is what I want. Unless we do that, I can assure Members that nobody will be happy with the bill that we will present because nobody will be able to produce a bill that will satisfy the Members or even a minority of the Members of this body. By that I mean we can look at the reductions that will be made in the National Science Foundation, the reductions that will be made in NASA, the reductions that will be made in Veterans, and the reductions that will be made in EPA enforcement programs. Nobody wants any of that. That affects every American in some fashion, directly or indirectly. I also neglected to mention public housing as well.

I cannot urge in stronger terms how important it is today that we enact a rule, and then go on to pass a resolution that will allow us to exercise the discretion of determining how all the Federal money in the discretionary areas is to be allocated among competing domestic needs. This is essential. The walls make no sense. They are coming down next year under the budget agreement anyway.

We are not adding to the deficit in this proposal. The deficit will remain the same. We are rearranging the deck chairs.

Some Member will say that this is the problem that this is really the *Titanic*. Guess what. I do not disagree with that. I disagree with the definition that was given to us recently as to how we got here.

We got here through borrow and spend. We got here through the Republican Presidents' borrow-and-spend tactics. Slash taxes, slash taxes, increase defense, that is what brought us here, and we borrowed that money.

Do Members not think the American public understands that? You built prosperity in the 1980's on the backs of your children and your grandchildren. You flooded the country with borrowed money, and you said this is prosperity.

Shame on you. Have you no conscience for lying to the American public? Do you think they are too stupid to understand those kinds of trickle-down economics?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAXLER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman explain one thing to me: How did we go from $500 billion a year in tax revenue to $1.3 trillion and be on credit? The problem is not revenues, it is your spending.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I will take back my time, and I will answer the gentleman. It came from Social Security increases. Fundamentally, I say to the gentleman, that is where it came from.

Let me also say we cannot slash taxes and increase defense dramatically, and if we had not cut taxes in 1981 we would not be in this problem. We would have enough money.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], a very distinguished member of the "Gang of Seven."

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time. I would like to commend my colleague from New York, Mr. SOLOMON, who is attempting to offer an amendment—which I support—which would allow for a legislative conferral of line-item veto authority to the President of the United States.

I happen to be one who believes the President inherently has that authority, and I have urged him to use it, and will continue to do so. But I would be delighted if the Congress would officially recognize that and give him the power to make spending reductions as Mr. SOLOMON and I are proposing. I think it is scandalous the amount of spending that has gone on over these past years.

I think for the decade of the 1980's—and it is worse now—but for the decade of the 1980's the annual average increase in inflation was 4 percent, and the annual average increase in reve-

nues into the Federal Treasury was 7 percent, and the annual average increase in expenditures out of the Federal Treasury was 11 percent. So year in, year out, we are increasing spending by nearly 3 to 1 over the rate of inflation. That is absolutely amazing. And it is disastrous for our economy.

The line-item veto, I think, is what is needed to address the problem. I just hope that this House will revert to its antecedents which basically are true democratic rule with a small "d" where one can offer amendments and have them debated and considered on the floor and not bottled up in some rules committee denying the membership of this House the opportunity to make a reform that would be vital for the long-term financial well-being of the American people.

I urge the Rules Committee to let us debate and vote on the line-item amendment to be offered to the legislation which is the subject of this rule.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, throughout my congressional career I have voted to shift funds from defense to domestic spending, but today, reluctantly, I will not vote to lower the firewalls. I think it is a mistake, for the following reasons, and some of them are personal and relate to my own State:

First, I am concerned about the impact such a move will have on the deficit. If the firewalls remain in place, our deficit will be reduced by over $9 billion this fiscal year.

Second, I am concerned about the hundreds and thousands of people that will be losing their jobs in the defense industry. Nothing has been done to convert the defense industry into viable alternative post-cold-war activities that maintain these people livelihood. What is going to happen to them? They deserve an answer.

Third, Mr. Speaker, I have 15,000 New Mexicans dependent on the Los Alamos National Laboratories for their existence. While the labs are changing their focus from making bombs to environmental cleanup and research and other scientific priorities, that transition has not happened yet.

If our parents or our grandparents thought that the few dollars they scrimped and saved each paycheck wouldn't have made a difference in the long run—many of our parents and grandparents would not have had a house or a car to call their own or have been able to help their children through college. Without their foresight to plan and work toward these goals, few of us would have the opportunities we have today, we need to do the same for our children.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I will not support lowering the firewalls.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there are no further speakers other than the closing speaker on the other side, and that being the case, I yield the balance of our time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], a member of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, as we close out this debate it is very clear what we are doing here is violating an agreement which I opposed in October 1990, and I know my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] did too. But frankly, a majority of this House supported it.

I think it was a mistake. But the fact of the matter is, the one good thing that was coming out of that, and I opposed it because of the tax increase, but the one good thing that came out of it was we were trying to deal with the deficit, and there are Members who are trying to convince us that this package is not going to be violated.

□ 1240

In fact, just yesterday in the Committee on Rules the very distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Government Operations said that this measure does not break the budget agreement; the budget deal remains intact. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if you believe that, you believe that Humpty Dumpty is a good egg and not scrambled eggs. It is broke, and I think it is a mistake.

We should adamantly oppose this kind of effort which is ultimately going to jeopardize the future of our Nation.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further request for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this gentleman simply wants to remind his colleagues both in the offices and on the floor that this rule, if adopted, would provide for general debate of about 3 hours, up to 3 hours today. The Committee on Rules intends to come back with another rule next week, at which time we will determine which amendments may be made in order.

The gentleman would also like to point out in his opinion at least that there has been a very interesting discussion here today and would like to again point out to his colleagues that passing this rule would make available an additional 3 hours today for continuing this discussion as well as continue the discussion for another hour or more, several hours, in fact, next week when we come back with the second rule.

I urge Members to vote in favor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 394 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3732.

□ 1242

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3732) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, with Mr. JENKINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] will be recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes; the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] will be recognized for 1 hour and 15 minutes; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] will be recognized for 15 minutes; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, today, this afternoon, we deliberate a single straightforward change that would reflect new realities both at home and abroad. We must decide whether we stay on a cold-war footing or recognize that defense savings can be invested here at home for the first time in a half century.

To seize this historic moment, we must make a minor midcourse correction, and that is eliminating the firewall around military spending that was erected in the 1990 budget summit.

A year later, that military-spending firewall has become a statutory straitjacket that precludes the investment of any defense savings here at home. In effect, it prohibits us from realizing any peace dividend until fiscal year 1994.

Just as the fall of the Berlin Wall reflected the new reality in Europe, the elimination of the budgetary firewall that protects military spending would properly reflect this new reality. Without this simple and commonsense

change, we will still have a cold-war budget process in a post-cold-war world.

This is a wakeup call to the Congress. Now is the time to make a modest change merely a year ahead of the time that is already provided in the Budget Enforcement Act.

This is a time that cries out for leadership in meeting the changes at home and abroad. Here, at home, our economy is in a period of economic stagnation. The supply-side economics practiced by the last two administrations have produced massive deficits, the worst recession since the Second World War, and a domestic economy that is on the ropes, with scant hope of meaningful growth.

In the face of this economic mismanagement with unemployment at 7.3 percent and rising, 9 percent in Michigan, 13 percent in the city of Detroit, the President of the United States offers us very little. His budget was resoundingly rejected by 119 House Members of the Republican Party and ridiculed as tissue paper by one of his Republican Presidential rivals. This is the same administration that proposes that this country needs more of the same.

In the meantime, we should presumably pray to the cyclical economic gods to solve our short- and long-term fiscal ills.

We need to change to meet the challenges of a changed world. The Democratic economic recovery program would both further reduce the deficit and make needed investment in jobs, particularly in communities devastated by military cuts, as well as investments for our children, our veterans, our senior citizens, and working Americans most hurt by the Bush recession. That is why the passage of the measure before us, H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act, has become so pivotal, so significant, so indispensable to the resolution of our economic crisis.

Our defense needs have changed, because the world has changed. With the end of the cold war and the collapse of the Soviet threat, there is wide bipartisan consensus that we can realize significant military savings. I repeat, there is wide bipartisan consensus that we can realize significant military savings. Indeed, even the President of the United States is united in this factual agreement.

But under the antiquated minicaps established by the 1990 budget summit, those savings cannot be intelligently reinvested for jobs and economic competitiveness. Yet, President Bush remains steadfast in his opposition to changing the now outdated law.

As a fiscal matter, the opposition shows how little the administration still refuses to recognize and confront the effects of the economic downturn it has created here at home.

As a practical matter, this opposition means that many more working and middle Americans will be out of work—as many as 400,000 who would otherwise be employed educating our children, retraining our workers, building our bridges, keeping our streets safe, and conducting our research and development so that we can better compete in the international marketplace. In short, if the administration prevails and this measure, H.R. 3732, is not passed, middle-class working Americans stand to be the biggest losers.

Eliminating the military spending firewall 1 year early is all that this bill does. Doing that accomplishes two complementary goals.

It prevents deep domestic cuts in the fiscal year 1993. CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, says that unless this measure is passed, outlays for domestic programs will be slashed $6.4 billion below 1992 levels.

□ 1250

It will also allow us to begin making longer-term investments here at home that will rebuild America and restore our competitive position internationally.

It will not affect defense spending. It will not affect defense spending. I am very happy to emphasize that fact, because under both the walls down plan that I advocate and the walls up plan, the budget authority and the budget outlays remain precisely the same.

Our bill thus addressed both our short-term and our long-term economic ills.

Now, we also understand the importance of both reducing the deficit and increasing investments in our future which have dramatically and dangerously declined in the past decade.

What we have here is an example in this chart of the shrinking share of the budget that is dedicated to Federal investment. We began at the beginning of the Reagan term with an investment of 13.8 percent of the budget for that fiscal year. These are investment programs dealing with community and regional education, employment and training, energy programs, environment and natural resources, health care, housing, science, space technology and transportation. This investment is an incredibly vital commitment that this Government, like any corporation in the private sector, has to make if it wants to continue to be viable and competitive.

So we understand the importance of both reducing the deficit and increasing investments in our future.

The current massive deficits are largely a creation of failed supply side economics, sponsored by a succession of Republican Presidents. Each year during the Bush and Reagan Presidencies have added as much to the deficit as all the previous budgets in our history. Without question, these deficits are decreasing our product capacity. That is why the humble proposal before the body today would cut the deficit below the benchmark set by President Bush at the 1990 budget summit.

These, Mr. Chairman, are the dire economic facts of life under the last two administrations, not only attested to by myself, but documented by the Joint Economic Committee.

We are currently in the longest recession since World War II, 18 months and still counting.

The Bush administration is the first in the post-World War II era to have a negative rate of economic growth.

During the Bush and Reagan years, the income of the wealthiest 20 percent of Americans grew by more than 20 percent, while the earnings of 60 percent of Americans who are middle and lower income actually declined.

In fact, income of the wealthiest 1 percent grew by 65 percent during this period, while the earnings of the poorest 20 percent among us declined by 6 percent. The rich are getting richer. The poor are getting poorer.

During the Bush and Reagan years, effective tax rates have gone up for the poorest Americans, while they have been slashed for the wealthy.

It is just not my belief, but these have been documented by the Joint Economic Committee and by public sector and private sector experts alike.

In the face of this economic crisis, President Bush submitted a budget full of gadgets and gimmicks. Indeed, the Joint Economic Committee estimates that the Bush budget accounting gimmicks would hide $61.3 billion in deficit increases over the next 5 years.

In contrast to this continued policy of economic neglect, our program addresses the key economic problems that we all must confront. In particular, the Budget Process Reform Act before you now would allow crucial strategic investments in our future.

This is the real world, Mr. Chairman. This Reform Act deals with the problems that we have to meet here in each of our districts.

We would create in terms of jobs as many as 400,000 new jobs more than the Bush budget.

It would create 220,000 more jobs than would be created with the walls down. Inside that 220,000 jobs that would be created with the walls down we would come up with 100,000 more highway jobs, 86,000 more housing jobs, 24,000 more mass transit, 6,000 more airport improvement jobs, 3,000 more Social Security jobs. Count them, 220,000 more kinds of employment that would be created with the budget walls down.

In addition, we would be helping education, which would be the biggest loser if these walls do not come down. With the walls down we could provide $2.7 billion in additional education aid. Impact Aid to assist the local school

districts would be increased by $423 million.

We would increase Pell grants by $951 million.

We would allow the Head Start Program to enroll an additional 37,000 preschoolers.

Education is where we have got to invest more resources if we are to regain our competitiveness. Education is the hope for the future.

In terms of health, we would with the walls down allow 110,000 more veterans to get VA hospital care provided them. We would have 2.4 million veterans able to make more outpatient visits.

We would have 850,000 more low-income women who would receive primary and prenatal care through infant mortality initiatives and community health centers with the walls down. These are important concerns for programs that in my district and in many of yours, would benefit by having these additional services provided.

We would allow 200,000 more women, infants and children, to receive nutritional assistance under the WIC program with walls down.

We would allow $391 million more to be made available for the National Institutes of Health in biomedical research with the walls down, allowing for the funding of many more of the NIH research project grants and increasing the average grant amount.

There would be $318 million more available for AIDS programs with the walls down, including fully funding the Ryan White title I grants.

For the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration [ADAMHA] we would give $166 million more for their very vital work with the walls down.

□1300

And there is this whole problem to rebuild America to meet our new economic challenge. In this consideration, I urge you to join with me in supporting a walls-down provision that would invest $3.1 billion in rebuilding America's highways, bridges and deteriorating infrastructure. We would make $539 million in economic investments in jobs to help communities hit hardest by the recession, by the base closures and the defense cuts that we all acknowledge are coming. Ninety thousand additional dislocated workers would be assisted with walls down. $417 million more would be provided for energy programs with walls down, including energy research and development, conservation, State grant programs, the promotion of the conservation and alternative fuel conversion for cars and expanding the strategic petroleum reserve.

So, H.R. 3732 simply makes one commonsense adjustment in the budget process. It consolidates all discretionary spending under a single cap. Only the so-called minicaps are eliminated.

The bill would thus allow Congress greater flexibility to reduce the deficit and to help support all who will be displaced by military restructuring, to fight the immediate problems of the recession here at home and to begin reinvesting in America's long-term needs for economic growth.

Join me in this very important process measure that is before us and sleep comfortably in your beds at night knowing that this bill does not break the budget deal.

Mr. Chairman, this does not violate the budget agreement. The overall deficit limits in the Budget Enforcement Act are not changed in any way. Indeed, our current budget package would cut the deficit below the benchmark set by President Bush at the 1990 budget summit.

Now, the President is waving his veto pen at this jobs and investment strategy, just as he waved it at unemployment benefits and middle-income tax relief. I am real worried about that. We have to really get shook up.

The President, note, threatens yet another veto. Everybody that is afraid of that, you can take consolation in knowing that that happens on just about every important bill. It may be a measure of the value of this legislation. So, what I am saying is not to worry.

We recognize that there are two fundamental economic problems: a short-term one, brought on by the economic recession; and the long one, brought on by long-term economic neglect. Unless we make the right and forwardlooking investment decisions, we will not be able to confront both these dual problems.

There is only one way we can invest the savings at home and still reduce the deficit—eliminate the military spending fire wall. This measure would remove a budgetary straitjacket and allow a modest and prudent package of investments in America's future.

So, let us join this committee in doing the right thing. I urge our Members to give this budgetary process bill its very careful and favorable consideration.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's outstanding leadership on this issue. The gentleman mentioned the prospect that we have heard of a Presidential veto on this bill. I would surmise from that that the President is threatening a veto because he is afraid that, if the firewalls are brought down, that Congress at some subsequent point would pass a piece of legislation that would authorize or appropriate spending for something with which he might disagree. For that reason, he is threatening to veto this bill that brings down the walls.

My judgment would be that what the President ought to do is let us bring down the walls so we can sensibly look at what our priorities are in this country and then take the subsequent actions to invest in those priorities. And then, if the President finds himself in disagreement, he can, can he not, veto those bills, veto any one of those bills?

Mr. CONYERS. If I might say to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon, he has put his finger on it. We have a pen-happy President, who is predisposed to threaten vetoes even in advance of the thought of having constructive legislation flow out on the budget process.

There would be ample time for us to receive his threats of veto as, one by one, Congress works its will on the programs, none of which is at the point of being brought to the President's desk at this point in time.

So, the President is premature in his threats. But it does serve to let us know that we might be on the road, it seems to me, I say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN] of something very important here. In advance of any tangible evidence of these bills coming to him, he is telling us right now he will just veto the entire budget process, undoing the work of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Government Operations in one fell swoop, if we are to believe his threats. The gentleman's point is well taken.

Mr. AUCOIN. If the gentleman would yield further to me, that then seems to be a way of saying that the President is basically saying, "I don't even want to know what you might want to invest in in the United States. I don't even want to know, I am going to veto this right now so you don't get a chance to show us where you would like to invest in America and its domestic priorities."

That seems to be what the threatened situation on this legislation is. I think it is wrong. I think it does not serve the country.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman is correct. This one gentleman has been numbed by the number of veto threats, which are the largest number in my memory. So, I really measure the importance of our work here in the Congress by whether or not it has a threat, or the threat of a threat of a veto.

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield before he reserves his time? I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. CONYERS. I would be happy to grant myself additional time. I guess the gentleman is a little short already.

Mr. HORTON. No, no; I just want to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] seek additional time?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes. I will take additional time, and I will yield to the ranking member, my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] a question.

Mr. Chairman, for some time the gentleman went through all of the items that would be served as a result of tearing down the firewalls. I was just curious as to an overall figure. As I listened to the gentleman, I came up with something like $90 billion, but that is just a guess. Does the gentleman have a figure for all of the items that he talked about that would be taken care of if this legislation were passed? I just want to know if he had an overall figure for that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I have not totaled it up, but it would probably be in the neighborhood of $6.5 billion.

Mr. HORTON. Well, I would think it would be a lot more than that, but I will accept the gentleman's statement.

Mr. CONYERS. This is in comparison to the President's budget.

Mr. HORTON. No; I was not comparing it to the President's budget.

The gentleman indicated there were certain items that would be taken care of if the walls were removed and certain jobs would be performed. He then went through a large number of items where he said, I remember one figure was $3.1 billion for highways. And there were others.

I just assumed that those amounts would be quite a substantial amount. In other words, there are a lot of people asking to get moneys, and much of it is warranted requests, but I was concerned as to the total amount because I do not think we are dealing with that much of an amount.

Mr. CONYERS. If I may reclaim my time, I can clear this up a little bit for my friend from New York—and I am yielding him all this time at the beginning, so I hope he will think kindly of me if I end up on the short side later on.

□ 1310

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of budget authority in here, in addition to the budget outlays, so that it would not be all reflected in the fiscal year 1993.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], and I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], in a bit of a colloquy. I understand we have 2½ hours allocated to the Committee on Government Operations, which means that on the minority side we have 1 hour and 15 minutes, and I had talked to the chairman before, and I understood that we would reserve 1 hour of our time, one-half on his side and one-half on mine.

I have just been informed from the gentleman's side that there is a request that we not yield any of this time. I think we need 1 hour's time for next week. But I understand that there will be some time yielded to us for the general debate, if and when we get a rule for the amendment process.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me ask the gentleman, "What is the situation with regard to time here today?"

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would be willing to agree that we should reserve some time, I say to my friend.

Mr. HORTON. Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the Chair that we should save 1 hour's time, half an hour on this side and half an hour on the other side, and we will reserve that time today so that we will have an additional hour next week for the general debate.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair states to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] that, when the motion to rise is made, if there is 1 hour left, 30 minutes on each side, then of course the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HORTON. We will reserve our time at that point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I just walked onto the floor and was prepared to get into a colloquy to find out how we are going to do this.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman, "That's what we're going to do, have half an hour on this side and half an hour on the other side."

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, we will probably, if we need more time, repair to the Committee on Rules for additional time, but under the circumstances of the day, and if it meets with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules who is on the floor, we would reserve a half hour of each of our allotted times.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] will continue to yield, I think that is certainly more than fair. If the gentleman does intend to rise with 1 hour of debate left, that would guarantee us next Wednesday, or whenever, having at least 1 hour to debate whatever new bill may come forth. If that is the intention, I just would commend and thank the gentlemen for making that understanding.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual situation because normally rules provide for general debate and then for whatever amendments are available, and under this rule all we have is a rule for general debate or 2½ hours for the Committee on Government Operations, equally divided between the chairman and myself as ranking minority member, and then a half hour for the Committee on Rules today, a half hour for the chairman and a half hour for the ranking member on this debate, and then it is my understanding that next week the Committee on Rules will go back and come up with a further rule which will provide for amendments. I will have an amendment and have an amendment before the Committee on Rules, and we will talk about that in just a few moments.

Mr. Chairman, back in 1990 this country was in a quandary about how it was going to get control of its huge budget deficit and its ever-increasing public debt. For months it seemed like the budget deficit was all we heard about. From spring until the fall, the administration, and Members from both houses and both parties, the leadership on both sides, met, not only on the Hill, but at the White House, and then they also met, as I understand it, at Andrews Air Force Base and spent many long hours trying to come up with a proposal which could be submitted, and ultimately at the negotiating table they came up with a proposal which came here, and it was basically to try to hammer out the details of a budget agreement that would take hold of the budget crisis, trying to inject some discipline into the way Congress spends money.

As everyone knows, including those who voted for it, the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 was not a pretty sight.

I want to say at this point that I did not vote for it for several reasons, but one of them was not the reason we are going to talk about here: fire walls. I thought the fire walls part of the budget was very good.

The Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 was provided for taxing unemployment compensation, which I felt was wrong. It also provided for taxing of election commissioners, which I thought was wrong. It also provided a new provision for removing the ability of people to deduct real estate taxes. I thought that was wrong. It also added tax on the sale of boats on the use of boats, and

automobiles and jewelry, and I thought that was wrong.

So, basically I thought the Budget Enforcement Act should have been defeated and we should have worked something out which would have been a better situation with regard to those taxes. But I did agree, and work in the conference, with regard to these budget walls.

So the act did have the virtue of continuing and improving the spending discipline put into place by Gramm-Rudman-Hollings in 1985 and 1987. The 1990 act like earlier budget laws, was enacted in an atmosphere of emergency. The grave seriousness of the deficit and debt problem was lost on no one. Everybody understood that the deficit was the big problem deficit, and what are we going to do about it, trying to balance our budget.

Our thinking was that a regime of discipline was the only way to keep hold of our resolve to lower the deficit. And by discipline I mean putting something in place that over time would force us to act to lower the deficit.

It is now 2 years later—and we still have a deficit. In fact, it is even higher than in 1990, although the deficit would be higher still without the discipline of the 1990 act. All the same arguments that made us unanimously concerned about the deficit in 1990 should be at least as powerful now. Now, in 1992, we are in the firm grasp of a long-term recession. Economic indicators affected by a high deficit, such as a low savings rate and an imbalance of trade, are all coming up wrong. The demand for Government-funded services is only increasing. And waste in Government spending continues to occur, although we do everything we can to try to avoid that and to try to cut back on the waste.

In this situation I fail to grasp how Congress could think that the battle has been won, that it is acceptable to forget about reducing the deficit. We have a $400 billion annual deficit, and it is growing every year. A little over a decade ago, about 10 years ago, the deficit was only about $70 billion. Now, 10 years later, the public debt is $3.6 trillion. We are obligated to take every opportunity that we can to work to reduce that public debt.

Mr. Chairman, the firewall provisions of the 1990 act were created precisely for this type of situation. It was designed to take care of this particular type of situation. That is why the firewalls were created. In the 1990 act, Congress made a crystal clear statement that if there were savings in any one spending area over the next 3 years, the savings could not be used as spending in another area.

□ 1320

That is what we said in 1990, 2 years ago, that for 3 years we were not going to have any of this money used in discretionary spending for anything except in those firewalls; if there were savings in any one of them, it would be used only—and I want to emphasize that—it would be used only to reduce the debt, the deficit. Reducing the deficit—that was the key word and that was the reason for establishing those firewalls. That is the reason we have had three deficit reduction laws in the last seven years, and that is how savings in the 1990 act had to be used, to reduce deficit.

I want to say parenthetically that what we did in our committee was a part of that process of the compromise or the conference. We agreed with regard to the enforcement that there would be these firewalls built up around three particular areas. One was defense, and there was a cap on it; one was domestic spending, and there was a cap on it; and one was international, and there was a cap on it. What we are trying to do now in this legislation is tear down the firewalls for 1993 and use the money, the discretionary spending money, notwithstanding what we did in 1990, tear the firewalls down and use whatever savings are available from the military because of the cutbacks in the military for domestic spending.

The fact that world conditions have changed since late 1990 does not change the fact that we have an enormous deficit which threatens the economic well-being of this country in a very fundamental way. That there will be some amount of savings in defense does not mean those savings should be turned right around to fund more programs.

There are many worthy Federal programs on which money could be spent. I have no doubt of that. As a matter of fact, I have a number of letters here, and all Members have received them, and every one of them makes a point for using the money we are talking about saving out of the defense bracket or firewall for very legitimate and good purposes.

For instance, we have here the American Federation of State, Government and Municipal Employees; here we have the UAW. The NEA wants to use the money for educational purposes, and the chairman listed a large number of those items that would be benefited as a result of tearing down these firewalls. They asked for education money. I understand that. I met with my educational people, and I know the needs that are out there.

I know also about the U.S. Conference of Mayors. We have a letter from them, and we have one from the legislative groups. The municipalities are concerned because they do not have enough money, and they should get some additional funds. We also have the National Committee To Preserve Social Security and Medicare. They are talking about moneys to help the older folks, and that is a good one. Then there is the American Library Association; the U.S. Student Association; the Committee for Education Funding; and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

The list goes on. I have a whole list of them here that signed one letter. The economists urged elimination of the budget laws, and here is one from the Council of Large Public Housing Authorities. Here we have the Service Employees; Leadership Council of the Aging Organization; and the National American Wholesale Grocers. On and on the list goes. I have a bunch of them. Their concerns are all worthwhile.

But what we have to remember is that we do not have this money. We are out of money. I have been in the Congress for 30 years, and we have never applied one dollar to the reduction of the deficit. Not one dollar has been applied to reducing the deficit. It seems to me that we have a wonderful opportunity now to apply whatever savings could be used, and I am told it is a figure between $7 and $13 billion, depending on who makes the estimate. That money in my book should go directly to deficit financing.

The gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Subcommittee on HUD, Housing and Urban Development, of the Appropriations Committee, made a very eloquent plea for additional money in the housing field. There is nobody in this Congress who has a better record on that than I do, and I will put my record up against anybody on providing additional funds for education, for the elderly, for our cities and communities, community development, for all of these programs. Nobody has a better record than I have, and I am proud of my record, and I have voted for additional funds to fund some of these very important programs. I know the need is out there now, but what I am saying is that this is the first opportunity we have had to dedicate some of those moneys to reducing the deficit. The time to do that has arrived and we should do it now.

I will offer an amendment when we take this up next week that would substitute deficit reduction language for the current text of the bill that is before us. That would assure that the walls stay up for this year, and that the peace dividend, whatever it is, would not be transferred into further deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all Members to oppose H.R. 3732 and vote to assure that there would be deficit reduction, not new domestic spending which would add to the deficit, but that we would have this money, whatever it is, applied to reducing the deficit.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute merely to inform my friend, the ranking minority member

of the Committee on Government Operations, that there is deficit reduction in this measure. I know he will be happy to know that. There has never been anything like this put in a measure of this kind before.

So if Members on his side of the aisle were persuaded by this debate to support the bill, they would have 25 percent of the deficit savings, some $2.6 billion, applied toward deficit reduction.

Now, is that not good and constructive news to deliver to the floor?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, my point is that I would prefer to put all of the money into deficit reduction. This is the first chance we have had in 30 years to do it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the gentleman should be proud of the fact that we are putting anything into the reduction of the deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has expired.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA], who is one of the hardest working and most learned Members of the Congress on this budget.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, last week the House adopted a budget resolution that essentially set us on two paths, two guidelines. Plan A was based on the ability to use defense savings and invest those savings in certain domestic areas, deficit reduction and conversion. Plan B was based on the possibility that we would not be able to have that flexibility, that the walls would stay up and then we would define priorities within the caps that are established under the agreement.

My thanks go out to all Members who had the courage to vote for that budget resolution and try to establish some priorities as to where we need to go with the country. I respect all the Members who voted for that resolution. Regardless of how they decided to vote on this issue, at the very least they had the courage to say that we need to follow some paths here, and they did not vote for either of the resolutions, the way many of my colleagues unfortunately did.

So I want to pay my respects to those Members. Regardless of how they vote, I want to pay tribute to them for helping the House do its job.

We are here now at the vote which decides which paths we will take. There were some last week who were criticizing us by saying that by taking two paths we are not making a decision. We are making the decision now. We will make a decision on what path we follow next week when we vote on this bill.

□ 1330

So you decide whether or not we reinvest this money or whether or not we stay within the caps established by the budget agreement.

It is not an easy vote. This is not an easy vote. I have struggled with this issue, just like many of my colleagues I am sure have struggled with this issue. Indeed, I said to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, this bill ought not to come up until we have passed a resolution that defines how we want to spend this money, where we want to invest it, what our priorities are.

There was a lot of effort at the beginning of the year to say we ought to take up the walls issue immediately. I opposed that, because I said the first thing you need to do is to establish what are our priorities? Where do you want to make those investments? Then vote on the walls issue, knowing what those priorities are.

My thanks go to the leadership and the members of the Committee on Government Operations and the chairman for following that guidance. Now we know what that blueprint is.

This is not something you are going to grab out of the air. Plan A makes some very clear decisions about priorities. It makes very clear what direction we are going to take with the defense savings. This is not just a grab bag. We say if you are going to achieve additional defense savings, of that amount $6.4 billion will be invested in three key areas. Very specifically, education, both Head Start and elementary and secondary; health care, additional funds for the WIC Programs, health research, immunizations, AIDS, and veterans' health; and, lastly, on job and long-term economic growth, we invest in infrastructure; providing for full authorization of the highway bill, job training, housing, development issues such as CDBG and EDA, which are essential to conversion, and energy development. Those are the areas we define in the budget. This is not a grab bag. We said those are the priorities.

And $2.6 billion would be committed to deficit reduction. Out of that $10 billion, $6.4 billion goes into investment, $2.6 billion into deficit reduction, and $1 billion goes back to the committees for conversion.

That is the decision that we made when we adopted plan A, and that is how the savings would be spent and how they would be invested.

Let me make clear, as I did before the Committee on Rules, it probably would be more appropriate if we just adjusted the caps to reflect that investment, as opposed to simply taking the walls down. I have suggested that as a possible option here. Then at least you would reflect what you are taking from defense and what you intend to put into domestic.

But nevertheless we have the opportunity here now to provide the flexibility to make the investments that are necessary. Why do we do this? Why are we doing this?

This is a new era. We have heard the speeches time and time again. My god, the public understands this issue. This is a new era. Let us wake up and understand that.

There are new priorities that we have to establish in this country. We have got to confront the problems that are facing the people of this country.

Every other industrialized nation now is dealing with issues in their own economy and their own society. We have got to do the same thing, or we are going to lose out. We are going to lose out.

So that is why we need to reorder priorities. Everybody understands that. The American people understand the need to do it.

You have got to do it in a way that does three things. You have to be faithful to the spending limits in the budget agreement; you have to do it in a way that continues a commitment to deficit reduction; and you have to do it in a way in which you can make the investments that are important for this country.

I think we do all three of those. Let me explain that.

First of all, the ability to invest some of these defense savings maintains the fiscal discipline in the budget agreement. Nobody can argue differently. Why? Because under this approach, we stay within the overall discretionary cap established under the budget agreement. We do not breach that. We do not go through that. So the overall ceiling that is established for all discretionary spending, defense, domestic, international, is maintained.

So those that would argue that we increase the deficit, you are wrong. We do not. We simply take savings from defense, invest some of it in the domestic area, and invest some of it in deficit reduction, but we stay within the overall cap.

As a matter of fact, that is the approach that the budget agreement lays out for 1994 and 1995. That is exactly what we are going to do in 1994 and 1995. This bill says, let us do that in 1993. I think that makes sense.

Mr. Speaker, let me just, as someone involved with these budget issues, make clear I think it provides for a better transition to 1994 and 1995 to begin the process in 1993. Why do I say that? Because if you are going to try to maintain some of the domestic areas in the future, it means that you are going to have to make one hell of a cut in defense. That is the numbers.

CBO right now tells us we would have to cut $40 to $50 billion between 1994 and 1995 out of defense if we do not start acting this year.

Mr. Speaker, we know very well we are not going to do that. So if we are going to have a smooth transition into 1994 and 1995, begin it in 1993. It makes sense in terms of the priorities that we have to confront.

Second, we assign, as I said, $2.6 billion to deficit reduction. Let me tell you something that I honestly feel. I think there is a better chance to put $2.6 billion to deficit reduction than to keep the walls up and make the assumption that defense savings are going to go to deficit reduction.

Why do I say that? Because under plan A there are constituencies out there that will make very certain that we achieve those defense savings, because they know very well that if you do not achieve those defense savings, you are not going to be able to make those investments in education, health care, and jobs.

Third, they will put pressure, therefore, to achieve those numbers, and we will put pressure to ensure that $2.6 billion goes to deficit reduction.

What if you do not have that? What if you keep the walls up? You tell me where the incentive is going to be to achieve defense savings and then put that to deficit reduction.

You know very well what is going to happen. Those committees are going to say, "Well, it was a great idea, but we are going to spend that money. We are going to spend that money."

Mr. Speaker, we know that very well. The Committee on Armed Services, the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, they are going to say essentially, "Well, it was a nice thought that we would put this to deficit reduction, but if you think we are going to cut defense spending in order to just put it to deficit reduction, you are wrong. We are going to spend it."

So from my personal point of view, I think there is a better chance for deficit reduction when you make the investment both in the domestic area as well as committing a portion of it to deficit reduction. I think there is a better guarantee you are going to put some money toward the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I want to make is the need to invest in these areas that I have described in America. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON], whom I have the greatest respect for, I think understands what I am saying. We have got to invest in this country. We have got to invest in this country.

My god, America has the highest infant mortality rate of any of the industralized countries. What a shame. What a tragic commentary on this country.

Children in this country are near the bottom of the world when it comes to math and science. What a shame. Our country, the greatest country in the world, cannot compete with these other nations when it comes to education.

Twenty percent of the children are growing up in poverty. Five million of our children are going hungry every day. Crime is in the streets. Sixteen million Americans are either unemployed or underemployed.

Mr. Speaker, we are rotting from the inside. We are rotting from the inside, and you cannot run away from those problems.

Mr. Speaker, as I said last week, when you make decisions on the budget, you are not making decisions just about numbers. You are making decisions about people.

We said that under plan A we could provide 400,000 jobs, largely because of the infrastructure number that is part of this. If you vote against the ability to make the investments that I am talking about, it is the difference between 400,000 jobs and maybe 100,000 jobs. It is the difference between whether you can provide 500,000 additional students with a Pell grant, or none. That is the choice you make when you make these decisions.

It is the choice between whether you provide 600,000 women, infants, and children with benefits from the WIC Program, or whether you cut that by 200,000. And it is the choice between whether you provide 135,000 kids with Head Start, or whether you cut that back to 98,000. It is the decision whether you provide 110,000 veterans with additional medical care, or none.

□ 1340

Those are the choices. Those are not just numbers. This is not just games. These are real people that we impact on when we make the decisions on the budget.

That is the choice that confronts this body. It is a fundamental choice.

Let me tell my colleagues that during the 1980's we saw what happened with priorities in this country. Defense spending went up 52 percent during the 1980's, 52 percent. And domestic programs were cut 15 to 20 percent. I did not hear any Members cry about that because we basically saw kids in school lunch programs, health care programs cut in order to provide more money for defense.

We made that choice, but the time has now come to restore some balance to this country and what took place in the 1980's has to be changed in the 1990's. So that is what we are trying to do in this budget and that is what we are trying to do here.

I do not know what will happen on this bill. The likelihood is obviously that the President will probably veto it. We would not be able to override it.

Some would use these savings for tax cuts; the other body is talking about the need to use this money for tax cuts. Some would talk about using gimmicks as a way to pay for anything.

This approach takes the responsible path. We say how much we want to target. We say where it needs to be invested. We are sending a clear message to this country that the times have changed, that we are aware of that and that all of us have to join together in strong leadership to say to the American people, "We care enough about this Nation, we care enough about these problems that are impacting our society that we are willing to commit ourselves to clear investments that need to be made, that we are willing to stay within the budget discipline that was established under the budget amendment and that we are willing to stay within the budget discipline that was established under the budget agreement and that we are willing to put some of it to deficit reduction."

My friends, that is the right path. Let us follow it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] has expired.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to ask the gentleman a couple of questions.

I want to say at the outset, I have the highest regard and respect for the gentleman from California, as he knows.

Mr. PANETTA. As I do for the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, he knows that I have supported many programs that he has already talked about here today, and I certainly understand what he is saying here today and the need is out there. I do not disagree with anything that the gentleman from California has said today with regard to the need.

I think he is one of the best, and we have had some excellent chairmen of the Committee on the Budget, I think he is one of the outstanding Members of this Congress, as far as the chairmanship of that Committee on the Budget. It is a tough job, and it is a very important job.

I did want to ask the gentleman, I know that he voted for the Budget Resolution Act of 1990, and I know that he is very familiar with the firewall part of that legislation.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HORTON. And the gentleman knows that that was a very integral part of that budget agreement. I was in the conference, as the gentleman was. I was in the conference when we established that part of the program to establish these firewalls. It was for 3 years.

It is my understanding also that when we set that up we thought that there might be some savings in one of these, but we said, any of those savings would go to deficit financing.

That is correct, is it not?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. HORTON. We also said that that would be for 3 years, and then it is also

my further understanding that at the end of the 3 years that whatever came out of that savings would go to deficit reduction; is that correct?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct, assuming that we got savings in any of these areas, that is correct.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it seems to me, and this is the point where we are now, it seems to me that the American people are really asking us to do something about the reduction of the deficit.

What I am concerned about is and what I would like to ask the gentleman now is, what impact does he think would occur in this country and abroad if we devoted all of these savings, the so-called peace dividend to deficit reduction? What would be the gentleman's personal view with regard to the impact that that would have without regard for all these other needs? What impact would that have?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman is saying. I have to say to the gentleman, I think whatever we could contribute to deficit savings would be regarded as a step in the right direction.

Let me just expand on that. I think that is the issue that we are confronting.

The problem right now is that when we stay within the walls, there is no incentive to reduce each area below the cap. There is not. It is certainly not true on domestic. We are not going to get more savings on domestic. We are not likely to get any more savings on defense.

So we are going to spend to the cap.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I disagree with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, we did not have any savings last year that went to deficit reduction, and we had the walls up last year.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, that is true, but what we want to do now, what we are trying to do is to take the walls down. And my point is that if we do, we want to reduce the deficit, and that should be the highest priority.

I would like to read to the gentleman from the letter that I received from Richard Darman, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and there has been some controversy here about the threatened veto.

That is a procedure that has been historic in the Congress and the executive. Democrats or Republican Presidents have threatened vetoes. We have to know what they are going to propose to do so there is nothing wrong with that.

The President is just signaling or his advisers are signaling what the President might very well do with regard to this particular piece of legislation, and in the letter that I received from Director Darman, he said:

If Congress were to abandon the mutually agreed discipline of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, it could trouble financial markets, cause interest rates to rise and, thus, prove counterproductive. That is, it could slow recovery and threaten job creation. Therefore, his senior advisers would recommend a veto.

I want to point out that the President is concerned about what may happen if we do not do something about the deficit reduction. And the gentleman's proposal that we had up here last week, plan A, would give, I think we said, $2.6 billion toward deficit reduction.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, that is correct.

Mr. HORTON Mr. Chairman, I do not disagree with that. I think that is a good step in the right direction.

What I want to do is enforce the budget discipline that we established in 1990 and make certain that all of the savings go to deficit reduction. I think that that would have a profound impact on America. If Democrats and Republicans could agree that we are going to take this money and we are going to reduce that deficit, I think that would have a profound impact.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would be happy to join the gentleman if we could guarantee that the defense committees would provide the savings just for the purpose of deficit reduction. I would be more than happy to try to enforce that effort.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I would work with the gentleman in that respect.

Mr. PANETTA. With regards to Mr. Darman, maybe he ought to heed his own advice because in the budget that was submitted to Capitol Hill, Mr. Darman himself suggested the possibility of using defense savings for the purpose of providing tax cuts.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, then we would have to veto that here.

Mr. SANTORUM Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PANETTA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the gentleman, my understanding of his logic for supporting the firewalls coming down right now is that he wanted the budget process to go through so we could establish the priorities so we know what we are voting on, and that is the reason he asked this to be delayed. And I know that is what he told us in the committee and now he is following through with that. I understand that, and I respect that.

My question, is, we do not know what resolution is going to come to the floor here from the Committee on Rules, and what it is going to look like.

My question to the gentleman is, if it comes to the floor with 75 percent for spending, 25 percent for deficit reduction, will the gentleman support that?

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I will not support any proposal that does not reflect the priorities that we laid out in plan A.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is left on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] has 54 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 38 minutes remaining.

□ 1350

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, only to continue the discussion with the ranking member of our committee, because I wanted to ask the gentleman from the New York [Mr. HORTON], if I can gain his attention, I want to know under his proposal what he would do with the unemployed. The rate is 7 percent nationwide, 9 percent in Michigan, and what would the gentleman do with people that are going to be thrown out of jobs because of the base closure and weapons cutbacks?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I am delighted to yield. What does the gentleman's proposal do about that?

Mr. HORTON. My point is that if we took all of this money that we are talking about saving in defense and applied it to the deficit reduction that would have a tremendous impact on the markets. I think that a lot of things that the gentleman is talking about would be solved as a result of that different outlook with regard to what the Congress can and cannot do. We will be signaling for the first time in 30 years that we are going to reduce the deficit, and that is what I think Americans are asking us to do.

Mr. CONYERS. Let me reclaim my time, sir.

I guess that what the gentleman is going to tell the unemployed in his area and those who are suffering unemployment from base closures and weapons cutbacks is that, "We put the money in the deficit and it is going to trickle back down again." I heard that somewhere before.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my friend and colleague the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], chairman of the Committee Education on Labor.

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to compliment him and the Committee on Government Operations for bringing us this legislation.

As the chairman of the Committee on the Budget has already indicated, there has been a great deal of concern since early in the year about when we would get to this subject matter, and there was an agreement by people to wait until a budget resolution was adopted that would identify for the American people and the Members of Congress

where money transferred from the defense expenditure side of the budget would go if the walls were to come down.

I do not think this argument really ought to be partisan here, because, as I understand what we have before us in one form or another, the President has sent us a national health proposal which includes a recommendation that we remove the walls for the purpose of funding it. Removing the walls, as the chairman of the committee, and I would like to note for the record that as the chairman of the standing committee who never gets what he wants from the Committee on the Budget, I do not often come down here and praise the work they do, and I do not expect, even if we bring the walls down, we are going to get what we justly deserve to provide to the American people most in need. But we will do a lot better than we will if we do not bring the walls down.

I agree with everything that the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] said when he spoke to us. I do not know when I have ever agreed with everything that he said at any time, but I certainly do agree with the fine presentation he made today.

I would like to just sort of refine it for the Members from the perspective of the Committee on Education and Labor. By removing the walls now instead of waiting for them to come down in the future, we can provide $3.7 billion more in discretionary education programs than last year's budget.

I might remind the Members that we intend before the end of this session to pass the President's Education 2000, and if we do not do this there will not be any money to fund it for him. I think we ought to at least give him his first shot at his one and only education initiative.

By removing the walls, we can provide Pell grants, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] told us, to 500,000 more young people than the President's program will provide without doing it.

How do I know we can do these things? Because we adopted last week, plans A and B in the budget, and bringing down the walls will facilitate following the route of plan A instead of plan B, and in the budget resolution we adopted last week we earmarked the budget shifts for these purposes.

By removing the walls we will see 40,000 more children in Head Start this year. By removing the walls we are going to increase job training funds by $700 million to about six times what the President will spend otherwise. Removing the walls can provide aid to about 180,000 additional dislocated workers. By removing the walls we can open fully and fund 10 job training centers in the country. By removing the walls we can and will provide $50 million in aid to dislocated workers as a result of the Clean Air Act that we passed in the last Congress. By removing the walls we can provide twice as many women and children access to the Women, Infants, and Children's Program that we know as WIC.

For the past 11 years this Congress has been party to a costly reordering of priorities. The domestic agenda of this country, education, job training, housing, health, middle-income American families, has all taken a back seat to what Congress came to believe, under the leadership of the President, was more important, increased military spending.

As the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] pointed out, military spending increased by more than twice as much as domestic spending was cut back. All of the giving has come from the American people, not from foreign aid, not from the military establishment, but from the American people, where it hurts in the quality of their lives.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we must take down these walls now. I remind the Members taking down the walls now instead of waiting for them to crumble their own way in another year does not increase the amount of money available for committees like mine to spend out of the entire cap on the budget by one penny. We will not have a deficit that is one penny higher by taking the walls down than if we do not take them down.

Anybody who intends to vote against this bill and then try to justify this vote against all of these programs I have mentioned by saying, "But I am worried about making the deficit larger," does not understand what is going on here. That dog will not hunt. We will not affect the ultimate budget deficit of this year by our vote here today. Those caps are going to stay whether the walls come down or not.

The difference is that we keep spending the money, spinning our wheels in the same mud puddle we got ourselves into in the 1980's, and we will not be investing in the future of the American people, and they are going to know it. I intend to vote for Chairman CONYERS' bill. I thank him on behalf of all of the beneficiaries of the programs that my committee bears the responsibility for, because we will be sending a signal if we vote with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], to people all over this country that we are realigning our priorities and we are saying that, "My children and grandchildren have a right to a better environment for the rest of their lives than they are going to have if we do not do this."

They are going to pay the debt off, and if we take down the walls we will give them some of the education and job training they will need to make the money to pay that debt off.

I rise in strong support for H.R. 3732, the Budget Reform Act of 1992. We must have the foresight to remove the walls between budget categories if we are to succeed in getting America ready for the future.

Removing the walls 1 year earlier than scheduled means that billions of dollars will be available for vital programs in the areas of education and labor.

By removing the walls we can provide $3.7 billion more for discretionary education programs than last year's budget. We can furnish working families with assistance in meeting college costs and expand access to chapter 1 and other elementary and secondary programs.

By removing the walls we can provide Pell grants to over 500,000 more young people than the President's program.

By removing the walls we can provide four times as much for science education programs.

By removing the walls we can add 40,000 more children to Head Start.

By removing the walls we can increase job training by almost $700 million, or six times the amount in the President's budget

By removing the walls we can provide aid to over 180,000 more dislocated workers.

By removing the walls we can open and fully fund 10 job training centers.

By removing the walls we can provide $50 million in aid to workers dislocated as a result of the Clean Air Act.

By removing the walls we can provide twice the WIC coverage than assumed in the President's budget.

For the past 11 years, this Congress has been party to a costly reordering of priorities. This Nation's domestic agenda—education, job training, housing, health, middle-income American families—has taken a back seat to a deficit fueled by 11 years of borrowing to promote military spending and tax cuts which coddled the rich. We now spend more to service the debt than we do on all domestic discretionary spending.

The time has come to reap the reward of the new peace. We must prepare our workers for the jobs of tomorrow. We must prepare our children and grandchildren for the challenges of a new day. The time to invest in America is now.

Mr. Chairman, we must take down these walls.

H.R. 3732 should not be a partisan issue. President Bush himself proposed bringing down the walls in his budget in order to pay for his tax bill.

In taking down the walls, H.R. 3732 would not abandon Congress' commitment to the 1990 budget agreement because H.R. 3732 does not break the overall cap on spending. All it does is take down the budget walls 1 year earlier than scheduled.

I intend to vote for Chairman CONYERS' bill because it is proinvestment and likely to accelerate our economic recovery. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this effort to take down the walls which restrict our access to our peace dividend.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, the debate we are having today is extremely important. Although what this bill does will be done next year whether we pass it or not, our domestic needs must be addressed now, not next year. People are hurting now and we should do

what we can to help. Why do the Members on the other side of the aisle want to put off helping middle class America until next year when we can do it immediately?

It is not because this bill raises the overall spending caps, because that is not what this bill does. All this bill does is allow transfers from defense spending to domestic spending or to the foreign affairs account in 1993 instead of waiting until 1994. I think we owe it to the American people to try to help now instead of waiting a year.

One of the important ways we can help secure the future for America is to take advantage of the historic opportunities in what was the Soviet Union. Yesterday the Foreign Affairs Committee passed a bill authorizing $500 million to help bring Russia and the other republics into the family of democratic nations. Foreign aid is very unpopular right now, but if we ignore our overseas interests either in Russia or in the Middle East, we will regret it and we will probably regret it very soon.

The foreign affairs budget currently takes up less than 2 percent of our total budget. The defense budget on the other hand is currently approximately 20 percent of the budget. With these figures in mind, the foreign affairs account should not be the one to take the hit. Our allies around the world, like Israel, Egypt, and now Russia, must not be left out by cries for a new isolationism.

Finally, I want to emphasize my concern about the Federal deficit. This bill does not increase that deficit, it keeps the caps agreed to in 1990 in place.

However, to protect our children's future we must do more to address the deficit. Current Congressional Budget Office estimates indicate that we will add nearly $1 trillion to the public debt in just the 3 years 1992 to 1995. Unfortunately, the effects of the budget deficit are indirect and do not have the same immediate effect on middle income wage earners as, for instance, the monthly payment of Social Security taxes do. But as the public debt grows, just as surely as we all pay taxes every year, we will be paying what amounts to a budget deficit tax. In 1993, this tax will amount to approximately $856 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. A family of four will fork out $3,424 in 1993 to cover its share of interest on the public debt. For me and my constituents this is a lot of money and every year we do not get our budget deficit under control this amount will increase.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3732) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES ON THIS LEGISLATIVE DAY

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to declare recesses subject to the call of the Chair on the legislative day of March 12, 1992.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT OF 1992

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 394 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3732.

□ 1400

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3732) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, with Mr. JENKINS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] had 31 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] had 54 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] had 15 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] had 15 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS].

Mr. MCCANDLESS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and rise in strong opposition to the bill before us this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I have a problem with this legislation. The sponsors keep referring to the savings we will realize when we reduce defense spending.

Mr. Chairman, that's like the person who has a huge credit card debt, but he shops all the sales, and keeps charging on his credit card because he's saving money.

Simply put, we cannot save money that we do not have.

The sponsors of this legislation are planning to take money from defense, and apply it to domestic discretionary spending. That is not saving. You cannot save by increasing debt.

The Congressional Budget Office projects the 1992 deficit at $352 billion. The national debt is an astounding $3.8 trillion, with interest on that debt alone amounting to nearly $200 million a year.

This money buys us nothing but our ability to keep on borrowing.

Given these facts, I ask my colleagues to seriously consider the effects of destroying the budget firewalls and of using defense cutbacks for any other purpose than deficit reduction.

We have a chance to protect America's future by actually reducing the deficit today. Please join me in that effort.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to this bill. At the outset I would note that I listened very carefully to the chairman of the Budget Committee outlining the amounts that would be applied toward additional discretionary spending and that would be applied to deficit reduction. He indicated basically, and previously has indicated that about 60 percent would go for discretionary spending and the remaining 40 percent, the defense savings for deficit reduction. There is a discrepancy. We have looked at the figures and analyzed the documents and in plan A, which was being reduced to, we understand the defense budget authority was being reduced by $14 billion in spending, and of this reduction discretionary spending would be $12.9 billion and savings of $1.1 billion. The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that instead of the 60-40 split, as we look at the figures, it is more like a 92 percent amount going to discretionary spending and 8 percent on budget authority going to deficit reduction, which is a far different figure.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago Congress did come together to devote a large part of what is a normally very short attention span in this body to the question of how this country was going to get a handle on the huge deficit. The process lasted several agonizing months, from late spring until late fall, and it was attended by 1,000 compromises and tough calls. It was not a pretty or an enjoyable procedure that we went through, but we did it because I think there was a general recognition that we had to. Our economic markets were suffering from our inability to act, and we needed to send a very strong signal that Congress was going to support them, that Congress was not going to allow us to sink ever deeper into the deficit morass.

What resulted was the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This was truly, truly legislation that only a mother could love. And even so, love is not the first word I would say, Mr. Chairman, that would come to the mind of any of those of us who supported it when Congress passed it, though I must say I think that I along with all of the rest of us collectively closed our eyes and held our noses.

But for all of its ugly qualities, and they were many, the 1990 act brought with it the promise of something that had been sorely lacking, even after the 1985 and 1987 Gramm-Rudman laws. That thing was discipline.

The intent was to reduce the deficit. We needed to tighten the mechanism of spending discipline already in place under Gramm-Rudman, and we had to send a signal to the American people that we were serious and would stick with that agreement. We needed to find ways to prevent ourselves from spending more money than we had. We needed to have somebody say stop us before we spend again.

I was one of the 47 Republicans who voted for the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. I did so reluctantly, and the President supported it, I think, because of the budget deal and the reforms that we got into that bill, which really ensured that we were going to get some handle on deficit reduction. So we had a spending discipline that the 1990 act brought to the budget process.

Under the act the three areas of spending were separated by what we called walls, which is what we are referring to here today, and each wall had a cap for the years 1991 to 1993. If the spending in any area fell below the cap, the savings were used to reduce the deficit, not for spending elsewhere.

The 1990 act might not have been pretty, and I think we would all agree it was not, but it did have the virtue of tying our hands and compelling deficit reduction whenever it was possible. This bill, by tearing down the walls, obliterates the most critical of all elements of this plan; to reduce the deficit. Its supporters claim that since world conditions have changed, but world conditions are always changing, that deficit savings should be used to fund needed domestic programs. What the supporters do not say is that our deficit is still and remains the most pressing problem we have in this country. In fact, the deficit is larger than ever, it is worse than it was in 1990. Anything we are saving now needs more than ever to go toward reducing the deficit.

Our economic markets are counting on us to stick to our agreement. The worst thing we could do at this point would be to break that agreement, because it would suggest that we have no credibility and that any deal we make can be broken with impunity.

So the markets are counting on us, I think, and the American people are counting on us to stick to our agreements when we make them. We all know that the economy is in a very precarious position now. Do we really want to make it worse?

It is argued that the bill will not increase the deficit. I think that is true. But the point is it is not going to decrease the deficit in any measurable form either.

So Mr. Speaker, I voted for this legislation, as I said, reluctantly in the past, this Budget Agreement Act, because I thought we were making a deal that we would stick to. And I think this was also why the President supported this deal, because he thought he was getting some budget reforms that were going to last. He has said he regrets that now. He regrets it because we are talking about breaking that agreement. We are talking about breaking the deal that we had, and I can understand why he would regret having supported this bill or having supported the Budget Control Act if the deal was going to be broken.

So, by tearing down the walls, Congress, I think, would lose all ability, any ability we have to say that we finish what we start.

So I urge all Members to oppose this bill and vote to assure that deficit reduction, not domestic spending and temporary tax cuts will be used to solve the deficit. I urge a no vote.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE], chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, whose work in this area has been extremely outstanding.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his generosity in yielding me 9 minutes of time. I have been listening vigorously to the discussions going on today, and I made myself some notes. The note I made was that Joshua fought the battle of Jericho and the walls came tumbling down. So I suppose we could call this Operation Joshua.

I heard some comments here today, Mr. Chairman, that everybody is sending messages to the American people. But the time is long overdue for the people that are sending those messages to the American people to listen to what the American people are sending as messages coming back.

I rise in strong support to take down these walls, and let me share with the Members why.

For 1 year, and I mentioned this the other day, for 1 year we worked around the clock and used all of our forces of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, and all of the efforts we had from our staff to produce an intermodal transportation bill, and we achieved that goal. I believe the vote in the House was 373 in favor of that legislation.

I am just sorry there are not more Members on the floor, because I could go from this side of the aisle, right down the center, and over to this side of the aisle and look in every eye in this place, all of our 435 Members, and I would get with each one, and I could speak to each Member about their cities, towns, States, and transportation needs, and the need for jobs for their constituents.

□ 1410

There is practically no one in this House who did not come to our committee and ask for help and direction.

Now, when we talk about the walls coming down, we are talking about a commitment to the American people. If you were to ask me what the signal is that the American people are sending back to the House, the signal I hear very loud and clear is: Who is for real around here? Who is making speeches? And then we make commitments, and the commitments are not carried out.

We said on the floor at that time that we had to put the trust back in the trust fund. The Committee on Public Works and Transportation played by the rules. The rules are the budget rules, Mr. Chairman, and the budget rules were based upon the point of view that if you are going to increase expenditures, you should raise the revenues to be able to do that, and we did just that. Many Members in this House, most of them, had the courage to come back when we could not get the nickel for America because there was not the support here to rebuild the infrastructure of this country and provide jobs, and after months of negotiations, we were able to get the additional 2½ cents, and we were able to get that job done.

What is happening here? The American people are told that if you pass a tax bill, either one of them that have been presented in this House, that it is going to put a lot of people back to work. I would like to tell my colleagues, which is probably heresy, but it is going to be said because I believe it, that the tax bill that has been presented to the American people is a fraud, and it is not going to put the people back to work. Anybody who is saying to the American people and sending them a message that a $200 reduction if you are single and a $400 reduction and a credit you are going to get to help the middle class, is going to change the process of the unemployment in this country is literally out of their minds, and I declare it a fraud.

The President of the United States, our President of the United States, joined with us in Texas when we signed the transportation bill, and our good President, not a Republican President, but the President of the United States made a couple of very telling statements, and one of the points he made in that speech in Texas is, "Don't define your missions," and I am quoting from the President of the United States, "Don't define your mission in isolation. We pursued this law because it moves closer to our three top domestic priorities," and the three top domestic priorities of the President of the United States, my President of the United States, and your President of the United States, was jobs, jobs, jobs. That is what the President of the United States said to us, and I support his statement in that direction.

He made another point which I want to share with Members, and I am going to quote again. He said, "This law culminates more than 2 years of hard work by my administration, and it illustrates my strategy for getting things done; first, define a mission and accomplishment." Early on we defined our mission, and I am quoting,

To lay the foundation for the most significant revolution in American transportation history. We understand from day 1 that America cannot move ahead in the international marketplace any more rapidly than its infrastructure will allow.

What do we have before us? We have taken down the walls. The administration presented the budget to this House, and in that budget they reduced the transportation bill by $4 billion. They reduced the transportation funding by $4 billion which would mean 160,000 additional jobs would be lost under plan A, and I do not totally agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

After much negotiation, they returned the full amount to the highway program, but still shorted the transit program by $1 billion.

In plan B, we will lose $3.2 billion in the transportation program, and all of those added resources that the President spoke to in Texas that you voted for on this floor go down the tube.

So if anybody is being shrewd around here and are going to go back to their constituents and their people who are sending messages, tell them when you vote to take down the walls that you took $3.6 billion out of the transportation bill, that we raised the fee that they are paying 2½ cents more for their gasoline taxes, because we had a commitment to them. We had a commitment of faith to the American people, and the American people—recently in a poll—agreed, 63 percent in a Presidential poll, that they would pay another nickel if the money was to be utilized for what this Congress taxes them for.

It is wrong, it is wrong, it is unfair, it is unjust, and it is a fraud upon the American people, and that is what the problem is in this House. The people of this country are looking for the Members that are represented here to tell the truth.

If you are going to tax them for a gasoline tax and if it is to be used for their transportation system, then do not divert it for other purposes. That is a fraud upon the American people.

If you are sincere about trying to create the jobs and provide the jobs for the American people, then you have got to vote to take these walls down, or what you are telling them is, "Too bad, we honored you in May and we deceived you in December." And that is what the challenge is around here.

It is not necessarily the point of view of disagreement on priorities. In my judgment, it is what we do stand for. Either we stand for the point of things that we campaign on and our word should be our bond, and that goes for both political parties.

If the President of the United States signed this legislation, touted it as being one of the most important bills we passed, if we provided the opportunity for 2 million jobs and the only job bill you have going for them, then I declare to you not to take down those walls is a fraud upon the American people, and all of these 373 people that voted for this bill are being defrauded also.

So I would hope that when we stop looking at a lot of the nonsense and esoteric views around here we would come back and, yes, we will listen to messages. But it is time that this House listened to messages from the American people, because they are the ones who are going to vote to elect us or reject us.

In the meantime, the key issue is jobs, not a $200 reduction in a tax bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GRADISON].

In yielding this time, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman. He is the ranking Republican on the Committee on the Budget and also a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. He does an outstanding job, particularly as ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992.

This bill would do serious damage both to our economic security as well as to our national security. No wonder the White House opposes this legislation.

I find myself in a paradoxical position in opposing this bill. I originally voted against the Budget Enforcement Act because, in my view, it provided insufficient restraint on discretionary spending. Today I am compelled to oppose efforts to overturn a key element of the budget agreement in order to retain what little discipline the Budget Enforcement Act imposes on the discretionary spending.

Many of the proponents of this bill are in an even more awkward position than this Member. No fewer than 56 of the cosponsors of this legislation originally cast their votes in favor of the Budget Enforcement Act. The flip-flop roster is quite impressive.

Let me begin by clarifying that the purpose of H.R. 3732, this legislation, is a vehicle to circumvent the budget constraints on discretionary spending imposed as part of the Budget Enforcement Act. It would consolidate the three categories of Federal spending under one cap so that cuts in defense could be used to pay for a raft of new or expanded domestic spending initiatives. It makes no difference whether through amendment the firewalls between defense and discretionary spending are eliminated or the defense cap is adjusted downward and the domestic cap raised.

□ 1420

Either way, the bill would use legitimate defense savings to finance new spending instead of reducing the budget deficit.

H.R. 3732 is highly objectionable on both economic and national security grounds.

On economic grounds, it is ludicrous that we should be seriously debating a bill that would increase spending while budget deficits are at record levels. CBO's deficit estimates for fiscal year 1992, that is the current year, have climbed from $124 billion, an estimate made in March 1990, to an all-time high of $352 billion, which is the current estimate for today. Even with the spending caps, the budget deficit is expected to resume its relentless rise by the middle of the decade.

I cannot for the life of me get through my head why spending $1 billion a day more than we are taking in is not considered sufficient fiscal stimulus.

We would all do well to reflect on the damage posed by higher budget deficits. Increased government borrowing drives up interest rates as the Federal Government crowds out private investment and it signals the Federal Reserve that the Congress has lost its resolve to control spending. Higher interest rates retard investment and capital formation. Over the long term, chronic deficits translate into slower growth, with only a modest improvement in productivity and the standard of living. Chronic deficits mean less jobs in our society.

It is imperative that we not abandon the modest budgetary discipline provided by the Budget Enforcement Act. Only about 30 percent of the $480 billion of savings enacted as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, of which the Budget Enforcement Act was a part, was supposed to result from the 1993, 1994, and 1995 caps on discretionary spending. This bill would squander much of those savings. Of course, we will still be paying the tax increases that OBRA provided up front, and it looks like we will be paying those forever.

Proponents argue that the cap on discretionary spending is starving domestic programs. In fact, the cap on domestic discretionary spending allows fiscal year 1993 domestic discretionary outlays to reach a level that is 19 percent above that of 1986 in real, inflation-adjusted terms, and budget authority will exceed 1986 levels by 34 percent in real terms, adjusted for inflation.

H.R. 3732 is equally objectionable on national security grounds, because it would lead to deeper, more accelerated defense cuts than those that are already taking place. Members may find it irresistible to raid defense accounts to find funds for domestic purposes. Just last week, the House narrowly passed a budget resolution that would cut an additional $47 billion from the President's 5-year budget request.

Deep defense cuts must be taken from manpower and operations, because outlay savings from cutting defense budget authority will be realized very slowly. Therefore, it will be very hard to get any significant 1993 defense outlay savings unless the 1992 budget authority is rescinded. Yet during markup of the budget resolution, Democrats rejected a Republican amendment to revise the budget resolution for fiscal year 1992 to reflect a proposal to rescind, that is, to decrease defense spending this year by $7.7 billion.

But let me repeat, the only ways to get outlay savings from the 1993 defense caps are to make 1992 rescissions or to cut manpower and operations.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, my view is this. Defense should only be reduced to a level consistent with our national security. Any savings from defense should be used solely for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3237, as well as any amendments which would lower the defense cap and raise the domestic discretionary cap.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have been impressed by the gentleman from Ohio from the time he served on these important committees, but as one who opposed the budget, he is the first one I know in this position who opposed the budget and who now would be its most strenuous interpreter. He opposes defense reductions but supports the President's bill which does reduce the defense budget as well. So the gentleman has left me thoroughly confused as to what it is the gentleman really stands for.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works who spoke a few minutes ago and said what we ought to be saying here to our folks at home, and I want to do that.

I want to tell you that the folks at home in Wyoming believe that the reduction of the deficit is the most compelling issue that we have before us, that the increasing deficit is the most damaging aspect of our budget that we have.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to tearing down these firewalls. Many of the speakers have talked in great detail, with great knowledge, and I do not have that great knowledge, but let me break it down into what I think are the basic issues here, and they are fairly simple.

One of them I believe is do you want to reduce defense spending at a degree much more rapid than what Mr. Cheney and Colin Powell and the President have described to us. I do not believe so. I think we have to have some sort of an orderly reduction, and I think we have that. This simply goes around that and says, "Hey, let's do it a different way and forget about what the people we ask to be experts in defense have said to us."

No. 2 is if indeed there are reductions in defense, as there should be, these reductions should go for reduction of the deficit or do we shift them over to domestic spending?

I serve on the Government Affairs Committee, and I admire the chairman. Also I think I have an idea where the chairman would go with a good deal of this money; $15 billion of it would go to support cities like New York and others. I do not support that idea, and $50 billion in the plan.

Finally, as these dollars go for domestic spending, I do not think there is any question but what as we increase spending this year, that that will have to increase and it increases the base line in subsequent years.

I did not vote for the budget agreement, but I thought the one redeeming features is that it did have some spending constraints. This as I understand removes those, and therefore I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

In the last several weeks, there has been a lot of criticism of the President for having admitted that he made a mistake on this budget agreement, that he made a mistake when he forgot how to read his lips, and that he walked back on his promise not to raise taxes.

Well, he went back on his promise in exchange for a promise from the leadership of the Democratic Party. The promise they made to the American public and to the President of the United States, a promise they said, "Read my lips, no new spending. Keep the firewalls up. Keep a handle on discretionary spending. We'll agree. We'll promise you, Mr. President, we will promise you, the American people, that we will restrain our appetite for more and more and more spending."

The American public knows the reason for the Federal deficit is because we spend too much. It is simple.

□ 1430

We spend too much here. So now we have an opportunity, and I supported Chairman PANETTA's plan B, I have supported the reductions in defense, so I can stand up here and say I supported lower defense numbers to put toward the deficit. We have an opportunity to reduce the deficit and uphold the promise that the people on this side of the aisle made to the President of the United States that they would not come back and ask for more spending. Read their lips, no new spending. Wrong, America.

Later tonight we are going to vote on an ethics question on the House bank. It is a question of character, a question of whether we can stand up and tell the truth. And here we are again; can the American public trust anything we do here? We come up here 14 months after we promised that we were not going to raise spending more, we were going to keep caps on these things, we were going to assure the markets and the country and the businesses that we were not going to soak up more debt. Fourteen months later, and we already forget our promise. I would hate to measure whether it actually took the President longer to forget his promise or the leaders of the House to forget their promise.

Mr. AUCOIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AUCOIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman knows that this resolution does not touch the caps. So, when the gentleman suggests that the caps are being removed by this resolution, he is engaged in something that is not candid. What we are talking about is eliminating the firewalls and the total aggregate amount of spending remains the same, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. SANTORUM. The cap on discretionary spending is removed.

Mr. AUCOIN. Aggregate spending remains the same, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. SANTORUM. Well, you are spending more money in discretionary spending than would be provided under the current cap. Is that not the case?

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I had expected that we would have a high noon shootout today on the direction we wanted to take in our budget. To say that I was extremely disappointed and disturbed to hear that the vote had been delayed is to greatly minimize my reaction. I still believe that we should have a full debate on this issue today and then make our choice. By now Members have had an opportunity to consider the options offered by the budget resolution. The choice we face is very clear and quite simple. We can vote to reduce the deficit by keeping the firewalls in place

and dedicating any peace dividend to deficit reduction, or we can vote to increase spending by tearing down these walls.

There have been claims that the planned reductions in defense spending have provided us with a peace dividend that can be transferred to domestic spending. Unfortunately, these proposals ignore the fact that the peace dividend does not represent found money, but simply less money that we need to borrow. A corporation that is $400 billion in debt cannot pay dividends.

The national debt has tripled in the last 10 years, and currently exceeds $3.6 trillion. We must deal with our deficit problem before it deals with our country in a very destructive way. We need more discipline in the budget process, not less. That is why 260 of our colleagues have joined me in cosponsoring House Joint Resolution 290, the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. It is very likely that in the next few months we will have an opportunity to vote on this amendment after the other body passes the balanced budget amendment. If the balanced budget amendment is adopted, as I believe it will be, we must start making the tough choices to bring spending in line with revenues. The vote next week will be one of many tough votes that we must make if we are ever to balance our budget.

The proponents of this bill have argued that we need to take down the firewalls in order to make necessary investments in education, jobs, infrastructure, and health care. I agree that the programs that the proponents have been talking about are all very good programs and I would point out that plan B makes strong investments in priority programs. For example, under plan B, more than 200,000 additional women, infants, and children will receive nutritional assistance than currently receive these services. The funding for children's programs, for job training, health care, low-income assistance, and other priority programs is higher in plan B than the President proposed.

I do not pretend that plan B can compete with the funding levels in plan A. This is not because those of us who support plan B do not care about funding for programs which help individuals. It is because we believe that we must balance the short-term needs of today against the long-term needs of future generations. The most significant way that we can care for Americans, especially young Americans, is to take the burden of the deficit off their backs. This debt burden will cripple the ability of future generations to make the type of investments that we have been talking about.

Some people have argued that we need to break the firewalls in order to respond to the recession. We have been tempted to make a quick fix for the economy by increasing spending. This runs counter to the advice of numerous economists who have warned that the deficit does more to slow down our economy than any tax cut or infrastructure investment could begin to offset. Every time we increase the deficit we drive up interest rates and further delay an economic recovery. According to a study by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, the massive deficits of the 1980s reduced the country's productive output by 5 to 10 percent. In addition, if we vote to loosen the discipline of the budget enforcement act, we will harm the economy by sending a message to the financial markets that we remain unwilling to control the Federal budget.

There is no question that this institution does not have a very good reputation with the American people. The public is frustrated with the unwillingness of policymakers to make tough decisions and take responsibility for our actions. There has been a failure of leadership in fiscal policy. Policymakers in Congress and the executive branch have been unwilling to make the tough choices necessary to keep the Federal budget under control. Now is the time for the House to demonstrate leadership and use this historic opportunity provided by the end of the cold war to make true and meaningful economic reform by confronting our deficit problem. Defeating this resolution will make only a small reduction in the deficit. But I believe that maintaining the firewalls will make one small step for deficit reduction, one large step for this institution and our country's economic future.

There are those who argue that this is not the time for deficit reduction. I disagree. I share the sentiments expressed by the Speaker when he urged the House to pass the budget agreement in 1990: "If not now, when; if not us, who?"

Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions in regard to H.R. 3732, the Conyers resolution breaking the budget firewalls:

Question: How will the Conyers Resolution increase the deficit, since the cap on total discretionary spending is maintained?

Answer: It is technically true that the Conyers bill will not allow spending to exceed the total levels set in the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA). In reality, however, the end of the Cold War resulted in general agreement that spending could be reduced below the total discretionary cap because of defense reductions. The Conyers bill will prevent his anticipated reduction in overall spending. Tearing down the walls and adopting plan A of the Budget Resolution would result in a deficit $6.5 billion higher than plan B, which assumes the walls stay in place.

Simply maintaining the total discretionary cap would be sufficient fiscal restraint if there was no need for any deficit reduction beyond that provided for in the 1990 summit agreement. Unfortunately, the Congressional Budget Office reports that, even with the BEA caps, deficits will exceed $200 billion well into the next century. Given these conditions, the opportunity for further deficit reduction provided for by the possibility of defense cuts should not be squandered.

Question: Shouldn't the Budget Enforcement Act be amended to reflect the changes in the world since 1990?

Answer: The caps placed in the Budget Enforcement Act were explicitly designed to be spending ceilings, not floors. The cap on defense spending was intended to set a maximum level for defense spending while allowing for further reductions if events warranted.

Despite the historic changes that have occurred since the enactment of the Budget Enforcement Act, the fact that was the driving force behind the BEA remains even truer today: federal deficits are placing an increasingly heavy burden on our economy.

Question: Don't we need to break down the walls in order to provide fiscal stimulus to the economy?

Answer: Numerous economists have warned that fiscal efforts to stimulate the economy would be counterproductive given our large structural deficits. By reducing the savings rate and increasing interest rates, the deficit does more to harm the economy than any public investment could offset. In addition, loosening the discipline of the Budget Enforcement Act would send a dangerous psychological message to the financial markets. Most economists agree that the most crucial action Congress could take to restore the long-term health of our economy would be to reduce the budget deficit.

Question: Won't deep cuts in domestic programs be required if the walls are maintained?

Answer: Obviously, spending for domestic programs will not be as high if the walls are maintained. Plan B recognizes that some short-term sacrifices must be made to address the long-term threat posed by the deficit. The most significant way we can care for Americans, especially young Americans, is to reduce the debt burden.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that even with the walls in place, $206.1 billion in Budget Authority and $224.7 billion in outlays will be available for domestic programs. Plan B is therefore able to make strong investments in health, jobs and other priority programs. Funding for high-priority programs such as WIC (Women, Infants and Children), Low-Income Home Energy Assistance, Childhood Immunization, and Job Training are funded to a much greater extent than the President proposed.

Question: Shouldn't Congress have the flexibility to set budget priorities within the budget without the restrictions of the categorical caps?

Answer: The Budget Enforcement Act was intended to place discipline in the budget process by making it more difficult to increase spending. The categorical caps were put in place to ensure that any spending reductions in any one category be applied to the deficit. Since the government was borrowing the money that had been spent on defense, the reductions in the defense budget do not represent "found money" that can be reprogrammed.

Question: Will taking down the walls result in additional cuts in defense?

Answer: Passage of H.R. 3732 alone will not result in deeper defense cuts. It will, however, increase pressure to raid the defense budget to meet discretionary spending demands without concern for security needs. Although the defense reductions are the same in plans A and B, there is no assurance that defense spending won't be cut deeper later in the process.

Question: Why is it important to maintain the firewall if doing so will only reduce the deficit by $6 billion?

Answer: While maintaining the firewalls is only the first step in improving our fiscal condition, this is not a justification for making the deficit worse. The deficit is too large for any one action to solve it alone. The summit agreement of 1990 was a positive step in dealing with the deficit. Passing the Conyers bill will represent a step backwards in that process and will make reaching compromises on future deficit reduction packages virtually impossible.

WHAT DO ECONOMISTS SAY ABOUT BREAKING THE FIREWALLS AND REDUCING THE DEFICIT?

"Reducing the call of the federal government on the nation's pool of savings is essential. Above all, I urge you to adhere to a budgetary strategy for FY1993 and beyond that is geared to the longer-run needs of the U.S. economy. At a minimum, maintaining a commitment to the elimination of the structural budget deficit over the coming years will help enormously to alleviate the concerns of the American people about our economic future."—Alan Greenspan, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, February 1992.

"Fiscal year 1991 closed with a record deficit of $269 billion, but 1992 and 1993 seem certain to exceed even that figure. CBO projects that, under current budgetary policies, the deficit will reach $352 billion this year and $327 billion in 1993. . . . The huge shortfalls will arise despite the stringent limits on discretionary spending that were imposed as part of the five-year, $500 billion deficit reduction agreement negotiated by the President and the Congress in 1990. . . . The deficit should return to the top of the political agenda in 1993. . . . Deficits of these magnitudes cripple economic growth by reducing national saving and capital formation. They also create a vicious cycle of more federal borrowing and higher debt service costs, which in turn make it still more difficult to reduce the deficit. Another round of spending reductions and tax increases, rivaling the $500 billion achieved in 1990, must come soon if the deficit is to be reduced to reasonable levels."—Robert D. Reischauer, Director, Congressional Budget Office, January 1992.

"In today's political climate temporary fiscal stimulus has about as much credibility as the tooth fairy. . . . The guiding principal behind any fiscal action taken at this point should be to adopt only measures that will still be useful several years hence."—Benjamin M. Friedman, Harvard University Department of Economics, January 1992.

"The country has a structural, 'consumption-driven' budget deficit from which it should be weaned. We can't afford all the private and public goods and services we're enjoying today; only escalating borrowing makes it temporarily feasible. We won't be able to enjoy these luxuries in future decades—unless we increase national savings by reducing the federal budget deficit and setting new expenditure priorities."—Roger E. Brinner, DRI/McGraw-Hill, December 11, 1991.

"The Federal government—executive and legislative branches alike—is perhaps most guilty of excessive short-term emphasis. Its huge and persistent budget deficits exhibit a shocking lack of discipline and concern for the future, creating a massive national debt that must be serviced if not repaid by future generations. That debt is now approaching $4 trillion, or about $50,000 for every American family. Productive private investment is crowded out and huge sums must be borrowed from abroad, adding further to America's status as the world's largest debtor nation."—Competitiveness Policy Council Bipartisan Panel Appointed by the Congress and the President, March 1992.

"In June 1991 the Committee for Economic Development (CED) recommended Congress should require that the entire budgetary saving arising from any further cuts in defense spending be used to reduce the deficit. However, instead of seizing this opportunity to reduce the deficit, political leaders are now proposing measures that threaten to raise the deficit or hinder its reduction. Congress has received numerous proposals for tax cuts and/or increases in domestic spending financed by further defense cuts . . . These proposals sharply conflict with the national priorities required to provide for future generations. Are we to be the first generation of Americans that not only does not sacrifice for our children but also places on them the burden of our profligacy?"—Roy L. Ash, Committee for Economic Development (An organization of 250 business and academic leaders), December 1991.

"Stein's first law of economics says that if something cannot go on forever, eventually it must stop. The only question is: what will it take to end this unsustainable pattern of deficits and debt, and when will it cease? . . . We need to lay the groundwork for future deficit reduction efforts. We need to devise meaningful, workable limits for entitlements and other mandatory spending. Don't breech the firewall between discretionary spending and pay-as-you-go. Pay-as-you-go discipline is the only thing standing between you and a takeover of the federal budget by burgeoning entitlement spending. The budget process will suffer a severe blow if Congress and the Administration choose to abrogate the agreement in order to serve short term desires to increase even worthwhile programs in this election/recession year."—Carol Cox Wait, Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, February 1992.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to H.R. 3732, which would repeal the only mechanism we have in Congress to control spending and I believe would open the floodgates of new spending. It is time, Mr. Chairman, that we do something about the deficit instead of paying lip service to it. I believe this is one of the most important votes we will cast in this Congress, and how we vote on H.R. 3732 will indicate whether or not we can act responsibly with the taxpayers' money. Our vote on this bill will tell our children and grandchildren whether we really care or not about further mortgaging their future.

This legislation proposes to scrap the provision in the Budget Enforcement Act which prohibits transfers of funds from the defense, domestic, and international discretionary accounts. Under current law, any savings from one account, that is, the defense cuts being proposed by both the President and Congress, would be applied to deficit reduction. By repealing this important provision, the Democrats who control this body will be free to drastically increase spending elsewhere. If we allow this, we miss a rare opportunity to slash the Federal deficit.

Mr. Chairman, this country is facing a fiscal crisis of astounding proportions, and if we don't do something about it we will face total fiscal collapse. In the past decade our debt has almost quadrupled from $1 trillion to nearly $4 trillion because we in Congress have in part failed to control spending and have piled up huge deficits year after year. About 17 percent of our budget is now dedicated just to paying the interest on this crippling debt. With a budget of about $1.5 trillion and a deficit of $400 billion, over 26 percent of our whole budget is financed using borrowed money. This is absolutely irresponsible and totally unacceptable to the American people. Every working American in central Illinois and throughout the country must balance his or her checkbook at the end of the month. It is about time Congress starts doing the same.

I hear my friends on the other side of the aisle talking about, quote, "redirecting spending" and, quote, "increasing domestic investment levels." They talk about a, quote, "peace dividend." These are the terms they use. The Democrats are good at calling Reaganomics "voodoo economics." This legislation is real voodoo economics.

There is no peace dividend. We are living on borrowed money, Mr. Chairman. Under current law, if we responsibly cut defense spending, and I wholeheartedly support that, what we are actually doing is reducing the amount of money which we must borrow. What the big spenders in Congress want to do is to go ahead and borrow that money anyway, and spend it.

Make no mistake about it, adoption of this legislation means that the budget agreement, as weak as it may be, is dead and buried. Passage of H.R. 3732 will lead to a floodgate of new spending. The President recently said he made a mistake in signing an agreement with Congress to raise taxes and control spending. The fact that we are considering this legislation proves that he is right. The President got the message that a deal with the Democrats to raise taxes was a mistake. We got the tax increases, but we won't get the spending cuts.

Let's keep this little bit of spending discipline we have. Let's keep the firewalls up, let's apply defense cuts to deficit reduction, and let's send a message to our constituents that we really do care about cutting the deficit.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal responsibility. Vote to keep the firewalls. Vote against H.R. 3732, whenever the Democrats in Congress decide to finally hold that vote.

□ 1440

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to talk today about this bill, H.R. 3732, and it is entitled "The Budget Process Reform Act of 1992." I cannot think of a title that could be more misnamed than to call it a process reform act. We might call it "The Budget Rape Act of 1992," we might call it "The Budget Negation Act of 1992," or perhaps we could call it "The Guaranteed Runaway Deficit Increase Act of 1992," but it certainly is not process reform.

Mr. Chairman, I say that not having particularly liked the 1990 budget summit agreement. I voted for it the first time around. By the time it came back, I realized we were snookered and did not vote for it.

But I do also recognize that that budget act had at least some discipline. In fact, the only discipline that we have in this body on spending is in that budget act, that summit agreement of 1990.

It does separate the spending by categories, and we knew why we were doing that, in the event that there were more savings in defense, and nobody thought there was going to be savings in domestic, that if there were more savings, we would apply that to the deficit. That is why we have those separate budget caps, and that is why today we are trying to take them down, because now we have those savings, and we want to spend it on something else.

It has been pointed out here today that things have changed in the world, and, yes, the Soviet Union does not exist any longer, and, yes, our national security needs are different, and, yes, the President has come back with a defense figure that is less than had been anticipated 2 years ago.

But something else has changed around here. The deficit is worse today than it was then. We are talking about a deficit this year of $399 billion. That is more than $1 billion every day. My colleagues, that is more than $47 million of deficit spending every hour of the day.

Something else has changed. The deficit has risen to close to 7 percent of the gross national product. That is higher than any other major industrialized country in the West, and so here we are with $15 billion of savings in defense, and we just cannot wait to get our hands on it and spend it because it is free money to be spent on other programs.

Something else has not changed around here, and that is that this place cannot make a deal and keep a deal. We saw it 11 years ago with Gramm-Latta. As soon as it was in place, we tried to take it down. Gramm-Rudman, take it down; Gramm-Rudman II, tried to knock that deal down, and so here we are with the Budget Act of 1990, trying to take that down and do away with it.

Of course, there are important domestic needs out there, but what about the needs of the next generation? I just met a few minutes ago with a group of high school students, and I looked them in the eye and thought what is going to be their future when we are spending their money, we are spending their future, the way we are because we do not have the guts to make hard decisions today about our spending priorities.

Mr. Chairman, we are on a course that is leading to disaster. We are rapidly reaching a point of no return on the deficit where the interest cost of the deficit will be increasing so rapidly that no amount of budget discipline will be able to get that under control. And then what is the answer? Of course, the answer would then be hyperinflation to inflate that debt away, to eliminate it by hyperinflation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a defining moment in the history of the House of Representatives. I am not confident that we can ever control spending, even if we keep these budget caps in place, but I know with certainty that we will not if we do not keep the budget caps in place.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF], and I want to commend the gentleman. He has been a member of the Committee on Government Operations and also a very important member of the legislative committee that handled this bill. He has done an outstanding piece of work in connection with this legislation, and I congratulate him.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I first want to say that it is a privilege to serve on the Committee on Government Operations with both the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON]. Both work very hard in the Government interest.

I want to say that I rise today to oppose H.R. 3732, Mr. Chairman. I voted in favor of the original budget agreement in November 1990 which became law. It was not a great agreement. But we needed an agreement. We must remember that at that time the United States was in the middle of an international crisis heading toward a war. It was my opinion that this was the best agreement that we could get, and we needed to resolve that issue so that we could concentrate on international affairs. But it was an agreement. All of the provisions that were placed into it, the firewall provisions and everything else, were a matter of give and take, compromise and back and forth.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is wrong to change a part of an agreement. I understand the argument that is being made here today, that we have money that we could use instead for other purposes. I am personally willing to revisit the whole situation. I would support any bill that would repeal the entire budget agreement of November 1990, every single provision, and put us back to negotiating all of the terms over again, including the firewalls. But I am opposed to changing just a part of an agreement and leaving other parts in place that are only there because the firewalls were agreed to by the other side.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, this is not the Budget Process Reform Act. This is the Let's Break a Budget Agreement Act, and it should be rejected.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I urge my fellow colleagues in the House to vote "aye" today to eliminate the obsolete 1993 minicaps on defense, international, and domestic discretionary spending which were imposed as part of the 1990 budget summit at the insistence of President Bush to protect military spending. Removing these minicaps will not impact the overall limit on discretionary spending which will remain in effect as established in the budget summit agreement and be subject to sequester if exceeded.

By removing these caps, we will be able to cut the deficit and begin to put additional funds into successful investments that will work for America's future competitiveness.

According to the Federal Highway Administration, 144,000 or 25 percent of our Nation's bridges are unsafe; an additional 40 percent of the bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete; and 260,000 miles of our Nation's highways have reached a critical level of disrepair. It is estimated that we waste 2 billion gallons of gasoline annually because of the state of our highways. Failure to respond to these demands will result in ever-increasing costs. Taking down the walls would permit these investments that will put America back to work and partially pay for themselves through increased tax revenues.

If the walls come down, we could spend considerably more on the Pell Grant Program. Currently, 3.8 million students receive Pell grants ranging from $200 to $2,400. We could provide Pell grants to 625,000 more students, and most of these students would be working students and students from middle-income families. Or if we use the money instead to increase the amount of Pell grants the currently eligible 3.8 million students receive, we could increase the maximum Pell award from $2,400 to $2,900, a $500 increase in the maximum award that would help us decrease the growing reliance low-income students have on student loans. Taking the walls down gives us this choice.

Taking the walls down would also enable us to provide Head Start benefits to more chil-

dren. Currently 621,000 children receive Head Start services. This represents about 25 percent of children who are eligible for these services. We spend about $2.2 billion currently on Head Start. If we wanted to serve all of the children who are eligible for Head Starts, we would have to spend $7 billion. However, if the walls came down, we would take a giant step in that direction by serving 135,000 more children, taking us to the point we served one-third, not one-fourth of eligible Head Start children.

Currently, we serve 16 percent or 70,000 of our Nation's eligible youth in the Job Corps. We could easily serve another 50 percent more eligible youth by completing Job Corps 50–50 plan. By the year 2000, we could place 81,000 annually, compared to the 54,000 today.

Our infant mortality lags behind more than 20 other industrialized countries. This should be addressed by investments in our children. We can easily serve 600,000 more women, infants, and children in WIC. We can immunize all of our Nation's school children when the walls come down.

All of these are investments with immediate return. For every dollar invested in Job Corps, You get $1.46 returned to the Treasury. During their lifetime, the average college graduate pays $169,000 in taxes while the high school graduate pays $77,000, a net difference of $92,000 per graduate. For every dollar invested in Head Start, we get back $6 in terms of increased productivity, decreased crime, and juvenile delinquency. For every dollar invested in WIC, as much as $3.90 is saved in Medicaid spending on newborns.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS], the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus and a distinguished member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1450

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, by our own agreement, the walls are scheduled to fall in 1994. Some will say that we should wait. But we cannot afford the luxury of waiting an extra year. Ask the millions of Americans who are out of a job, out on the street and feel like they are out of luck to wait one more year? Surely we cannot be that callous.

We must change the economic direction of America. We can only do this by breaking down the artificial wall which we have imposed.

Americans are suffering with the highest unemployment rate since the end of World War II. The infrasturcture of our cities are crumbling. Our industries do not have the necessary capital to retool and compete in a global economy.

The threat posed by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries is as dead as the ideology of communism which gave it birth. Yet this threat is rapidly being replaced by other threats to our national security; unemployment, homelessness, illegal drug trafficking, and violence. These threats are not on distant shores. These threats are in our homes, carried on the shoulders of our people, and living in the hearts of our children.

Americans are suffering with the highest unemployment rate since the end of World War II. It does not take a genius to realize that the unemployment opportunities of parents determine the fate of children.

Thirteen million American children go to bed with hunger pains in their stomachs every night. Many others have given up the dream of a college education and a decent life. We owe it to them to restore hope and improve reality.

Let us face it: The world has changed. We must have the courage and foresight to change with it. America has been a world leader in the 20th century. We can maintain our position of prominence if we use this moment to invest in our future through investing in education for our children, jobs for the displaced worker, and research, development, and capital for our industries.

We must knock down the walls and prevent further suffering. I urge Members to vote to knock down the walls. That is the vote to make.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], a member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I am going to be able to give any wisdom to this debate, so much has been talked about. I do have a couple of thoughts though.

Really this is a moral issue. Is it moral to spend money on worthy projects, and is it immoral to save that money and put it toward deficit reduction? That really is the issue.

Mr. Chairman, I guess that I submit that since 1984, we have been spending the money. It has not worked. We have exceeded what we wanted to do by $1.8 trillion and I think we have come to the end of our rope.

Clearly we have got to have a budget, and it must be fair and it must mean something. But the one thing a budget says is this: Are you going to do what you say you are going to do? That is all it is. Are we going to abide by what we said we are going to do, or are we going to change that? Will we keep the structure set up, not by me, but by a bipartisan group of leaders of this House, that said over a 2 year period we will do what we said we would do? Or are we going to break it in half?

Now, do conditions change in the country? Of course they do. Was the 1990 5 year agreement the best we could find? Absolutely not. But what budget agreement is?

Would it be intellectually better to scrap the whole thing and start over again? Possibly. But, again, that is an intellectual argument. The reason it is an intellectual argument is because we have the agreement. We have told the American people about it. We hope they understand this. It provides that discipline that all of us have been talking about today.

Is discipline important? I happen to think it is. We had Gramm-Latta, and we broke it. We had Gramm-Rudman I, and we broke it. We had Gramm-Rudman II, and we broke it. Now we are coming up to the summit agreement only 2 years ago and we are thinking of breaking it.

In 1984, the majority leader of this House said, when we voted in Gramm-Rudman, "When you vote tonight, you are voting on whether you want to practice for excessive deficits, that trend, that set of facts, to continue."

In 1987, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means said, "We establish in the Gramm-Rudman portion of this bill now a reinvigoration of the process to reduce the deficit and set deficit reduction targets." We broke that agreement.

The chairman of the Committee on the Budget said in 1990, "This summit agreement is enforceable." Indeed, it is.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] himself said at that time, "For the next 3 years, and perhaps for the next 5, our hands will be tied tight."

Every time we make an agreement, we break it. Is this really what we want to do?

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JONTZ].

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the legislation.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] who serves with great distinction on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I really salute his leadership in this area.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important votes this House is going to have. It is very hard for me to stay in my seat and listen to person after person who did not vote for any budget agreement come down here and cling to it like it is the Holy Grail or the Great Tables, or whatever. If it is so great now, how come it was not great when we voted on it? That is amazing to me.

Second, it is incredible that we are clinging to an agreement made at a time when the world looked very, very different. The Soviet Union crumbled because it held on to 5-year plans, and it finally learned you do not make 5-year plans and then hang on to them no matter what happens.

Here we are. They have given up doing 5-year plans, and we are going to hang on to ours because somebody agrees to it.

Now, look, as one who has voted for a lot of budget agreements and not

wanted to many times, but felt this place was better off with a budget than without a budget, I know why these walls are here. These walls are here because they were scared to death of the SCHROEDERS and the CONYERS and other people taking money away from defense to put into domestic programs, or taking money from maybe foreign aid to put into domestic programs.

Now, what are we talking about? We are not talking about lifting the amount of the budget. I get very tired of Members saying we are trying to lift the cap, break the budget, drive the deficit, and all that. Baloney. We are not talking about that at all. We are talking about being able to act sanely.

Mr. Chairman, let us use some of those tanks we bought in defense to crush this wall. Look, the Berlin Wall was up when this thing happened; it is now a speed bump. Can we not take this wall down and put some of the money over on the side of the priorities that we have been neglecting for so long?

Everything this House does should be based on are we getting ready to compete with Canada, Europe, and Asia, for the highly skilled, highly educated, well-paying jobs? Or are we getting ready to compete with the Third World?

If you want to do option A, then you had better vote to get these walls down. Because the four things we have got to do is focus on education, which right now we are getting an F in. We are not even making the commitments to our people we made in the sixties at the Federal level. You have to be the best in education. We are not. We cannot be unless we get the walls down.

You have to have the best infrastructure. As the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ROE] pointed out, if you do not bring the walls down, you cannot get in with the infrastructure.

You have to do flexible capital markets, and you have to move out to get the best innovation and best technology going. That means conversion.

Mr. Chairman, what happened was we did not listen to Eisenhower, and what he said came true. We became a military-industrial complex. Getting the walls down allows us to recycle money and change this to the kind of complex we can sell. This is very important to the future of America.

Mr. Chairman, I salute the bill of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], and proudly support it. I hope we bring the walls down.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the Republican whip.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say first of all that I am perfectly cheerful to stand up here and say I voted against the budget agreement at the time it was passed. I thought it was a bad agreement then. I think the Democratic leadership today is proving my case.

I said at the time we are going to have a $146 billion tax increase, and, at the first opportunity, the Democratic leadership is going to break its commitment to the President, tear down the walls, and raise spending.

□ 1500

The agreement ostensibly was to get closer to the deficit, to shrink the deficit.

Every Member who came down and voted for the agreement said, we have got to worry about the deficit.

First of all, if we look carefully at even under the agreement, domestic discretionary spending went up $12.9 billion the first year, $21 billion the second year, $8½ billion the third year. Every year domestic discretionary, which is essentially about spending by politicians in this building, went up.

Now, what do we hear? I am not here to defend the Pentagon's budget. I think we have won the cold war. I think we can shrink the Pentagon. I think we can spend less. That is not the issue here today.

The issue here today is twofold. First of all, if the Democratic leadership wants to break its agreement with the President, let us cut down the $146 billion in taxes and give those back to the American people. George Bush broke his pledge because he was told by the Democratic leadership they could keep their word. And he signed a tax increase, which was their charge, their fee, their tariff in order to get him to agree to spend more money domestically.

They said, we will protect defense, and we will protect the things we care about for 5 years.

What has happened? What they want to do now is break their agreement with the President but keep the tax money. So my first challenge is, do they want to take this bill back and put into it the $146 billion in tax cuts to give back to the American people what they extorted in return for what was supposed to be a set of walls? I will consider at that point cosponsoring the bill. At least then we will be back in a fair playing field.

They want to keep the $146 billion in tax increases and break down the restraints.

The second point, if we are going to cut defense spending, is the wisest use of that money to put it into the welfare state, into the bureaucracy, into Washington politicians, or is it better to reduce the deficit? Almost every American I know believes that we already have a government that is too big and does too much. Most Americans believe we already have a deficit that is too large. So if we say to them, we do not need to spend the money at the Pentagon, why do we not reduce the deficit so we are not borrowing the money from our children, most Americans would agree that a smaller deficit is more important than a bigger bureaucracy.

So the second point I would make is, if we do not need to spend it on defense, and I do think we can reduce defense spending, then let us actually cut Government spending, have a smaller deficit, borrow less from our children. And as a result, be a healthier economy.

That means lower interest rates, means we can sell more homes, can sell more cars, create more jobs. It means the whole country would be healthier.

Third, I want to go directly at my good friends who represent the welfare state and urge, government is a lousy buy. We had a very fine gentleman who I respect greatly from New York City who got up and talked about how many things we have to do.

Go and look at the Reader's Digest January article entitled "How the Unions Stole the Big Apple," look at a $57,000 public school janitor who is required to mop the floors three times a year. Why should we in Washington transfer more money to big city bureaucracies that are loaded with waste, loaded with crazy work rules? And my colleagues do not have to believe Reader's Digest.

Read the New York Times editorials in the last 2 months about the most recent sanitation workers contract that Mayor Dinkins signed, which allows workers to work 4 hours and then to get paid for 4 additional hours a day while doing no work.

I ask my colleagues, how can we, with a straight face, come down here and suggest that at $1.4 trillion, our problem is, we do not have enough money? How can we with a straight face take the New York City budget, which is $13.3 billion, and suggest that that is $13.3 billion in personnel costs alone and suggest that what we need to do is find a way to spend more money?

I would argue that the No. 1 challenge to the Congress is to overhaul and replace the welfare state, to have the courage to take on the bureaucracy and to be prepared to deal in a direct way with rethinking it.

For us to say, let us pour more money into a welfare state which is failing, I do not see how that makes any sense.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman seen today's New York Times?

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, in fact, I have written a letter to the editor.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the New York Times' misleading editorial on the next Willie Horton issue.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 12, 1992]

A GREAT-TASTING BUDGET BILL

Tastes great/Less filling. That false dichotomy sold a lot of beer. Today, the House of Representatives will vote on a similar dichotomy: Reduce the deficit/Increase domestic spending. Logic argues for a "yes" vote. Those goals may seem contradictory but in budgets as in beer, there's no reason the nation can't have both.

The vote will come on a bill sponsored by John Conyers, the Michigan Democrat, to remove firewalls in the 1990 budget law. Those barriers forbid Congress to switch money from defense to domestic programs. Once those barriers are down, Mr. Conyers and the Democratic leadership propose splitting the peace dividend saved from declining military budgets between deficit reduction and public investment.

In opposition, President Bush and Republican leaders argue that the only acceptable way to use the money is to reduce the deficit. They say only deficit reduction can spur growth and, besides, firewalls are needed for fiscal discipline. Mr. Bush and his allies are doubly mistaken.

Public investment is every bit as important to growth as private investment. And the Conyers bill would only shift spending among programs; it wouldn't raise the deficit a dime or erode discipline.

The 1990 budget law was designed to reduce the deficit by about $500 billion over five years through modest spending cutbacks and tax hikes. Without debate, Congress agreed to separate caps on domestic, international and defense programs. The amendment defaced an otherwise laudable bill, blocking Congress from doing what it's elected to do: make choices.

What was politically perverse in 1990 has now become fiscally irresponsible. The demise of the Soviet Union now makes frivolous tens of billions in proposed defense spending. But Congress has precious little incentive to capitalize on the golden opportunity. It can cut military spending but the entire saving must go to deficit reduction. Congress isn't likely to undertake painful tasks like closing bases on behalf of the grand abstraction of deficit reduction.

Besides, deficit reduction alone performs no magic. Smaller deficits help the economy because they mean the Government siphons less out of private capital markets. That leaves more money for entrepreneurs, leading to faster growth in investment, productivity and wages.

But there's another key to economic growth: Public investment in telecommunications networks, water treatment, education, training, research. These have been slighted in the Reagan-Bush years, yet study after study shows that such public investments produce returns as high as, or higher than, private investment.

Mr. Bush threatens to veto the Conyers bill because he assumes Congress will throw away the peace dividend on wasteful expenditures. That's a legitimate worry. But the remedy is not to veto Congress' capacity to choose; it is to veto wrong choices it might later make.

Deficit reduction; increased public investment. The economy needs both. Both taste great.

I would just say about that editorial, it is factually wrong. I just sent the New York Times a letter to the editor quoting their editorials, whch they have written in the last 2 months, about precisely the same absurd work rules and precisely the same absurd bureaucracy, which they condemn.

I am not going to back off an inch on this. Until we overhaul the big cities, I will mention Detroit in passing, until we overhaul the big city bureaucracies, the big city work rules, and the welfare state values, I do not see any reason why any working American should transfer another dime to the welfare state.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the gentleman mentioned New York and he talked about a time where the walls are up. It would seem to me that he made an argument that we should knock the walls down because if all this is happening with the walls being up, then we should bring them down.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say to my good friend, whom I respect a great deal, my argument is simple. Until we replace the welfare state and until we thoroughly overhaul the big city bureaucracies, spending more money just increases the costs of the bankruptcy.

The reason we have a major problem in the major cities of this country is because the core values of the welfare state are destructive. The core structure of the big city bureaucracies is destructive. Until we are prepared to fundamentally overhaul the big city structures to replace their bureaucracies, to replace the crazy work rules and to go to a system that has values starting with workfare, requiring every able-bodied adult to work before they get money, until we are prepared to do that, I would say to my friend, we are not going to be able to improve the quality of life in places like New York.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], an important member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations for his excellent leadership in bringing what I regard to be the most important piece of legislation that has come before the Congress since I took office in September 1990.

I was here during that debate of that Budget Reconciliation Act, which imposed these artificial barriers, which restricted the Congress in making decisions as to how our government funds ought to be spent. And so now, after more than a year of being here, it seems to me that finally we have a chance to do what we are elected to do. And that is to come here and address honestly how the funds of this country ought to be spent and not to have to be restricted by these arbitrary restrictions.

I think that it is quite right that we have to hear so many speakers here regard this piece of legislation in terms of supporting some that they consider evil and, therefore, call it the welfare state.

It seems to me what we are dealing with here is the inability of the administration to understand that there are people in this country that are suffering from lack of jobs, lack of food, lack of adequate housing.

Our health system is in decay. Our educational system is not what it should be, when we want to boast to the world that we have the best in the world.

So what we are attempting to say is the country must now take this opportunity, and that is what the world has presented us, with the end of the cold war, an opportunity to reassess our priorities and to put our funds where it really counts, in the future security of this Nation, in things like the infrastructure, in rebuilding our society, in putting people back to work.

We have a bill also coming out of the Committee on Government Operations that intends to spend $15 billion each year to do something about our public works deficit and at the same time to put people back to work. I have a $25 billion bill in the House Committee on Education and Labor because I feel education is an important element to the investment of our country.

So my colleagues, this is what we are here for and this is the highest priority bill that we could consider this year.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON] has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has 14½ minutes remaining.

□ 1510

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the comments of the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], because she is looking for an opportunity to spend. I rise against this bill.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I personally feel discipline is greatly needed. That is the reason I am opposed to this legislation.

Throughout the summer and fall of 1990, this Chamber saw a vigorous debate over the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990. That act separated Federal spending into three accounts; defense, international affairs and domestic. So called firewalls were used to prevent transferring money from one account into another and spending caps were placed on each account. Why? The answer is simple—to begin the arduous, but critical, task of controlling Federal spending and reducing our monster debt.

Today, however, that plan is in jeopardy. For the first time since the passage of the new budget agreement, we are considering a budget which authorizes less than the spending caps would allow. This gives us a great opportunity, not to shift money from one sector of the Government into another, but rather to reduce Federal spending and reduce the amount of money this country must borrow to continue operation. Some Members of this body want to remove the firewalls and lift the cap on Federal spending. I oppose this plan. Removal of the firewalls could not only cause further, dangerous, reductions in the defense budget, but could also preclude an opportunity to control Federal spending.

We have already voted to reduce the defense budget by $9 billion—an amount I consider to be too large. By removing the firewalls, the desire would be further enhanced to make even deeper cuts in defense. This would be a dangerous precedent. Despite the diminished Soviet threat in this post-cold war era, we still face potential hostilities from many third world nations. What assurance do we have that, one day, we will not have to defend ourselves against Iraq, Libya, China or others? Such threats compel us to maintain a strong national defense and one which will not imperil the United States in the future. Some reductions may, in fact, be necessary—but those cuts should help us solve the greatest domestic danger this Nation faces—Federal spending that is furiously out of control; spending that is forcing us to borrow more and more money and contribute to a debt which is larger than anyone's comprehension.

The responsibility is ours to resist the temptation to look upon the savings in the defense budget as a windfall—because nothing is further from the truth. Transferring money from the defense budget into other sectors of the economy would tragically perpetuate the dangerous trend that has, for too long, controlled our budget process. The American people are tired of the wasteful, irresponsible spending that we are all too often engaged in. Our citizens want from Congress the same spending discipline that they must endure each day. Today's vote is an opportunity to tell the American people that Congress is finally ready to get control of our spending habits. This vote is a defining moment for the 102d Congress and the time to send a message. Are you willing to be targeted as one who cannot control your desire to spend or one to seize this opportunity to apply self-restraint and tackle our incredible debt? The choice is clear and the opportunity is yours. Carpe diem my dear friends—seize the day.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS].

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, the questions at the heart of this bill affect every aspect of the budget process, and indeed would represent a fundamental change in the 1990 budget agreement. We need to put every aspect of that agreement on the table if this is to be a substantive debate and not just an exercise in politics.

Most importantly, Representative JERRY SOLOMON, on behalf of many Members submitted an amendment that could make this measure acceptable to the American people. The Solomon amendment would attach a line-item veto provision for 1993 to the dismantling of the budget walls. Unfortunately, the Rules Committee will have to rule this bill in order, if the House is to have the opportunity to vote on it. If making the budget process make sense is not germane, I don't know what is.

If the Democratic leadership is not prepared to make the Solomon amendment germane, we should offer it as a free-standing bill. I want to see if this House is serious about budget reform.

We know that President Bush will never sign the bill as reported. And he shouldn't. This Congress made a promise to the American people in 1990. I wasn't a party to that agreement. I voted against it. But I think we should not eliminate the one provision that we have in place to force us to do something about the Federal deficit.

The world situation has changed and our military needs have changed. The Pentagon told us last year that we didn't need a number of military items, but this Congress forced the military to fund them. There are cuts that could be made in the Armed Services budget if we could eliminate the pork in the budget, the weapons systems the Pentagon doesn't want, the military museums. We could eliminate these too with a line-item veto. We might even be able to fund a lot of the necessary social programs you have spoken of just by applying a line-item veto to the Pentagon budget.

Some of the items funded last year were an embarrassment to this institution: The million dollar bike paths, the marble floors in the House elevators, the searches for space aliens. We all know how these items get in the budget and I think the majority of Members in this House, given the opportunity, would like to get them out. We could all look at our children and know we have spent our public funds in their best interest.

Think about the big picture. We can have better use of our resources. We can fund programs crucial to our children. We can cut wasteful pork out of our budget and restore honor to this House. We can start toward real deficit reduction.

People in my district and your districts are suffering because of the economic stagnation. Let's not play politics, we should be honest with the American people. If the firewalls come down, we need a line item veto for fiscal sanity.

Let's work together for a change. Let's make this day the day when Congress turned the corner and started solving this Nation's problems and not worsening them. Then, maybe that 19 percent approval rating of this Congress will improve.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Government Operations Committee, I would like to commend our distinguished chairman, Congressman JOHN CONYERS, for formulating this important legislation which we are considering today, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1991.

Passage of H.R. 3732 will allow us to respond in a responsible manner to the dramatic international events which have made our world a very different place than it was when the budget agreement of 1990 was reached.

With the dismantling of the Soviet Union and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, it simply does not make sense to continue the same defense strategy that was in place before the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

By removing the rigid firewalls between spending for defense and domestic discretionary programs, we will have the flexibility we need to address the most serious threat to our Nation's strength—our domestic problems.

It is ironic that the massive military buildup of recent years has in many ways made our Nation more vulnerable, as valuable resources have been siphoned away from such critical areas as education, job training, housing, and community development.

Mr. Chairman, in the Education and Labor Committee on which I serve, we continually hear disturbing testimony about the inadequate performance of American students compared with their counterparts in other nations.

In urban schools, conditions are nothing less than appalling. How can students excel academically when they are sent to dilapidated schools with outdated equipment and textbooks, in an atmosphere where drugs and violence are commonplace?

I am not antidefense; our country must defend itself, and I have the highest praise for our young men and women who choose to pursue careers in military service.

However, we have to ask ourselves some tough questions. What kind of example are we setting for the world, when we have men and women who fought in the Persian Gulf war who are now homeless? Last fall, Stars and Stripes newspaper ran an article about a report on homeless veterans conducted by the National Coalition for the Homeless. According to the report, more than 250,000 veterans of all wars may be homeless every night. Yet, only one-tenth of 1 percent of the VA's budget is dedicated to programs to provide services to homeless veterans.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Budget Process Reform Act will allow us to make our country stronger by addressing our urgent domestic problems

which have worsened during this prolonged economic recession.

I want to stress that H.R. 3732 is a fiscally responsible measure. By replacing the separate spending caps for defense, domestic, and international affairs with a single cap on all discretionary spending, the bill does not affect the limit on total discretionary spending set by the budget agreement of 1990.

The Congressional Budget Office has determined that enactment of this legislation would result in no additional cost to the Federal Government.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I commend our chairman, Mr. CONYERS, for his leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to support the Budget Process Reform Act.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose removing the budget firewalls. No question about it.

During the past few weeks, I held a number of town meetings throughout my district. Everyone who attended overwhelmingly declared the best way to get our economy growing and restore consumer confidence is to cut Federal spending and reduce the deficit. I couldn't agree more.

A few weeks ago when the House voted on tax plans portrayed as economic growth stimulants, I voted against any effort to raise taxes and the Federal deficit. Spending money we don't have is a sure-fire way to stifle economic growth, not create it. Pushing the deficit even higher is probably the worst thing we can do.

We're killing our economy, hurting our ability to compete, and stealing funds that should be going to businesses and individuals for investing in our future. We have no right to spend our children's future standard of living and burden them with the high cost of paying off the debts we incur today. That is truly unfair.

Mr. Chairman, I opposed the infamous 1990 budget summit agreement because it raised taxes and it raised spending. The only good thing about it was the spending caps. We can't now remove those caps simply because their precise intent is taking effect. We must make the hard spending choices necessary to live within the firewalls. After all, when was the last time we had one vote that could stop the deficit from going up by $10 billion?

For every dollar we cut defense spending after World War II, domestic spending went up 8 cents. After the Korean war domestic spending went up 25 cents for every dollar cut from defense. After Vietnam, Congress spent $1.09 for every dollar cut. After President Reagan's defense buildup, we spent $2.30 for every dollar in defense savings. What do you think will happen this time if we take the firewalls down?

Mr. Chairman, taking down the firewalls just sends the deficit up. I will not vote to do that.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure now to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3732, the Budget process Reform Act of 1992, which eliminates the firewalls between domestic, international, and defense spending while maintaining the limit on total spending imposed by the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act.

The main issue before the House today is not whether to fund long-neglected domestic programs with an increase in the Federal deficit. Whether we approve H.R. 3732 or reject it, the "peace dividend" anticipated in the House budget resolution will shrink the deficit next year and for many years to come. The real issue before us is one of balance: how much deficit reduction should be achieved, and at what cost to Americans who are suffering today because of the recession?

My own answer is that H.R. 3732 strikes the right balance between deficit reduction and the pressing need to invest more in our economy, our people—our future. Of the $10 billion peace dividend called for in the budget resolution, H.R. 3732 would target one quarter, or $2.5 billion, for deficit reduction; $1 billion for economic conversion; and $6.5 billion for vital domestic programs. The additional domestic spending would fund new research and development, health care improvements, cleaner air and water, rejuvenation of our cities, and better education for our children.

In addition to addressing these urgent and neglected domestic priorities, there is another compelling reason to support H.R. 3732. It contains funds to prevent a major crisis at the Government agency that serves as a lifeline for so many elderly and disabled Americans—the Social Security Administration. As part of its comprehensive 1991 oversight initiative, the Committee on Ways and Means discovered that a 20-percent staffing cut made during the Reagan administration is causing serious problems for Social Security on several fronts.

The Social Security Administration's most critical failures affect disabled Americans. Because the agency cannot keep pace with the current level of applications for disability benefits, more than 800,000 Americans are now struggling to make ends meet while their claims sit awaiting action. Under the President's budget request, this backlog would rise by 70 percent during 1993, to an amazing—and intolerable—1.4 million applications.

The Reagan administration's legacy of staff cuts is causing other problems at SSA as well. Elderly and disabled individuals must wait 4 to 5 weeks just to file for benefits in some parts of the country. SSA's toll-free number is plagued by high busy rates, and the agency has failed to comply with a 1990 statutory mandate to restore the public's telephone access to local Social Security offices. Office waiting times are increasing, and some understaffed offices routinely turn away elderly and disabled people who arrive without an appointment, suggesting that they instead call the chronically busy 800 number.

To address these problems, H.R. 3732 includes an additional $500 million for Social Security administrative funding. These funds are desperately needed, and they provide one more strong reason to vote for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, it is rare for this body to have before it a proposal that provides the best of both worlds; but I believe that H.R. 3732 does just that. It allows us to address our most pressing domestic needs and to reduce the deficit. The strength of the recession that is gripping our economy makes this the right course of action for 1993. To relieve the intolerable and unconscionable backlog of Social Security applications makes it imperative. I urge my colleagues to strongly support H.R. 3732.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, there is no peace dividend. This Nation has a Federal deficit approaching $400 billion. If there is anywhere in this national budget of ours where we can find room to cut, we ought to do the American taxpayers a favor and reduce the deficit with those savings.

It is absolute nonsense to cut the military budget, only to transfer every dime of those cuts or two-thirds of those cuts over to the domestic side of the ledger to spend that borrowed money.

People argue that we need this discretionary spending on higher priority domestic needs that will go unmet. We need this several billion dollars transferred from the Pentagon to domestic purposes or the recession will go on, and this funding, this deficit spending, is the only way to turn the economy around.

People argue that the domestic budget has been squeezed and crunched and squished and almost obliterated over the last number of years, and all of that is frankly a bunch of malarkey. We have plenty of room in the domestic budget without transferring a dime from the Pentagon budget, if we are willing to make choices.

We have to ask ourselves, among domestic spending items, what is most important to this Nation? Do we need a multibillion dollar space station more than we need veterans' health care, yes or no? Do we need a multibillion super-

conducting super collider more than we need clean water facilities or more than we need energy alternatives, yes or no? Do we need Economic Development Agency grants that go to some towns that have good grant writers on their staff more than we need funding for Head Start for our preschool children, yes or no?

Do we need direct Small Business Agency loans at low interest rates for some businesses while most businesses have to go to the private sector for loans, more than we need assistance in terms of children's health care, yes or no?

Those are the choices we ought to make on the domestic side. We will not make a single one of these choices if we crosswalk several billion dollars worth of Pentagon spending into the domestic agenda. We will go on funding everything and then a little more. It is time we woke up around here and leveled with the American public about the peace dividend being illusory.

When we have $400 billion worth of red ink, there is no dividend. We have to make choices that matter to America. Those choices will not be made if we transfer the money to domestic accounts.

□ 1525

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], a member of the Committee on Government Operations who served with me on the Judiciary Committee, and a past president of the University of Arkansas Law School.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank the distinguished chairman of the Government Operations Committee not just for yielding me time in support of this important legislation, but for his leadership in this committee as we seek to address the issues which have come into being, not because of a peace dividend, but because of the remarkable circumstance that once every 40 years or so the United States has had the opportunity to develop new strategies for a changing world. These events happen usually at the end of a war when the investment over a long period of time bears fruit and is harvested, giving an opportunity to look not at the past but at what the future needs of this country are as we address our need to remain militarily strong, but also to address the problems of a faltering economic strength which has resulted in unemployment for American workers and which has resulted in the neglect of the education and training of American students and adults who need to be retrained for jobs. This legislation provides that opportunity.

As I mentioned on the floor of this House almost a year ago, we have the opportunity to now develop new strategies for a changing world, to redirect some of our resources toward domestic challenges through a comprehensive, coordinated strategy as appropriate to our needs as the Marshall plan for Europe was to the needs of Europe following World War II. It is time, Mr. Chairman, to have a Marshall plan for America to address America's needs.

On April 24 of last year, I urged my colleagues to consider whether our national security was better served by maintaining hundreds of thousands of foot soldiers in Europe to defend against a nonexistent Warsaw Pact, or whether some of the expenditure could be redirected, and I am quoting from a year ago, "toward improving our country's competitive position in world trade and manufacturing." Strong efforts are needed now to provide the foundation upon which our economic strength can be advanced into the next century, and all of us know full well that our national security depends upon more than military might alone.

This Budget Process Reform Act makes the beginning of such a strategy possible. It will permit the redeployment of a small portion of our military savings to domestic economic investments while maintaining the spending caps required by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990. This enables us to truly advance and enhance America's national security without raising the spending limits included in our budget agreements.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, did you ever hear your father tell you, "Son, just because you got money in your pocket you don't have to spend it. That money is not going to burn a hole in your pocket." I heard mine say that. The Democrats remind me of those children with money in their pockets and they just cannot wait to spend it.

There is a big difference though with the Democrats. They do not have any money in their pockets. It is not their money. It is not even the money of the American taxpayer today, because we have already spent all of the money we have collected from the taxpayers. The money they are trying to spend, the money they are in such a rush to spend is the money of today's children, and probably even their children because they are going to have to borrow that money. This $6.7 billion of extra money that is going to be freed up by the defense savings is not real money. It is only savings on paper. It still is money that is going to be borrowed if we spend it. That is the big difference.

There was a poll taken of the American people February 22 through 24 of this year. Earlier one of the Democrat speakers told us that the American people were not stupid. I agree with him. Let us hear what the American people said about this question.

The question was: If there are to be savings in defense, where should we put those savings?

Before the Democrats rise up with their paternalistic attitude and say, "Well, the American people really don't know what's best for them," one might say they would probably say give me some tax breaks for that money, reduce my taxes. Wrong. Only 26 percent of those surveyed said reduce my taxes. Only 18 percent of those surveyed said increase domestic spending, and 51 percent of Americans surveyed said if we get any savings from defense, please put it toward the deficit.

Americans know what the No. 1 problem is in this country today, and while we have many problems, and the Democrats have enumerated those today ad nauseum, the No. 1 problem is the deficit and the accumulation of that annual deficit that we call the debt, and the interest that we must pay on that debt every year. That is what is robbing our children today, the children of America, and we have to stop it right now.

Please vote "no" on the Conyers bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. AUCOIN].

Mr. AuCOIN. Mr. Chairman, we just heard testimony on the floor about what the American public thinks about the use of the peace dividend that we have worked so hard to win. Let me show my colleagues what the American public thinks about this question.

Eighty percent of Democrats in this country believe that the peace dividend ought to go to investments in domestic needs. Of Independents, 72 percent believe that the peace dividend ought to go to investments in domestic needs. Of Republicans, 64 percent believe that the peace dividend ought to be invested here at home, in human capital and infrastructure.

Budget deficit? Sure, there is some sentiment for reducing the deficit. But look at what the public is telling us to do. Let's respond.

Let's talk about what this bill does and what it does not do. What it does not do is just as important as what it does do.

This bill does not worsen the deficit. It does not remove restraints, as the minority whip just said a few minutes ago. It keeps to the budget deficit reduction targets established in 1990 and goes one better. At least 25 percent of the savings in defense, under this resolution, will go to deficit reduction, and that, I would submit, does enhance the long-term strength of the United States of America.

My friends, we can do more to improve the long-term economic strength of the United States of America. We can make investments in our people,

investments in America, and investments in education. Education and kids lose big unless we bring down these firewalls. These firewalls were put in place to protect military spending at a time when we were still fighting the cold war, before Eastern Europe became independent, and before the Soviet Union disbanded and broke apart.

Given those changes, after having this society fight that long twilight struggle of the cold war, as Jack Kennedy spoke of, now that it is won, why can't we invest in our kids? Why can't we invest in the education of our kids so that they will be fully competitive with kids in Japan and Europe? Why can't we immunize the kids in this country? We are not doing that today. Why can't we put kids in Head Start to prepare them for education? Why can't we make sure that middle-income kids are eligible for Pell grants? We are not doing that either.

If we want to compete in the global marketplace then we must make human investments a priority. We must work to produce a highly skilled, high performance work force, one that is fully capable of competing with our international competition.

This bill is necessary. We must break down the firewalls. We're not talking about exceeding the caps, only allowing us to make investments here at home at a time when Americans are asking for leadership.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself my remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was very interested in what the gentleman from Oregon had to say, and I would just like to add this: He wanted to know what we are going to tell our people with regard to these programs. I think the big question is not that, but what are you going to tell your children and your grandchildren when their need for precisely these programs that the gentleman eloquently listed cannot be met because servicing the multitrillion-dollar debt is consuming the lion's share of Federal revenues.

These programs that they have been referring to all afternoon will not be around for their children or their grandchildren unless we show some discipline, and this is what I am talking about. I think it is very important. And this is the only opportunity we have had in the 30 years I have been in Congress to make some contribution toward deficit reduction.

But these are the numbers that we are talking about for servicing the public debt right now: In 1992 it is costing $293 billion just to service the debt; in 1993, $315 billion, and on into 1997, $388 billion. The President's budget for 1993 is $1.5 trillion.

□ 1540

The percentage that is going to just servicing the debt if we did away with all that, we could take care of all these programs we are talking about.

Well, the servicing of that debt is 21 percent, or about one-fifth of that total budget. That is what we are talking about when we talk about trying to do away with the deficit.

This is the first opportunity we have had to do that.

The firewalls were set in place 3 years ago as a disciplinary action. It was taken by this Congress. It was taken by the administration. The President signed the bill, as we have heard today, and now we want to change that discipline.

Well, I say if we are going to do it, let us do the same thing that we would do in 1993, apply those proceeds of savings to the reduction of the deficit.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the measure.

Mr. Chairman, this House is grappling with a deep and powerful credibility problem. A majority of the American people do not trust us. An overwhelming majority disapprove of the job that Congress is doing. In fact, about 4 out of 5 do not approve. We are once again embroiled in a crisis—with talk of abuse of privilege, arrogance, scandal, and cover-up dominating the news.

So what are we doing here today? Are we taking responsible action toward shackling the spending monster? Are we making a serious dent in the colossal $400 billion budget deficit? Are we even trying to set priorities? Are we cutting waste? No. Today the majority leadership is asking us once again for permission to spend more money, to create new programs and to abandon all sense of fiscal responsibility. It comes down to this: Under these rules, there must be some restraint on spending. But this has become bothersome to some of my colleagues who seem to believe that instead of cutting spending to live within the rules, we just need to change the rules.

Mr. Chairman, let us open our eyes and look directly into the eyes of that budget-deficit-spending monster, and say "no". Vote no on H.R. 3732, and keep this monster firmly caged by the firewalls.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to announce that there will be additional general debate on this matter. This does not close out our general debate, assuming that the Committee on Rules grants my desire and the desire of the ranking minority leader of the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged to yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I support the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992, because our Federal budget needs reform. Our Nation is drowning in a sea of red ink, but the key to rescuing our Nation is economic growth and productivity. The Federal budget can help to create economic growth and productivity not only by cutting spending that we cannot afford, but by making public investments that our economy desperately needs.

The problem is that the budget categories and the walls that we are talking about today undermine our ability to do that by not distinguishing between these two types of spending. American families know the difference between borrowing money for a college education or a home and borrowing money for a vacation. One is an investment that can generate a return. The other is an expense that the family may or not be able to afford.

Every successful business in America knows the difference between an investment that creates wealth and an operating expense that simply cannot be afforded.

It is about time that the Federal Government begin to understand that difference and that that be reflected in the Federal budget and in our debate.

I think we can begin that process by taking down the firewalls around budget categories that are irrelevant to the task before us, which is rebuilding our economy.

Next, I think we should separate our budget into capital investments and operating expenses.

Third, I think we should analyze each of these categories of investment and spending on the basis of their impact on our economy, both short term and long term, and on future budgets.

Dr. David Aschauer, professor of economics at Bates College in my State of Maine, has reported that if we maintain our public infrastructure spending for the last 20 years at the rate that we did 20 years before then as a percentage of our gross national product, productivity growth would be up 50 percent higher than what it is today. The average profit rate of our businesses would be 22 percent higher and the rate of private investment would be 19 percent higher than it is today.

We do not need firewalls, Mr. Chairman, around obsolete budget categories. We need a productivity strategy for America that distinguishes between capital investment and operating expenses, that seeks to return to the taxpayers of tomorrow savings that can be achieved through investment and productivity today.

Let us begin the hard work of budget reform. Let us pass the Budget Reform Act of 1992, and let us go on with the budget process that will rebuild the strength of the American economy.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act, the bill that provides us with flexibility to meet our current needs, yet retains the discipline necessary for us to work within our financial limits.

H.R. 3732 updates the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, which prevents any discretionary defense savings from being used to take care of necessities here at home. It frees us from a process that was set up 2 years ago to support a defense strategy that is now obsolete. It frees us to protect basic, critical programs in health care, job training, education, housing,

nutrition, and mass transit. It frees us to put our money into preventive programs—in medical research, energy conservation, and small business financing—that will save us money down the road. If we do not pass this bill, we will be $6.4 billion short of what we need just to maintain our current levels in these areas.

Although H.R. 3732 is responsive to our needs, it holds us responsible to the discipline that is such an important part of the Budget Enforcement Act. H.R. 3732 does not increase overall discretionary spending. It does not increase the deficit. It does provide for deficit reduction.

Opponents of this bill will say that H.R. 3732 causes additional defense cuts, even though it does not. Overall defense spending in the budget resolution does not change as a result of H.R. 3732. But, the majority of any defense savings will be used to meet important demands here at home. And the remainder will be used to reduce the deficit.

Opponents of this bill will also say that we are just sacrificing deficit reduction for increased, compulsive spending. But this is not true. The situation that our country finds itself in is not that simple. We have multiple priorities that must be balanced.

American families are suffering under the weight of this recession. They have to balance paying off their debts with meeting their basic, everyday needs. And we are no different. We cannot afford to have tunnel-vision. We cannot afford to ignore one priority in favor of another.

We must attack this deficit that we have accumulated over the years. We must take care of today's basics. And we have to look toward the future. We have to responsibly focus our limited resources in all three areas, and we have to do it now. It is the only way we can regain our stability.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Chairman CONYERS and the members and staff of the House Government Operations Committee for their efforts in formulating the Budget Process Reform Act. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support H.R. 3732, the tool that gives America the means to manage our different responsibilities and commitments.

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Chairman, as Members of Congress, we all have a vested interest in the ability of Congress as an institution to fulfill its governmental responsibilities. In 1990, I was a conferee on the budget reconciliation conference for purposes of considering the budget process. I also was the named plaintiff in the original suit attacking the constitutionality of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings in 1986. The budget process always has been a matter of significant interest to me.

During the 2 weeks before Congress voted on the final reconciliation package in 1990, I repeatedly raised my concerns with the leadership, the conferees, and other Members about the passage of the budget process amendments. The amendments with which I had such concern are the subject of this debate today. In the atmosphere of extreme urgency that was pervasive since the failure of the original budget summit agreement in early October 1990, these doubts went unheeded.

It is no secret that I did not and do not like Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and believed it should have been repealed long before it finally died a slow death. The budget process amendments which set up new deficit reduction targets and implemented these budget walls contributed to the needed demise of Gramm-Rudman.

At the time, however, I believed that the alternative would prove to be worse and it has proven so. I did not sign the conference agreement in protest of the budget process amendments and the resulting firewalls between categories of spending.

The amendments to the budget process tended to validate the complaints against us that as Members of Congress we cannot govern. We continue to set up elaborate systems of procedure that eliminate the need for Members to vote on specific issues. At some point, the public may conclude that we truly are unnecessary.

Because of the present firewalls in the budget process, we have eliminated our ability to take care of national priorities on a comprehensive and cohesive basis. Instead of being able to set national priorities by evaluating all programs on an equal basis, we now have priorities set only within categories. Defense, international aid and domestic spending do not and can not operate separately without regard for the impact on each other category. All are necessarily intertwined in order to develop strong national policies and security.

Why do we, as Members of Congress, want to continue to accede to the diminution of our power? The process by which this legislation was approved, may provide a clue. Instead of hearings and careful consideration of such significant legislation, the amendments were presented basically as a done deal.

While no one could have accurately foreseen the incredible and welcome changes in the world, we also should be intelligent enough to acknowledge that history has never remained constant. We should never restrict our ability to respond to change, if and when it does occur.

While I wish deficit reduction were able to be put on automatic pilot, process mechanisms can not substitute for Member involvement. More importantly, turning over power in a budget process that is enforced through sequestration by unelected officials is constitutionally irresponsible.

The walls that we created through the adoption of the budget process amendments was wrong in 1990. It was wrong not only because of the reasons I have already stated. It was and is wrong because it does not permit Members of Congress to provide for the most critical needs of its citizens. We can not wait another year for an artificial barrier to be dropped. It must be done this year.

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to rise today in this noble Chamber to offer my strong support of H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act.

Mr. Chairman, the successful passage of H.R. 3732 will mean an additional $211 million to be attributed to hospital health care for approximately 110,000 veterans. The success of this long overdue bill means 500,000 additional Pell grants for higher education; and 37,000 additional slots for the Head Start Program.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3732 means additional food and nutritional aid for 116,000 women, infants, and children. This comprehensive legislation seeks an additional $303 million to fight crime in the streets. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for $2.7 billion in new infrastructure investments; and $266 million in economic development for communities hit hard by defense cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the recommendation of the Government Operations Committee that it is now time to remove the firewalls between spending for defense and domestic discretionary programs.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for us as lawmakers to take a leadership role in making that move right now. H.R. 3732 is a very effective means by which we can reach that objective. It is one of many attempts to put the American economy back on track that warrants our unwavering support. Mr. Chairman, I beg my colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation.

Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we will be presented with an opportunity today to clear the path for the use of billions of dollars from our defense budget in our domestic economy. There is unequivocal bipartisan agreement that the time has come to cut this Nation's defense budget. These savings should be used for creating civilian jobs, for rebuilding this Nation's infrastructure and housing, for promoting education, and for championing a long-term solution to our economic woes.

We are constrained by an outdated law that prevents us from appropriating money currently in the defense budget for domestic applications. I urge my colleagues today to support H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992, that would allow us to employ much needed funds from the defense budget for a domestic recovery. In communities like my own district in Detroit, these funds mean nothing less than survival. Let's break down the budgetary walls.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, the budget process reform measure before us today has little to do with the budget process and contains even less reform. This measure does nothing to force Congress to spend less over the long haul, it merely allows us to shuffle money between programs and throws a small bone to deficit reduction.

True budget reform would eliminate the endless bickering we face each year in Congress. My colleague, Mr. CHRIS COX of California, introduced a bill to overhaul the Federal budget process and end the ceaseless, budget-driven debates which paralyzes Congress every year. I like to call the Cox measure the cut-the-B.S.-in-budgeting act.

This bill would establish true spending limits early in the year with the President's cooperation. Any spending above the preset limits would be subject to a two-thirds vote in each House and the President would have a type of line item veto to weed out ridiculous, wasteful spending projects.

Mr. Chairman, rather than consider today's measure we should be striving for ways to streamline the budget process.

Americans are tired of the constant squabbling and inaction in Congress. We are the object of scorn by Americans who must balance their checkbooks each month no matter what their economic situation.

To regain their faith, we must put responsibility into the budget process. Today's bill

does nothing to address budgetary accountability. I urge consideration of the Cox budget reform bill. Congress is running out of time to show the American public that we can do something right.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act of 1992. I would like to commend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for the skill, foresight, and leadership he has exhibited in bringing this vital measure to the floor. I consider this legislation to be one of the most important measures to be considered by Congress this year. H.R. 3732 will give us the flexibility to make spending adjustments needed to address many of the economic and social problems facing our Nation.

As you know, the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 established separate spending caps for three categories of discretionary spending—defense, international and domestic. Restrictions were placed on these accounts, the so-called firewalls, to prevent any transfer of funds among them until fiscal year 1994. The bill we have before us today would eliminate these walls and allow us to consolidate these separate categories into a single category for the 1993 fiscal year. Such action is essential if we are to successfully address the many domestic woes confronting our nation.

With the end of the cold war, the collapse of the Soviet threat and the persistent recession, we now have an opportunity to reduce defense spending and target these resources for funding of programs which are critical to meeting our needs here at home. Funding for these activities is needed now, more than ever.

The American economy dipped into a recession in July 1990 and appears to be in the longest downturn in this country's postwar history. Furthermore, most agree that failure in 1992 to adopt spending and tax policies which address the Federal debt, employment, health, education, housing, and other urgent needs will contribute to continued economic deterioration and will assure a sluggish and protracted recovery once the economy does hit bottom.

Mr. Chairman, data compiled by the House budget committee indicates that, during the Bush Presidency, our country has experienced one negative economic record after another. In fact, President Bush can take credit for setting several records during his tenure as they relate to our economy. For example:

Our Nation has seen the slowest economic growth during the first 3 years of a new administration. Currently, our Nation's economy has grown by only 0.7 percent over its 1989 level when President Bush took office. In fact, this is the worst record for the first 3 years in office of any administration since the Commerce Department began releasing this type of data in the late 1940's.

Americans have had reductions in real disposable income, which have fallen at an annual rate of 0.6 percent. This makes the Bush administration the only administration since World War II to preside over falling per capita real disposable income.

The Bush administration can claim the lowest level of housing starts for any administration since World War II. Residential construction has fallen at an annual rate of 8.59 percent.

Our Nation has the highest level of poverty since the beginning of the war on poverty which began in 1967. In 1990, the official poverty rate jumped to 13.5 percent.

In 1990, health care spending as a percent of GNP was 12.4 percent—the highest ever recorded, and also the highest share for any country in the world.

Moreover, under the Bush administration our Nation has seen the fastest growing budget deficit in its history. Building on the record of the Reagan Presidency, the current administration has increased the national debt to well over $3 trillion, or more than triple what it was in 1980. Interest on this debt is projected to increase from $196 billion fiscal year 1991 to $342 billion in 2001. In 1993, interest on the debt will be greater than total spending on domestic discretionary programs.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the need to address these trends, elimination of the firewalls is required in order to maintain current services for many domestic programs. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that fiscal year 1993 domestic outlays will have to be cut $6.8 billion below 1992 levels if the budgetary firewalls are left standing.

It is for these reasons that I opposed the budget agreement in 1990. We should never have compromised our domestic needs. When we considered the budget agreement in 1990, our Nation was experiencing major domestic crises in crime, education, health, housing, to name a few. Today, we have the added burden of major corporations announcing massive layoffs. For those facing layoffs, thousands will join the ranks of the jobless or underemployed.

Mr. Chairman, in light of these matters, our mandate is clear. We must bring down the firewalls. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3732.

Mr. JONTZ. Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor to express my support for H.R. 3732 which will allow us to take money we no longer need to spend on defense and foreign aid and spend it at home where we need it so badly. While I agree with much my colleagues have said here in support of this resolution, I was to speak on behalf of a group of people who have not been mentioned here today. People who made it possible for us to stand here and debate what to do with money saved from a reduced defense budget. People to whom we owe a great debt of gratitude and much more—the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces, our military retirees, our veterans—the people who sacrificed so much to win the cold war and who deserve some of the benefits of that victory.

Our country depends on its career military personnel to maintain our defensive strength, and we make promises of pensions and medical benefits to encourage people to make a career of service. With the reductions in defense forces and the ongoing process of base closures, we are reneging on some of those promises. We promise career military personnel medical benefits for their retirement, but as we close bases we are closing the clinics and the commissaries. Military retirees are left to depend on the less generous resources of Medicare and the VA for their medical needs. Because of base closures, Indiana will soon be left with no active duty military facility, no clinics, no commissaries.

Our military retirees deserve better treatment than that, but the Defense Department will not consider alternatives. The DOD says it cannot justify and will not consider retaining clinics or commissaries solely for the use of retirees and reservists. So retirees who have depended on these facilities for medical care will become beneficiaries of Medicare and the VA. If we are going to save money on defense, why can't we use some of it to preserve these benefits for our military retirees? If the Defense Department refuses to maintain clinics for retirees and they have to rely on resources from the domestic side of the budget, let's pull down the walls and move some funds from the defense side to the domestic side to pay these additional costs.

And, Mr. Chairman, what about our veterans? Don't they deserve some of the benefits derived from reducing the defense budget? These people have fought our wars, sustained our wounds, won our peace, and secured our freedom. How can we justify continuing to fail to meet their needs? The VA's ability to meet its responsibility for the medical requirements of veterans—to provide quality patient care—has been compromised. The VA's facilities are aging; obsolete equipment is not being replaced; first-rate physicians, nurses, psychiatrists, psychologists, and physical therapists are harder to recruit and retain. Reports of substandard care and veterans frustrated by long hours in admitting rooms, clinics, and pharmacies have damaged the VA medical system's public image. The Independent Budget for Veterans Affairs suggests that we need about $3 billion more than is currently budgeted this year to start bringing VA medical care up to par. Can't we find that in a smaller defense budget?

One problem of great concern to me is the failure of the VA to adequately address the 500,000 Vietnam era veterans suffering from posttraumatic stress disorder. A recent study found that almost 70 percent of veterans with PTSD have never been treated. In the last few years, we have made some progress in meeting the needs of these forgotten vets, but there is a long way to go. We need additional funding for inpatient and outpatient PTSD programs, for research, and for training and sustaining PTSD clinical teams. The CBO tells me that we could initiate a 5-year program like the one in my bill, H.R. 841, to put us on track toward serving these vets for only $200 million. Let's find that money in a reduced defense budget.

Mr. Chairman, I, like everyone in this body, recognize the need to reduce our budget deficit, and with the passage of this resolution, the House budget will not only meet but exceed the deficit reduction required by the budget agreement. But while we meet the Nation's need for sound fiscal policy, let us also meet the needs of our veterans and military retirees who achieved our victory in the cold war and made defense budget reductions possible. For too long we have been telling our service people and veterans to wait. We have asked them to sacrifice in war and we have asked them to sacrifice in peace. We have asked them to hold on while we built up our defense establishment, while we built missiles and submarines, while we sent money overseas to shore up our allies, and to their credit they did

wait, as we knew they would. We can no longer ask our veterans to wait. It is time to make good on our promises. The end of the cold war gives us opportunity to do that. This resolution gives us the means. I urge the passage of H.R. 3732.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3732, the Budget Reform Act of 1992.

In 1990, when we reached what was then an agreeable balanced budget compromise, Congress imposed barriers between domestic, defense, and international operations expenditures.

In essence, Congress prohibited itself from reducing funding in one sector to supplement expenditures in another.

I say that the budget agreement of 1990 was agreeable because there were a number of us who predicted our national Government had reduced expenditures for vital domestic programs so severely, that we would soon witness a diminished return in our human and economic resources.

In fact, some Americans consider Congress is more concerned about building a Stealth Batmobile than they are in building homes and schools.

Some Americans consider Congress is more concerned about the future of Star Wars than domestic wars on poverty, drugs, and unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, as I look about my district and across this great Nation, I see that the situation has changed since 1990. Millions of people are out of work. Millions of jobs have gone overseas.

Thousands of people who never envisioned they would require social services are eagerly awaiting their stipends.

The primary reason for this occurrence is the slowdown in the mighty U.S. economy.

However, I am not here to assign blame to any one sector or party. Because when the everyday working man and woman on the street experiences economic pain, we as a nation suffer.

Already during the 2d session of the 102d Congress, we have passed an economic growth package and a budget blueprint that has proposed to eliminate the barriers between the three sectors.

The plan passed by the House last week calls for decreasing defense spending in order to provide 70 percent of the savings for domestic spending and the remaining 30 percent for deficit reduction.

Mr. Chairman, whenever economic conditions become strained in either our personal or professional endeavors, we are always forced to make tough decisions and balance one area of spending against the other. This task is not less difficult than with our current economic downturn.

However, I shudder to think how bad things can become if we do not infuse our economy with much needed investment in America and its fine people.

The 2d session of the 102d Congress is going to be a very busy and intense session.

Our mettle will be tested to its limits as the American people demand that we end the partisan bickering and fix the machine because it is indeed broke.

To close, I encourage our colleagues to support tearing down the walls so we may gain access to precious resources that can begin to augment the growth package we passed 2 weeks ago and restore dignity to all those persons who want to resume the business of making America strong, proud, and competitive.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 394, 30 minutes will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H.R. 3732 is relatively simple. It amends the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act by eliminating the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for the purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993. These separate categories were to remain in place through fiscal year 1993 and then be folded together into a single, capped discretionary spending category for fiscal years 1994 and 1995.

H.R. 3732 is very narrow in its scope, it still maintains a cap on discretionary spending—it simply calls for combining the three categories into one single category—something that was already slated to happen under the BEA in fiscal year 1994. This measure just advances that process by 1 year. H.R. 3732 accelerates an existing mechanism in the statute to allow flexibility in the allocation of spending while continuing to maintain budgetary restraints with an overall cap in fiscal year 1993. It is not an indictment of the 1990 agreement or an attempt to dismantle that process, but rather a recognition that we must modify this well-intentioned, still workable, but partially out-of-date process if we are to properly address current budgetary needs.

The cold war thankfully is behind us. While there certainly are and will always be numberous threats to our national security, the enemy that has haunted our Nation for 40 years no longer exists. Of course we need to be prepared for any external dangers and potential harm to this great country, but we need to do this realistically. We are not endowed with unlimited financial resources. We can no longer neglect our domestic needs to overbuild our military establishment. Since 1981 our defense budgets have averaged over $300 billion annually. These enormous and unprecedented funding levels came amid fears of the Soviet Union defense buildup. While this may have been the prudent course to take at the time, we just can't continue this costly endeavor in the absence of the Soviet threat.

No one is suggesting that we abandon our laudable goals for a strong national defense—only that we approach them in a more fiscally realistic and responsible manner.

It is time to put aside partisan differences and fix this agreement to meet the needs of today, not the outdated priorities of the past.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I spoke at length earlier on the rule, so I will limit my remarks right now.

Mr. Chairman, when I hear the supporters of this bill calling for the destruction of the 1990 budget agreement firewalls, I am reminded of Joshua at the Battle of Jericho.

Here is how the Bible describes the final moments of that great battle:

> So the people shouted, and the trumpets were blown. As soon as the people heard the sound of the trumpet, the people raised a great shout, and the walls came tumbling down.

The difference between then and now is that today's Joshuas, who are shouting to bring down the budget firewalls, are shouting to a different trumpet. Their trumpet is sounding "Retreat": retreat from the budget agreement; retreat from deficit reduction; retreat from spending control; and retreat from their commitment to the American taxpayer. Shame.

And the other difference is that our modern-day Joshuas know that no matter how hard they may huff and puff, the firewalls are not going to come tumbling down, because George Bush is not going to allow it to happen. The President has promised to veto this bill and the Democrat leadership cannot even find a majority of Members to vote for this bill—let alone a two-thirds majority to override a veto.

So why are today's Joshuas blowing all this hot air at the firewalls? What is this exercise in hyperventilation all about? The answer is very simple, my friends: they are trying to put one over on the American people. They are trying to have it both ways, and it is not going to work.

The reason theirs is such an uncertain trumpet is that they are blowing out of both sides of their mouth.

The modern-day Joshuas would like to create the illusion that they are bringing down the firewalls so that they can promise the people the treasures of the city that lie beyond those walls.

That is why they are madly sending out letters to their colleagues and their special interest groups and all their friends promising the goods if the firewalls come down.

And you have heard it on the floor today for about 3 hours now: there will be so many more billions available for education, so many more billions available for transportation—pork, pork, pork—so many more billions available for welfare. Mr. Chairman, it goes on and on and on.

But the simple fact is that this is all funny money. They are making promises they cannot keep with money we do not have. The fact is that our national bank account is already overdrawn to the tune of $4.5 trillion, and you cannot get away from that, that is a fact.

We are swimming in a sea of red ink; and the Democrats would have us believe it is just red, red wine, and everything is fine.

□ 1550

Well, Mr. Chairman, everything is not fine, and the American people should call them on it. The Democrats want to blame the President for spoiling their big spending plans, and we Republicans are going to spoil it.

My colleagues, I was both amused and amazed last week when the Democrat leadership in this Congress expressed mock shock at the President's saying he now thought that agreeing to those tax increases in the 1990 budget agreement was a mistake.

Our distinguished Speaker, whom I have a great deal of respect for, was quoted as saying that the budget agreement "was one of the best judgments the President has made * * * a wise decision at the time and a wise decision today."

And then our distinguished majority leader, who is a Democrat, was quoted as saying the next day that the President "made a mistake in backing off something * * * that he stood for at one time."

But what these Democrat leaders ignore is the context of the President's statement, and it is easy to understand why. What the President said, my colleagues, was, and just listen because this is a quote:

> I am very disappointed with Congress. I thought this one compromise, and it was a compromise, would result in no more tax increases. I thought it would result in total control of domestic discretionary spending.

And he went on to say:

> And now we see Congress talking about raising taxes again. And some in Congress are talking about trying to break down the spending caps. And so I'm disappointed, and given all that, yes, a mistake.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the President thinks the budget agreement was a mistake because the Congress has not been living up to its end of the bargain.

I told the President at 6:30 a.m. when he called me the day before the vote back in 1990 that this Congress would renege on those promises and that is why I could not give him a vote. By my count, the House of Representatives alone, with the full support of these same Democrat leaders, has abandoned, has broken, and has violated the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act on at least 11 occasions over the last 16 months. I hope the American people are listening, and I hope the press is listening because these violations are why the deficit has doubled in the last 16 months from $220 billion to over $400 billion. Not million, billion.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell my Democrat colleagues the reason why. I say to them, because you did it, Congress.

You did it on the very first day of this Congress, January 3, 1991, when you changed House Rules to shift pay-as-you-go scorekeeping from OMB to CBO.

You did it with illegally declared congressional emergency designations on four appropriations bills, one supplemental authorization bill, and two unemployment compensation bills.

You did it by abandoning the pay-as-you-go requirements in your own economic growth/tax increase bill that just passed the other day, on February 26.

You did it last Wednesday with your no firewalls budget resolution.

And here you go again, doing it today with this firewall demolition bill, and yet you wonder why the American people have no respect for this institution.

So, Mr. Chairman, for the Democrat leaders to be criticizing the President for calling the budget agreement a mistake when they themselves have already violated or ignored that agreement on at least 11 occasions in this Congress, is a little like the pot calling the kettle black.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues, "Do you remember the Peanuts comic strip? How many times does Lucy have to pull that football away at the last moment before Charlie Brown gets angry?"

Well, I am going to tell my colleagues something. The American people are more than just angry. They are damn mad, and they ought to throw us all out of here. This is a disgrace.

The problem with the breakdown in the budget agreement does not lie in the White House; the President has courageously vetoed bills that violate the agreement and he is going to keep doing it.

The problem lies right here in this House, where the pressure is always on to spend, spend, spend, more, and more, and more. And this bill is the final cop-out, betrayal, and license to spend more. That is why this bill ought to be defeated, and, if it is not, the President will veto it on behalf of the American people.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES].

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act. However, I want to first commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], for his efforts in bringing this bill to the floor. He is one who recognizes that this is not a partisan, political issue, as some want to make it. Rather it is a human issue. His commitment and vision are very timely, given the desperation that this country will face if we do not take the appropriate action today.

Mr. Chairman, passage of H.R. 3732 is an important step toward addressing the critical domestic concerns of this Nation. We cannot wait until 1994, to adjust our budgetary spending. Our cities are near collapse, and our citizens are suffering. Last year's budget agreement is no longer an adequate blueprint for this country's economic future. We must negotiate a different agreement that reduces the deficit as some of us seek to categorize our Nation as the world's only superpower, and they are ignoring the domestic needs of this country.

I am a sponsor of H.R. 3732, which eliminates the firewalls between spending for domestic and defense discretionary programs. Simply stated, the Budget Process Reform Act will give Congress the flexibility to make defense funds available for the true defense of this country—investment in the needs of this Nation's citizens.

It is now clear that structures set up in 1990 to reduce spending have failed, and budget priorities that reflected a 1990 bipartisan consensus are now hopelessly obsolete. Instead of continued emphasis on military spending at the expense of deserving domestic priorities, we should set forth a blueprint for reinvestment in education, health, employment, housing, and crime prevention programs.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, in yielding back the balance of my time, let me just say that in looking at a page out of the Congressional Budget Office report, a forecast about what would happen if economic growth takes place and what kind of revenues that would bring into the Federal Government is made. I look back at what happened during the 1980's, and I can recall when we had revenues of $500 billion coming into the coffers. I should say we had taxes that brought in revenues of $500 billion. During the 1980's, in a 7-year period of growth, because 21 million new jobs were created, because hundreds of thousands of new businesses and small businesses, created most of those new jobs, revenues coming into the Federal coffers doubled without raising taxes at all. From just slightly over $500 billion to almost $1 trillion, tax revenues went up without tax rates having to be raised. And yet this Congress went out and spent almost twice that much, and that is how we have developed these huge deficits.

However, Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, we talk about whether or not we should invest these peace dividend savings in reducing the deficit or in spending programs; and there is no doubt some of it is needed in spending programs. But if we can agree to

instill confidence in the American people and get this economy going again, economic growth will bring about the necessary revenue without raising tax rates. Just for example, with only 1-percent growth, and that is practically zero, the Federal Government receives an additional $35 billion. If the economy grows at 2 percent, that means an additional $70 billion. We hope it is going to grow somewhere between 2 and 3 percent in 1993, and that is almost $100 billion in new revenue.

So, when we hear it said that, if we do not take some of these peace dividend savings and shift them over to domestic spending we are not going to be able to help the veterans hospitals, or help Head Start, or help education, my colleagues, that is just a lot of baloney. By reducing the deficit with these savings, we are going to stimulate the economy and provide for economic growth.

□ 1600

God knows we might even get a little guts around here and pass a real economic growth package which would make the economy grow even more. But the main thing is to lower the deficit and to reinstill confidence in the American people and the private sector, and then all those things can be done that many Members want to do and that I want to do.

Mr. Chairman, that is why we have to defeat this bill. I have confidence that we have in this House enough good Democrats who will join all good Republicans to do just that and get this economy moving again.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the Members over there for being patient with me, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3732, the Budget Process Reform Act. This legislation would remove the spending caps placed on domestic and defense discretionary spending in the 1990 budget agreement.

Yes, the world has changed since the 1990 budget agreement was enacted. The Soviet Union has collapsed, the cold war has ended and we are closer to world peace than ever before. Given this victory, defense spending could be reduced, albeit carefully. Nothing in the 1990 budget agreement prevents spending cuts of any kind including defense cuts. However, the budget agreement does require that the savings go toward reducing the Federal deficit.

One thing that has not disappeared since 1990 is the deficit. It is still here and it continues to grow. Interest payments on the deficit also continue to grow, taking up money which could instead be spent on domestic programs. I believe that savings should go toward reducing the deficit. A reduction in the deficit will reduce interest payments and allow Congress to spend more on domestic programs in the future.

In light of the deficit and the interest payments, this country can not afford to increase spending in many domestic programs, no matter how worthy the program is. Increases now will result in less money in the future as interest payments on the Federal deficit continue to grow and consume more discretionary spending.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I will oppose passage of the Budget Process Reform Act. This legislation makes no reforms in the budget process. It will only increase the Federal deficit which will have a long-term negative effect on Congress' ability to fund essential domestic programs.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time, and I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYES of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3732) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to eliminate the division of discretionary appropriations into three categories for purposes of a discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 1993, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 3732, the bill just debated.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO LAGRANGE HIGH FOOTBALL TEAM

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

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the No. 1 high school football team in the country—the LaGrange High Grangers.

The Grangers compiled a record of 15 and 0 over the course of the regular season and the Georgia State playoffs, and we were ranked No. 1 in the USA Today newspaper's final 1991 poll.

Behind the coaching of Gary Guthrie, the Grangers had a perfect regular season and advanced to the 4-A State playoffs.

In the playoffs they beat Valdosta and McEachern, and faced Colquitt County for the Georgia State Championship.

With just minutes to play in the championship game, LaGrange made a magnificent drive down the length of field. They then kicked a 25-yard field goal with 13 seconds left to win the game 17 to 16.

This exciting finish capped a perfect season and one that will be remembered for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate everyone who played a role in the Grangers' national season, and I submit for the RECORD the names of the LaGrange players and coaches:

1991 LAGRANGE HIGH SCHOOL GRANGERS

Romano Dudley, Chris Jennings, Rodney Hudson, Scott Simons, Bernard Boyd, Deyano Martin, Trent Price, Diallo Burks, Jason Bray, Andre Short, Marcel Rachel, Demetric Shipman, Daryl Burks, Johnny Easter, Vernon Dardy, Balandor Flowers, Marcus Gates.

Quinton Cameron, James Read, Eric Daniel, Kenneth Spearman, Keyda Hardnette, Leon Robinson, LeQuincy Shepherd, Rico Riley, Tony Pettit, Walter Harris, Nate Hardnette, Desi Harrison, Benji Shepherd, Anthony Franklin, Issac Johnson, Dexter Fitzpatrick, Paul Pickett.

Mike Blom, Evans Crowder, Barron Wood, Billy Skipper, Ahmand Tinker, Byran Edmondson, Darrell Kelley, Carlos Williams, Bubba Scott, Lamont Cofield, Tommy Ware, Jacob Smrekar, Marcellus Gates, Skip Hale, Chris Hardnette, Russ Davidson, Darren Bailey.

LAGRANGE HIGH SCHOOL FOOTBALL COACHES, 1991-92

Gary Guthrie, Head Coach.

Jerry Batchelor, Johnny Berry, Donnie Branch, Kenny Moore, Sam Pickett, David Pleasants, John Revere, Rob Ridings, David Traylor, Ben Aderholt, Vince Allen, Steve Pardue.

REJECT SCAPEGOATING TO STOP THE BASHING

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the Los Angeles Times newspaper, and which is entitled, "Reject Scapegoating to Stop the Bashing," written by Mr. Stewart Kwoh, director of the Asian-Pacific American Legal Center of Southern California.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kwoh made some very salient points about the impact of our current Japan bashing on our Asian-American communities throughout the United States. Mr. Speaker, while Japan gets bashed, our Asian-Americans end up becoming the victims of racism and bigotry in several communities of our country.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kwoh offered several suggestions and challenges to the Asian-Pacific American communities not to isolate themselves from the problems, but be more involved with community activities and demonstrate to the American people that the Asian-Pacific American community is an integral part of our American democracy—that these Asian-Pacific Americans have also bled and died in defense of our great Nation—that they also pay

taxes and pursue the American dream like all other ethnic groups who live in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to inform my colleagues in this Chamber that the largest foreign investor in this country is not Japan, but Great Britain—well over $100 billion. The second largest foreign investor in America is not Japan, but the Dutch—in excess of $80 billion. And yet, I have not heard one Member in this Chamber expressing fear and concern that the British and Dutch investments in our country should be restricted. Such hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let's stop the bashing and get on with the real issues of the day—let's find solutions to our economic problems, and not blame entirely other countries like Japan.

Mr. Speaker, attached herewith is Mr. Kwoh's article to be made part of the RECORD, and I recommend its reading by my colleagues:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 11, 1992]

REJECT SCAPEGOATING TO STOP THE "BASHING"

(By Stewart Kwoh)

Do Asian-Americans have cause to worry about the current round of Japan-bashing in the United States?

Emotions have run high during the debate on the Green Line train proposals. So many anti-Asian comments surfaced that it prompted Mayor Bradley to call for a stronger stand against racism and bigotry in Los Angeles.

Yet some have questioned whether the concern in the Asian-American community is exaggerated. After all, Asian-Americans constitute 40% of the entering class at UCLA, compose the largest bulk of minority-owned businesses in California and make up close to 20% of the professional and technical staff in several aerospace corporations.

However, rising violence and other indicators suggest that times are changing.

Two months ago, a Japanese-American community center in Norwalk was vandalized with racial epithets scrawled over the walls. A Japanese-American man who was incarcerated in 1942 commented that "It's happening all over again." Statistics support a disturbing elevation of this problem. The Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission reported a 150% increase in anti-Asian hate incidents in 1990, its latest reporting year, making Asian-Americans the second most victimized ethnic group in Los Angeles after African-Americans.

Other tensions have also fueled these incidents. Anti-immigrant sentiments continue to surface and will likely escalate. Friction between African-Americans and Korean-Americans arise from a complicated mixture of economic despair and cultural misunderstanding. This dynamic has led to positive efforts aimed at resolution, but also to an escalation of incidents where Asian-Americans are targeted simply because of their racial features. Recently, a Thai woman was pulled from her car and beaten because she was thought to be Korean.

The most vexing development flows from the growing estrangement between the United States and Japan as well as the countries in Asia.

Few other racial minority groups in the United States have been so dramatically affected by the changing relationships between countries as have Asian-Americans. From the exclusion of Asian immigrants, beginning with the Chinese in the 1880s, to the internment of Japanese-Americans in 1942, people of Asian heritage in this country have suffered grave losses of rights and abusive treatment as relations between the United States and Asian nations have deteriorated.

In these times, it would be a serious mistake to remain complacent. There are a number of steps that Asian-Americans can take to constructively meet the challenges posed by increasing racial tensions.

Asian-Americans must articulate a position against scapegoating and for increased investment in American jobs and workers. Particularly during discussions on trade and the economy, racial epithets and derogatory remarks made of any nationality should not be tolerated. Politicians, business leaders and the media should be closely monitored and criticized for such irresponsible remarks.

The unfair singling out of Japan or Asian countries as the prime culprit behind our economic problems must be challenged. Americans must examine our own contributions to troublesome economic developments. It is also important to note that the "bashing" rarely takes the form of anti-British or anti-Canadian activities, although the foreign investment in the United States by those two countries combined far exceeds that of Japan.

On the positive side it should be urged that political and economic action be taken to invest in America—its workers, industries and regions—rather than simply blocking foreign products and services. Our criteria for contracts or purchases should emphasize how they improve productivity rather than exclusive use of nationality.

Articulation of such a position should not be perceived as surrogacy for Asian corporations. In fact, Asian-Americans should be highly visible in encouraging and pushing Japanese, Chinese, Korean and other foreign-based companies to improve their community relations and business practices in the United States, particularly in hard-hit inner cities.

Asian-Americans must begin a concerted community relations and development strategy. The relative political and social isolation of many Asian-Americans from their communities must change. Education can strengthen our cohesiveness and improve our poor track record of reporting incidents of hate crimes instead of hiding from the problems. This effort must be matched by developing consistent ties with other ethnic and community groups. In this economic downturn, Asian-Americans are not the only ones being scapegoated.

In this process the values of Asian-Americans will be put to the test. Can our reverence for family be extended to others in our community? Can our hard work in education and business be matched by initiatives in bettering human relations?

Finally, the proactive outreach to other communities must be complemented by a strong response capability. Already a national network against anti-Asian violence has made an impact on cases and communities from North Carolina to California. Our legal center here has joined with our counterparts in San Francisco and New York to form the first national pan-Asian consortium focusing on legal initiatives to combat racial violence and tensions.

Rather than waiting to see if scapegoating once again dominates our politics, Asian-Americans must join with other Americans in ensuring that it never happens again.

URGING FULL DISCLOSURE OF HOUSE BANK RECORDS

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, in this awkward, institution-consuming debate that has wracked this body, I rise to stress one point. In a classic sense the House bank is not and never was intended to be a commercial bank. It is a nonbank bank, an institution of accommodation for Members staffed with publicly paid personnel. Hence, the issue before us is one of privilege, demanding disclosure, not privacy requiring respect for individual accounts.

This is not the biggest scandal in congressional history—the taxpayer after all, has lost little—but it stands out because the sin is measurable, because the average American lacks access to similar credit-flexible institutions, because loose personal banking is a reflection of loose fiscal leadership.

At issue is the honor of the House.

Accordingly, whatever the embarrassment, the least Congress can do is come clean. The public has made a proper demand for the fullest possible disclosure, the fullest possible reform of procedures, and the greatest possible individual accountability.

Perspective is difficult to apply to events of the day. The irony is that at the very time the rest of the world wants to copy our system, there has never been more self doubts about our own institutions. We appear to have lost confidence in ourselves. The American public has concluded something is rotten on Wall Street, something is askew in Washington.

A society that allows a Michael Milken to earn half a billion dollars in a single year, that finds Congress unable to withstand penny ante conflicts on interest, that abuses its own bank, is a society in need of reform.

In Chinese history there is a theory of revolution based upon a mandate of heaven. A government can stay in power until the mandate is removed as signaled by natural phenomena like droughts, floods, and hurricanes. My sense is that the American people are in the process of concluding that any mandate Congress might have presumptively thought existed for itself has long been removed. Man-made conflicts, after all, are far more inexcusable than natural events.

A House divided against itself, a House that cannot balance either the public's or its own checkbook, a House that bounces an average of 44 checks every working day, is a House that cannot stand.

What Congress needs today is a crusade that has nothing to do with politi-

cal parties, nothing to do with conservatism or liberalism, but has everything to do with decency and competence, with an ethic of service rather than privilege.

A modest first step should be full disclosure.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House of today, the House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2026

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8'o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.

RESIGNATION AS SERGEANT AT ARMS AND APPOINTMENT OF SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, DC March 12, 1992

Hon. THOMAS P. FOLEY,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully submit to you my resignation as Sergeant at Arms of the United States House of Representatives effective March 12, 1992.

It has been an honor and a pleasure to serve the Members of Congress and this institution for the past 25 years.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JACK RUSS,
Sergeant at Arms.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (2 U.S.C. 75a–1), the Chair appoints Werner W. Brandt of Virginia, to act as and to exercise temporarily the duties of Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF WERNER W. BRANDT AS SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will Mr. Brandt present himself in the well of the House.

Mr. Brandt appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office of Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives.

MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION ON TODAY OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 393 AND A SUBSEQUENT RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE INQUIRY INTO THE OPERATION OF THE BANK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Thursday, March 12, or any day thereafter, to consider the following two resolutions in the following order and manner:

First, House Resolution 393, to be debatable for not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

Second, immediately following disposition of House Resolution 393, it shall be in order to consider a resolution, if offered by Representative GEPHARDT of Missouri or Representative MICHEL of Illinois, said resolution shall be debatable for not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution to final adoption without intervening motion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

□ 2030

INQUIRY INTO THE OPERATION OF THE BANK OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the direction of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 393), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 393

Whereas House Resolution 236 directed the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to review the use and management of the Bank of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives for the period July 1, 1988 to October 3, 1991;

Whereas, after reviewing the operations of the House Bank and account information of Members, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has reported to the House that it has identified the accounts of Members and former Members who, on the basis of such review, abused the banking privileges during such period by routinely and repeatedly writing checks for which their accounts did not have, by a significant amount, sufficient funds on deposit to cover; and

Whereas that Committee has recommended that, after such Members and former Members have had the opportunity to be heard by the Subcommittee which conducted the inquiry, the names and pertinent account information of those Members and former Members who the Committee finds have abused the banking privileges be publicly disclosed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, after the expiration of ten days following adoption of this Resolution by the House, and after giving such individuals an opportunity to be heard by the Subcommittee which conducted the inquiry, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to publicly disclose the name and pertinent account information of any Member or former Member who the Committee finds, pursuant to House Resolution 236, has abused the banking privileges during the period July 1, 1988 to October 3, 1991; and be it further

Resolved, That the pertinent account information to be publicly disclosed for such period shall be the following: the number of insufficient funds checks written; the particular timeframe during which those checks were written; the number of such checks that the House Bank returned to the Member; the number of nonaccount checks that were cashed or caused to be deposited to the Member's account with insufficient funds to cover them; and the number of months that the negative balance in the Member's account exceeded the next month's net salary deposit; and be it further

Resolved, That the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is directed to provide to any Member or former Member who so requests it in writing on or before December 31, 1992, the following information regarding the account of such Member or former Member at the House Bank during the period July 1, 1988 to October 3, 1991; the number of insufficient funds checks written; the particular time-frame during which those checks were written; and, where the information is available to the Committee, the number of months that the negative balance in the account exceeded the next month's net salary deposit.

Mr. MCHUGH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, I have offered House Resolution 393 today on behalf of the

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

I would like to begin by thanking the members of the Committee for their cooperation, and by expressing my appreciation in particular to the members of the Subcommittee who for the past five months have worked very hard on a non-partisan basis to bring this matter to a just conclusion: Mr. HANSEN (of Utah), Mr. CARDIN (of Maryland), Mr. GRANDY (of Iowa), Mr. MCDERMOTT (of Washington), and Mr. GOSS (of Florida). I believe that all of us owe a special debt of gratitude to the Ranking Republican Member, Mr. HANSEN, for his leadership, common sense, and just plain decency throughout these proceedings.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, on October 3d of last year this House passed House Resolution 236 by vote of 390 to 8. The Resolution was prompted by widespread concern that there might be problems at the so-called House Bank operated by the Sergeant at Arms Office. This concern followed publication of an audit report by the General Accounting Office (GAO) which indicated, among other things, that over the 12-month period covered by the audit 134 House members had written 581 checks on their accounts at the Bank, which checks had face values of $1,000 or more but did not have sufficient funds in the accounts to cover them.

House Resolution 236 directed our Committee to conduct an inquiry into the use and management of the Bank. The inquiry was to cover a 39 month period, from July 1, 1988 to October 3, 1991. The Resolution instructed us to review the Bank's operations and determine whether its use or operation presented questions of potential violations of the House Rules or other applicable standards. In making this determination, the Committee was directed to consider, among other things, whether anyone "abused the banking privileges by *routinely and repeatedly* writing checks for which their accounts did not have, *by a significant amount*, sufficient funds on deposit to cover". (Emphasis added)

If the Committee determined that there were potential violations of House Rules or other applicable standards, House Resolution 236 further instructed the Committee to consider, if appropriate, initiating a preliminary inquiry, which is the first stage of a formal disciplinary proceeding under the Committee's Rules.

Shortly after passage of House Resolution 236, the Committee designated a Subcommittee to conduct the inquiry. I was privileged to chair that Subcommittee, and also to serve as Acting Chairman of the full Committee.

At the outset of our investigation it became readily apparent that the Bank's records were in primitive form and would have to be substantially reconstructed for our purposes. Ten people from GAO were detailed to our Subcommittee and, at our direction, began the tedious and time-consuming process of compiling the information we needed. We insisted that every piece of information the Subcommittee received be presented by GAO in coded form; that is, at no time did the Subcommittee or the full Committee know the identities of account holders. We preserved anonymity at all times so that it would be clear that all of our judgments were made without reference to personalities or party affiliation. That anonymity continues to this very moment.

The Subcommittee first requested from GAO a comprehensive list of accounts on which at least one bad check had been written during the 39-month period. To give us that list GAO had to examine each daily Settlement Sheet for the entire period; it was on the back of these sheets that the Bank tellers would note the overdrafts that came in each day. The name of the Member who wrote the check and its face amount would be listed.

The first list that we received from GAO showed that there were 355 Members and former members who had overdrafted their accounts at least once. In addition to the coded account number, the list indicated the total number of checks that had been overdrawn in each case and the aggregate of their face amounts.

It is important to emphasize that face amounts are irrelevant and misleading in judging the account practices of Members. To determine abuse of banking privileges one must know the deficiencies in an account, that is, the amounts by which the face amounts of checks exceed the funds in the account at any given time. In order to provide this information—essentially an account's running balance—GAO had to completely reconstruct an account's history check by check, deposit by deposit, for 39 months.

The Subcommittee concluded that it was neither necessary nor feasible to reconstruct the history of every account. On the basis of the preliminary information, it was clear that many Members had not abused their banking privileges. Moreover, if GAO were to reconstruct every account, this inquiry would have dragged on for many more months.

Therefore, on the basis of the preliminary information available, the Subcommittee instructed GAO to reconstruct complete histories for those accounts that we thought might potentially be the most problematic. Our selection was based primarily on the number of bad checks written, and the number of months the aggregate face amounts checks for each month exceeded the account's net salary deposit. It is important to emphasize that the accounts chosen for reconstruction were not designated abusing accounts. We did not have adequate information to make that judgment; most notably, we did not have the deficiencies for any account.

GAO was finally able to provide us with the complete account histories in early February of this year. While we waited for those records, the Subcommittee considered how we would specifically apply the criteria set forth in House Resolution 236. After receiving the records, we reviewed these carefully, applied the criteria, and decided upon the findings and recommendations we would present to the full Committee. All members of the Subcommittee, three Democrats and three Republicans, supported our report.

The full Committee met on Thursday of last week, March 5th, and voted in favor of the Subcommittee's report. The vote was 10 to 4. We have distributed the Committee Report to all Members and I hope that you have had a chance to read it. It describes in detail the history and practices of the House Bank, the process the Committee used, and our conclusions. I would now like to summarize those conclusions.

I.

The House Bank was actually not a bank, but a disbursing office that also provided check-writing and check-cashing services. The Bank's funds consisted of Members' salaries and other deposits. For at least 40 years, and perhaps for much longer, the Bank had a practice of honoring most overdrafts on Members' checking accounts. Past Sergeants at Arms justified the practice as a draw against the next month's net salary deposit. That salary deposit, as we all know, represents payment for the prior month's service.

Although it appears that no funds were lost as a result of account overdrafts, that is, all overdrafts were ultimately made good, the Committee concluded that the Bank's practice of routinely honoring overdrafts was unwise and should have been discontinued years ago.

II.

The management and operation of the House Bank were not professional. Its recordkeeping was haphazard, its internal accounting controls were lax, and its failure to promulgate and distribute formal guidelines and procedures to those who used the Bank contributed to the problems which are the subject of this inquiry. Although the Sergeant at Arms inherited the system, ultimate responsibility for poor management must rest with him. As the Committee Report points out, on a number of occasions he was given specific recommendations for reforming the Bank and they were not carried out in a timely or effective manner. Re-

sponsibility must also be shared by the Bank Director and the Committee on House Administration, which had oversight responsibility.

III.

The Committee found that there were 19 current Members and 5 former Members who abused their banking privileges. As I said earlier, we don't know their identities since the Committee has at all times made its judgments using coded account numbers only.

Pursuant to the direction of House Resolution 236, the Committee had an obligation to identify accounts where banking privileges were abused. Moreover, the Resolution defined abuse for the Committee as those cases where a Member repeatedly and routinely overdrew the account by a significant amount. We had the difficult job of putting flesh on those terms, and reasonable people might differ with our conclusions.

We defined a "significant amount" as an account deficiency which exceeded the Member's next monthly net salary deposit. That is clearly a significant amount. Beyond that, for many years Bank employees have considered it significant and testified that they communicated this by telephone to Members and their designated staff when such account deficiencies occurred. The only times the Bank ever bounced a check was when overdrafts caused the account deficiency to go over the next month's net salary deposit, and even then checks were not always bounced.

Having defined a "significant amount" of overdrafts, the Committee then had to decide when such overdrafts were repeated and routine. This was not easy, and the Committee simply had to choose a standard that would meet the test of reasonableness. It chose a 20 percent standard, that is, significant overdrafts were considered repeated and routine when they occurred in at least 20 percent of the months that a Member had an account at the Bank. Therefore, if one had an account for the full 39 month period of this inquiry, one would have to overdraw by the significant amount at least once in each of 8 months.

IV.

The Committee did not initiate formal disciplinary proceedings in any of these cases, but rather decided to submit to the House the Resolution I have offered today. As you know, the pending Resolution would direct the Committee to publicly disclose the names and pertinent account information for those found to have abused their banking privileges. The Committee believes that lengthy formal proceedings would be unlikely to develop much more of substance that this inquiry has already produced.

The pending Resolution would defer public disclosure for at least 10 days after passage. This would enable the Committee to privately notify those on the list and give them an opportunity to examine the records on which the Committee based its decision in their own case. Each person would also be afforded an opportunity, if requested, to be heard in executive session by the Subcommittee that conducted the inquiry. An individual would be taken off the list before public disclosure if it can be established that he or she was mistakenly put on the list.

The pending Resolution also provides that any Member or former Member not on the list can by December 31, 1992, request in writing from the Committee a letter setting forth that person's pertinent account information.

The account information to be revealed in both of these situations is set forth in the pending Resolution.

V.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Committee found that no non-Members abused their banking privileges by cashing at the Bank window checks drawn on other banks. Quite a few people presented overdrafts for cash, but the number and size of those checks did not rise to the level of abuse defined in House Resolution 236. The Committee did conclude, however, that the Sergeant at Arms and a former Bank teller misused their positions at the Bank by cashing several checks with insufficient funds to cover them.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a long and difficult investigation. As I mentioned, reasonable people might approach this somewhat differently, but a majority of the Committee believes that we have faithfully carried out the task assigned to us by House Resolution 236.

□ 2040

As the Members know, there will be a second resolution offered tonight after the vote on this resolution. It raises the question of full disclosure, and I have been asked as chairman why our resolution, the one pending before us now, did not provide for so-called full disclosure.

By full disclosure I mean publication of all of the names on the list of 355, together with the number of checks that were bad in each case. I would like to say briefly why we did not recommend so-called full disclosure.

First of all, it was not consistent with the instructions we received in House Resolution 236. That resolution instructed us, in effect, to identify abusers of banking privileges, not lay out all of the information about non-abusers.

Second, checking transactions are essentially private in nature. If someone did nothing wrong, if a Member did not abuse his or her banking privileges, we believed it would be wrong to violate the privacy of these transactions and disclose them. Under our proposal, members could do that on their own, if they chose to, by requesting a letter from the committee.

Third, disclosure of the number of checks is not full disclosure, despite it being called so publicly. The fact is that we do not have complete information with respect to any accounts but the 66 I have described. We have the number of checks, but that says nothing about deficiencies. And I think that this lack of information points out clearly why this is not full disclosure. We did not reconstruct any but those 66 accounts I mentioned earlier.

Finally, disclosure of the number of checks may not be accurate disclosure. As I indicated, the GAO constructed a comprehensive list of 355 accounts and the number of checks that were overdrawn for each account by looking at the back of the settlement sheets. GAO has reported that in reconstructing the 66 accounts, they discovered that the settlement sheets were sometimes inaccurate. They corrected those mistakes that the bank had made in the case of the 66 reconstructed accounts. But with respect to all other accounts, there are likely to be some mistakes. Disclosure of the remaining accounts and the Members on that list of 355 is likely to result in some error. I need not describe to Members the kind of misunderstanding that can develop in the public's mind as a result, the kind of damage that can be done to Members. This would not be a problem under the resolution we are offering now. There would not be disclosure of that kind of information, unless the Member requested it. It would be the Member's option. Under the next resolution, however, there would be no option. It would be mandatory disclosure. It would not be accurate in some cases.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, I believe the Committee fully implemented the instructions we received from this House in October. I would urge the Members to support and vote for this resolution.

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

□ 2050

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

Mr. Speaker, this is, I hope, the conclusion of a very long and difficult investigation. I do not know anybody in this House who enjoys going down and being buried in the dungeon of this Capitol for 5 months at a time, spending literally hundreds of hours poring over all kinds of accounting procedures on things that we feel would possibly be detrimental or hurt Members of the House, but that is the job that you gave us, and if it can be enjoyable, I guess it was enjoyable because we had the opportunity of serving with people like the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], an honest, common-

sense, reasonable, fine gentleman; serving with other members of the committee who did their very best to put aside partisan politics, to work at what in their hearts and minds they felt was right and correct and to come to some conclusion of this.

Mr. Speaker, many of these investigations start out, and they get a lot of publicity, and people talk about them for about 20 hours, and then they die, and one poor person has to suffer for months as we go through it.

Not in this one. In this one, almost every Member of the House has had to suffer. The public has had to suffer. The media has been interested in it. It has created an image different than any other investigation that I have been part of now in my 12th year in the House, and I have been on this committee for 12 years.

We have talked about the bank. And I think the acting chairman did an excellent job in outlining where we are going.

What kind of bank are we looking at? Come on, this is not a bank. This thing has been around since 1830. They started taking checks in 1889. This bank is a disbursing office. Those Members in those days had to find a way to get their money. They had to walk over to the Treasury and get a voucher in those days. They got a little tired of that. They said, "There has got to be a better way to do it." So the Speaker said, "We will work on it." They put together a group of people, and they called it a bank. It disbursed money.

Unfortunately, from that time to this time, people have been trying to figure out how do we really do this. We do not have any real good rules going back 100 years ago. It has not been delineated. It is awfully easy to cast aspersions against the leadership, against the Sergeant at Arms, against the people in the bank. Maybe that could go around to a lot of people. I think it is kind of a hollow argument, because the thing has not been looked at like a commercial bank.

The people of the United States of America want it to operate like a commercial bank. They want their bank settlements to show a negative and a positive balance. Here is a bank statement from the bank.

Now, for the 39 months we are looking at, you cannot find one of these with a negative balance on it. They did not do it.

Of course, we wonder who gave them those instructions. So what did they do when a check came in that was over? They put it aside. Let us say the man had $10,000, and the check was written for $11,000. That one would go aside. The next day one would come in for $4,000, and it would be paid, and one for $2,000, and it would be paid. That is not the way we do it in a commercial bank. It is very difficult for many Members to even know where they are going.

As we looked at this great bank we had down there, yes, it is very convenient. It is sure nice to walk down and cash a check and take care of things. I would hope that people would realize that this was not a bank. I would hope they would also take it upon themselves to read this report that we put out. It is very, very clear. The first part of it talks about the bank history.

If people would read that, they would see that we were operating a little differently than people thought we were. I just cannot buy the argument that we were playing with a bank. We were playing with an organization that was poorly run, did not have definite instructions, and, in effect, and I do not know why more people were not in trouble considering what we were working with.

I would be less than honest if I did not say that the people who work down there are not pretty good souls. A lot of those folks tried very hard to do what they could to be very attentive. How many banks are there in America that every accountholder's name is on the wall or a picture of him? You do not go into the First National Bank and see everybody's picture on the wall. We have got them all down there.

I think the people who were heading this bank tried to do what they thought was best. Their whole intent was this: take care of the Member; do not upset the Member; cater to the Member; kowtow to the Member. You could come into the bank if you were $20,000 overdrawn and if you wanted to cash a $5,000 check, and the teller knew it, he would still cash it for you. So we have made our mistakes, and now that bank is closed, and I hope the people of America realize that.

The intent of this investigation was not criminal. Every day people are calling saying, "Why do you not do something about this?" What do you do anyway in a situation where we look at a Member? We go through a preliminary investigation. Then we decide if it is necessary, if it is laudatory, if it is meritorious. Then we go through hundreds of hours and days and months working with that Member, and at the conclusion of that, we decide whether a letter of reproval, a reprimand, a censure, or an expulsion. Has anyone ever stopped to think what these things really are? A letter of reproval is really nothing, but we will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to get to one. A reprimand, we stand up here for an hour, the person is reprimanded by the Speaker, and we go our way. A censure, he stands in the well, turns around and faces it. The one that has any clout is expulsion.

As we looked at this, the hard, difficult thing to handle, the easiest way we could see it to take care of what we thought would be discipline would be the 24 names, or, as the chairman has explained, coming up with those we thought were true abusers. I think it has been adequately covered. We have done it in our caucuses and other places, talking about repeat routine and significant.

We know how this should fall out.

Mr. Speaker, now, I dismiss the idea out of hand when the press has been saying that what we have is not disclosure. Very candidly, both of these are exposure and disclosure to the people involved.

Now, really if you want to be very candid about it, why do you now turn and look at the back page of the one we are talking about now? In there it talks about indirect disclosure. And what does it say? It says these people, from No. 25 to 355 can receive a letter, and that letter will have three things in it.

We are politicians here. Just ask yourself, be brutally candid about it, you are on the 355, that group I was just talking about. What do you think the press will do? What do you think your opponent will do? This goes on and on and on. You are going to live with this a long time.

It was very tough in a way. The one that will come up later I really think is a kinder and gentler one as far as getting it over for some people.

I noticed on "Good Morning, America" that somebody stated about this that it had overdraft protection. That is news to me. This bank had to overdraft protection. But people go in, and they say, "Well, you can do that at a commercial bank." You do not get overdraft protection. You do not have a line of credit. When you walked in there, I would really like to see this person, and we have had them all in front of the committee, who said to you as a Member, "You go ahead and overdraft for 2 months." They did not say that under sworn testimony in front of our group.

The defense we have heard, that we have had a 24-month contract, and so we, in effect, have our full salary for 24 months, but that is not the way it works. We get it month by month just like most other people do. Another defense is, "Nobody told me about this. I did not know I was doing this." I have a hard time accepting that.

Most of us learned to add and subtract in elementary school. If people followed that, I think they would have been OK, but I do not blame Members. I can see the feeling in their hearts and how uptight they are over some of these things, and some of them do have some very legitimate problems, and I am sure we will get a chance to look at that.

Mr. Speaker, our categories are basically abusers. Following abusers would be, in this resolution, the indirect exposure, and disclosure, and the next category would be those who did not bounce any checks, and the last category would be those who were not Members of this bank.

Keep in mind those categories were working.

I think the chairman adequately explained this. I appreciate the opportunity to briefly go over some of the issues that I felt were important.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], a very valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my chairman for yielding me this time, and I want to point out to all of the Members of the House, I hope, our deep appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for the work they have done in guiding the ethics committee in its work.

□ 2100

Both these gentleman have worked in a nonpartisan fashion to bring us a resolution that I think carries out House Resolution 236, a resolution that was passed by this House.

I think both of these gentleman have worked in the finest sense in the traditions of the Ethnics Committee to make sure that our finding represents a nonpartisan view as to how we should proceed whenever ethnical violations are brought against this House or any of its Members.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Ethnics Committee, and one of the six members chosen to investigate the iregularities of the House Bank, I have been shocked and terribly disappointed by the degree to which a number of House Members took advantage of the system.

Our findings are very critical of this institution and its members. Let me quote from the report:

The Committee finds that the long-standing practice of the House Bank in honoring overdrafts on Members' accounts was unwise and should have been discontinued years ago. * * * Responsibility for the overdraft practices of the Bank must be shared. A series of Sergeants-at-Arms and Bank Directors should have insisted upon a much more professional operation. The Committee on House Administration should have exercised more diligent oversight of the Sergeant-at-Arms Office. The House Leadership should have intervened in those earlier years when GAO was highlighting the problem. * * * In the final analysis, however, major responsibility must be borne by all those Members who, with some regularity, month after month, year in and year out, wrote significant overdrafts on their House Bank accounts."

The Ethnics Committee followed the instructions of the House as incorporated in H.R. 236, which was passed by the House on October 3, 1991 by a vote of 390 to 8. That resolution directed the Ethnics Committee to identify the abusers using the standard of those who "routinely and repeatedly" wrote checks for which they overdrew their accounts by a "significant amount."

There are those who argue that the standard used by the Ethnics Committee should now be changed so that more members are labeled as significant abusers. Whatever line is drawn, reasonable people will differ over the logic of establishing culpability. Clearly, there are at least 24 Members and former Members who are the worst offenders and should be identified as abusers.

The Ethics Committee has followed the instructions given to it by H.R. 236. We have set a clear standard of behavior that meets the test of routinely and repeatedly abusing the system.

It was the job of the Ethics Committee to identify the most flagrant abusers. Now it is up to the voters to make their judgments, on those whom we have identified as abusers, and on every Member who has written even one check against insufficient funds.

I am a cosponsor and supporter of the resolution calling for full disclosure, for every Member who has written any insufficient checks. I believe it is consistent with the recommendation of the Ethics Committee. It is clearly consistent with the demands of the people of this Nation, who are outraged by what they have learned, and who want the facts.

It preserves the Ethics Committee's determination of the worst abusers, while providing for full disclosure of the rest of the individuals who bounced at least one check. These Members will need to deal with this issue in their own districts. It will now be up to our constituents to judge our actions and that is the way that our system should work.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and leader, the gentleman from Utah, for yielding me this time, and I thank both he and the distinguished gentleman from New York for their service to this committee and to this House.

This is undoubtedly the most unpleasant experience this Member has had for the last 5 months. It is also undoubtedly the finest working group that I have ever been privileged to work with, and that extends to the chairman, the ranking member, and all the members of the subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, what normally happens when we bring an ethics resolution to the floor is it becomes a kind of grisly, but impersonal, spectator sport. Most of you sit in your seats and watch some Member twist in the wind as we record our findings and you sit in judgment of your colleague. Tonight you sit in judgment of yourself. I do not envy you this decision, because you have to do in just a few hours what the Ethics Committee has struggled to do for 5 months. We have tried to weigh incomplete, often inaccurate, and always circumstantial evidence, to find a common pattern of practice which we then can determine as abusive after the fact.

In other words, what we are doing tonight is defining the crime and then identifying the criminals. There is no precedent for this in U.S. statute. There is no precedent for this in the House rules. There is no ethics case to which you can refer to give you guidance. It is a process that is unfair. It is unkind, and for many of you it will be totally unbearable. And yet we have to do it. It must be done. The collective weight of years and years of sloppy banking practices, creative accounting, and abuse of privilege have brought the credibility of this institution to the brink of collapse. So we must fully disclose what we have done, how we did it, and why we did it. And we will. Today we will. You will have before you two complete resolutions, both of which advocate full disclosure, but are disagreed on the means to achieve that disclosure. But full disclosure is only half our charge.

We on the committee are empaneled to protect the institution from the individual, and so we will name publicly those individuals who we believe brought disrepute to the House of Representatives; but the other half of this job, Mr. Speaker, is to protect the individual from the institution.

So I hope tonight we will balance full disclosure with fair disclosure. This means that despite our zeal to restore credibility and to return integrity to the House, we must not lose sight of our responsibility to give every single Member due process and a fair hearing, based on the rules of evidence.

□ 2110

Unfortunately, this is the part that our constituents are not going to like and they probably will not understand it. I can guarantee you the press could not care less.

A few days ago a reporter asked me to explain how the Ethics Committee reached its conclusions, but before I could finish my lengthy discussion of the process, she interrupted me impatiently and said, "Congressman, excuse me, but my editor is pressing me for numbers. We want to know big numbers." Let me just say to all of you this is a disciplinary proceeding, it is not a telethon. Big numbers do not tell the tale.

When you look at 20,000 checks over 3 years, when you hear about $10.8 million in overdrafts for every Member, your press may be tantalized, your constituents may be shocked, but these numbers do not tell the tale of what happened. If you want to know what Members did, if you care, you have to look beneath the numbers to discover the patterns of behavior which run the absolute gamut from stupidity to willful deceit.

Now, 66 accounts were reconstructed by GAO. Why not more? Time.

If we had taken a complete profile of every single Member of the 355 that bounced even one check, we would not complete our work until autumn, much too long for this sorry scandal to drag on.

So, based on the last two audits which the GAO made of the bank, the subcommittee decided to breakout those accounts that appeared suspect either by the heavy volume of checks or by the size of overdrafts, or both. And we broke them down and went through them day by day, check by check. For those other 289 Members who bounced one or more checks, less detail was requested because a preliminary review of these accounts did not trigger the suspicion of the subcommittee. Indeed, over 100 of these individuals wrote 3 or fewer overdrafts.

So, we were trying to establish a potential population of abusers, and when we did that, the subcommittee's next task was to discover what standards were employed by the House bank. This was easy: None.

Every witness, from the Sergeant at Arms to the lowest bank teller, testified that the guiding principle of this bank was service. In other words, what the Member asked for the Member almost always got. And this meant, for example, any Member of Congress could go to the bank window on a Friday, and could appear with a check to deposit for $50, a check to cash for $1,000, and have 20 bucks in his account. All business was transacted courteously and quickly, no questions asked.

Perhaps the following Monday or Tuesday the Member would receive a call in his office informing him of his overdraft and requesting him to make up the difference. And some Members would respond immediately, some would delay indefinitely, and some would not even take the call.

Now, bank employees all concurred—under sworn testimony—that they constantly telephoned Members when they were overdrawn. So, we had reason to believe, in the subcommittee, that there was some haphazard, informal system of notification. But of all the 355 Members implicated in this affair, only 5 ever got a check back from the bank. Only five documented, incontrovertible instances of formal notification.

And yet the Ethics Committee has constantly been reminded that our list is too small, our selection is too lenient, and we are presiding over a coverup. Think what you like. This is not totally a court of law, this is also a court of public opinion, as you know. But certain individual rights must be preserved, and foremost among those is a Member's right to challenge the evidence before it is made public.

Given the practices of this, I will not call it a bank, I will call it a cash club, and the hopeless system of accounting which never at any time on any bank statement ever indicated that a Member was overdrawn, what could the subcommittee conclude that Members had reason to believe they could and could not do with their accounts? There was only one theme that emerged across the testimony, and that was you were not supposed to draw beyond your next month's net salary deposit. But even the generous standard of that cannot be fully understood by just looking at the raw data, which you have now seen leaked in the press.

I want to take two hypothetical accounts and consider them. They are not specific accounts, but they are indicative of the kinds of accounts we looked at, as we went month by month, day by day, check by check, through 39 months and through 66 Members.

Let us say there are two Members, and let us say that they both have overdrawn their accounts beyond their next month's salary three times in the course of 39 months. Most likely on that list of 66 which we originally broke out, the first Member has a huge overdraft, let us say $25,000. But on closer inspection we learned that his balance at the time was $23,000, he had a deposit of $4,000 which was made before the $25,000 check but credited after, causing him to be $2,000 in the red. The next day, the difference is made up, and the account is balanced.

Let us say this happened over a 39-month period, and let us say it happens at wide intervals over 3 years and in every instance the account is made good the next day.

Now, the committee cannot ascribe motives to nameless accounts. Our purpose was not to establish intent.

But I ask you, from what I have described, is this contrived manipulation or is this accidental bookkeeping for which the bank is partially responsible?

Now let us say there is another Member with three times over the next month's salary, but as we look into this Member's account, what we discover is all the questionable activity is taking place a few months prior to an election. And in this case the overdrafts are not made good until, let us say, the second Tuesday in November. Now, it would appear on the face of it that one individual is clearly using the time value of money, in other words, ripping off his fellow colleagues, and one is not. But if, as some recommend, we raise the threshold to 66, they are both on the list.

The point is the 20 percent threshold that we decided upon is arbitrary, but it is based on the individual profiles that emerged from every single account broken down and examined, and the choice was based on capturing those Members whose patterns indicated abusive activity.

We do not have every guilty Member, I am sure of that. This is not my personal threshold. But I am reasonably comfortable we have not trapped any innocent individual.

Now, again, this explanation is not going to sate the public appetite to post all the names on the doors of the Capitol, and in this highly charged atmosphere the Members of the House are going to get an opportunity to vote in favor of full and, in my opinion, very hasty disclosure over measured and fair disclosure, which is before you now.

We on the subcommittee understand that. It is not your job to define or defend the banking practices of the guy sitting next to you. That is the committee's job. And our task today is to establish an honest public record of abuses many of you do not yet know you have committed.

Now, because of this, the subcommittee decided that for the 411 Members who are not publicly identified as the worst-case abusers, a form of indirect full disclosure was the fairest way to proceed.

Since the spectrum of behavior ranged from abusers who might otherwise be on the dreaded list of 24 all the way out to those vestal virgins who never even used the bank, indirect disclosure was deemed the best way to make the punishment fit the crime.

A letter describing the number of checks overdrawn, the timeframe in which they were written and, where available, the number of times over the next month's salary, is available to every single Member who requests it.

Now, this form of self-discipline is going to be a Godsend for most of the individuals who wrote a couple of checks and want to divorce themselves from the agreed-upon public villains. And I expect the line to form outside the Ethics Committee tomorrow morning.

But for those offenders near the front of the list, indirect exposure borders on cruel and unusual punishment because based on what you have seen so far, the public pressure to release your letter will be overwhelming and you have to decide how bad your record is, and then whether to make that information public.

Will some Members stonewall? Well, of course. Will they survive? In some cases, yes. But except in those districts where individuals are terminally entrenched, when the combined efforts of your constituents, your opponent, and the press turn up the heat, you will be compelled to see the light and come clean with the information.

As you know from the phone calls in your offices, the press and your public do not like this idea. They do not like it because it splits the difference between their right to know and their responsibility to find out. But our ultimate judges are not in this room; they are in our districts. And the committee feels that if it comes to it, you should

stand trial back home. But we also feel that it should be a fair trial and that is why we give all the accused the right to see the evidence, prepare their case, and then go public.

□ 2120

Now, if my colleagues choose later to accept the alternative version of direct disclosure by publication of a list with names and numbers, which will be their other choice here this evening, I can support their opportunity to make that choice. But do not think for a minute that this report, the subcommittee report, the full committee report, is letting someone off the hook. We are probably sticking them on one.

Mr. Speaker, as of today your talk show hosts have a topic, as of today your opponent has an issue, and your constituents have a reason to support term limitations.

I want to make one final point. No matter which version of full disclosure my colleagues may prefer, they may be assured of one thing, and in this rare instance I disagree with my distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN]. This matter does not end here today with this vote. It begins. Individual inquiries will be made, complaints filed, appeals heard, and possibly even criminal investigations undertaken. But it is not now, nor was it ever, the responsibility of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to preside exclusively over individual Members' fates. We merely prepared the table of contents. All of us must write our own book.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, keep your own counsel in this matter, but, as one of the few Members that has reviewed 66 account histories day by day and also looked at the supporting material on everyone else, I hope all of you individually will at least be guided by the words of Harry Truman: "Tell the truth. That way you don't have to remember what you said."

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes now to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI], a valuable member of the full committee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for yielding me some time to participate in this debate this evening. As the chairman indicated, I am not a member of the subcommittee, only the full committee, and, as such, I wish to commend the Chair, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], as well as the members of the subcommittee, for their very excellent work on behalf of the committee and on behalf of the House of Representatives. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] were exemplary in the conduct of their duties as chair and ranking member of this committee, and I want to publicly commend and thank them for setting such a great standard for us. Their work was excellent. It was based on principle, and we owe them our gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the subcommittee who have spoken already have talked about the work of the subcommittee, and they have gone into some detail about the report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, so I will not address those concerns in any depth except to recall that the House passed by a vote of 380 to 9 a resolution asking the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to decide or make a list of those who had repeatedly and routinely in significant amounts written checks in excess, in significant excess, of what was in their account.

The House, when it did that, made a decision. We had a lot of hoopdeedoo around that time, and this body made a decision. It decided to ask the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to work for all these months, and the subcommittee especially by far bore the brunt of this for all these months to point out who repeatedly, routinely and in significant amounts fit the bill and could be described as an abuser.

Mr. Speaker, we come here today with a report from our committee, a report which I think is worthy of the support of the Members of this body, and really not only of our vote, but of our respect, because it puts forth in a very fine and a very clear way what our colleagues asked the committee to do and also provided for disclosure, full disclosure, in a way that was determined by the committee, which was most familiar with the situation, a disclosure that fit the bill.

The House of Representatives has now changed its mind. It has said, "Yes, we wanted you to do that. We wanted the subcommittee to work for months and months, but now we've decided that that's OK, we want to release the whole list anyway," which is the House of Representatives' right to do.

Mr. Speaker, I just think in the future it might be a good idea to save everybody a lot of trouble and work if we would decide what it is we want to do and make the commitment to that decision, because again it could save a lot of time and trouble and, in this case, a lot of heartache on the part of some families that might be involved in this.

Later we will be able to vote on another version of full disclosure, which I fully support. However I warn the Members that that disclosure will be based on, not information that the GAO has gathered, or verified, or indeed even examined, but information that has been just picked up from the bank and will now be released to the public without any examination or verification and without the imprimatur of the GAO. But that will be the decision of this body, and, as I said, I support it. It could have taken us 5 minutes to do that 5 months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this is the end of it. It is a frustrating time. We have heard the other Members talk about criteria that related to Members not writing checks in excess of their next paycheck which was for work that they were doing now. This is not uncommon in Federal service, in the military, or in the Foreign Service and State Department, and my colleagues can check their list for that, and they might want to take a look at how others in the Federal Service are compensated and how they draw on the salary that they are earning at the moment.

I just think it is a great honor to serve in this body. I talked about two very excellent people, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and there are hundreds more, and it is very sad to see what is happening in the media in regard to this body where hundreds of people come, elected by their constituents to work for the people and for our country, and I think the country should know that one of the surprises for me when I came to this body was the caliber of the Members here because I believed some of the things I had read in the paper, and to my surprise I came and found people highly intelligent, very committed, with great integrity, working to make this country great, and I hope that we can get back with the business of governing the people once we put this issue behind us.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is customary to express plaudits to the chairman and ranking member after committee legislation makes it to the floor. In this case, I cannot do that, because simple plaudits would not adequately express my admiration for the way the gentleman from New York Mr. MCHUGH and the gentleman from Utah ranking member HANSEN conducted our work. The subcommittee worked tirelessly and maintained a scrupulously nonpartisan atmosphere. We had a very small, and I might add over-worked staff, limited resources, confusing facts, conflicting testimony, and widely differing views. We were even able to operate relatively leak free against a concerted press onslaught—at least until recently. These two men have done an outstanding job in dealing with House Resolution 236—which might better be described as "mission impossible." They deserve all of our gratitude and special recognition. They—and our whole subcommittee in my view—never have lost sight that our efforts should first and foremost be directed at restoring the credibility of

the House. Mr. Speaker, I believe the committee report deserves support even though I also favor full disclosure—as apparently does just about everybody else in America. I will vote for the committee report as the door opener on this matter—and I will further vote for the resolution calling for full direct disclosure to fully open the door and provide the direct accountability that people across the country are demanding.

Right now, Congress' disapproval rating is at almost 80 percent—4 out of 5 people say we're not doing our job well, and 2 out of 5 strongly disapprove. In this matter, it does not take a Delphic Oracle to figure out what is wrong in the minds of our constituents.

First, we have a perk to deal with. That offends many.

Then we have abuse of that perk—actually a very startling abuse by any standard.

Then we have a perceived coverup or a perceived whitewash because the total information isn't being released right now, whether it is accurate or not.

All this is happening in an atmosphere of economic recession when average folks are hurting and many are without jobs. The perception of a "let-them-eat-cake" Congress writing themselves interest-free loans on demand is way too much to take. Many are understandably infuriated by the perception.

Then our constituents listen to the explanations like "everybody does it" or "we were doing what we were told was OK" which sounds a lot like "we were just following orders." The problem here is that everybody in the world with a checkbook knows that it is wrong to knowingly write a check when there are insufficient funds to cover it. Most people know the difference between right and wrong, why doesn't Congress? Almost any explanation at this point is labeled more beltway bologna; any lack of explanation suggests coverup or whitewash.

The truth is this payroll/check service facility we call a bank was very sloppily managed; too much deference, not enough oversight. In fact, oversight that seemed more like "overlook" than "look over"—ultracasual and nonprofessional procedures. In fact no Member can be sure tonight whether he or she is on the list of insufficiency because the bank practices were so loose, Members were not fully or consistently informed. Bank statements that Members received were deceptive and misleading. Yes there were abuses—and we could debate forever where the line should be drawn between an abuser and merely a Member with a large amount of insufficient checks.

I urge Members and all interested parties to read the full report of the committee—go behind the sensationalism and read the material. The report explains just how ineffective and unreliable procedures were. It notes the breakdown in proper oversight by the responsible House committee. It shows years of ignoring GAO audit reports about Members' insufficient funds checks. It shows, ironically, that this public scrutiny was triggered by check bouncing by the Sergeant at Arms, the very person responsible for running the bank. What the report does not show is evidence of criminal wrongdoing—not because we didn't find any, but because we didn't have the time, the staff, or the explicit authority to examine intent or motive behind the checks. We were fully occupied with an accounting-like approach to defining "routine, repeated," and "by significant amounts," the standard that the full House set in House Resolution 236, which instructed us to determine the worst abusers of the banking privilege. In the many months and long hours that we worked, we were able to reconstruct only a modest number of Members' accounts. By consensus—a very hard-won consensus—we came up with a standard some felt was too tough, others feel was not tough enough. Working under the constraints of House Resolution 236—which really tied our hands—we recommended full direct disclosure of 24 account holders who clearly abused the system. We also developed a process for full, indirect disclosure to provide individual members accurate data by letter which members could use as they see fit. Many feel this system would be long, drawn-out and painful. Others suggest it might allow some near-abusers to stonewall indefensible positions. Though I have serious reservations about where we drew the abuser line and about just how good our indirect disclosure system would be, I am pleased that we achieved consensus in our subcommittee and I recommend support of our work product as a meaningful first step in restoring credibility by proving that we can clean up our own mess.

□ 2130

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I very much support the official report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The task force that came out with a bipartisan report did an excellent job laying out the history of, and the operational problems at, the so-called House bank. Up until this point most Members were only vaguely aware of these problems.

The chairman of the committee, Mr. MCHUGH, again tonight articulated the situation clearly and thoroughly. I hope people outside this Chamber will listen to what the chairman had to say and the facts he laid out.

Mr. Speaker, tonight two resolutions will pass: One, based on the excellent work of the committee and one calling for complete disclosure of all Members who had overdrafts and the number of their overdrafts. I support both resolutions and will vote for both resolutions.

I hope that tonight's actions will finally get this issue behind us and let us get on with dealing with the critical problems that confront our Nation.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the committee because I think the committee did what the committee should have done in relationship to what the rules and regulations were for the operation of the cooperative. They did exactly what those rules were.

What were those rules? Well, 17 years ago when I joined that cooperative, I was told several things. First of all, I was told that I would not have FDIC insurance. It was my risk putting the money there.

Second, I was told that I would not receive any interest on my investment. Third, I was told I would not pay any interest when I used pool money. Fourth, I was told that I could write checks on the present months in which I was working up until the amount of that check.

That is what they judged the 24 people on, and that is the way it should have been done.

But, let me tell you, this is the only court in the world that I know of where now the rules are changed. Now we are all going to be judged based on what the press, the public, and some Members thought the rules should have been.

That is not very fair, in my estimation. As I said, it is the only court in the world where you could possibly get away with something of that nature.

Now, last September when we heard about this, I said to my constituents that no, I could not bounce a check because you could not bounce a check unless you went beyond that month's earnings. They said, "Did you ever do that?" I said yes, one time, to the best of my knowledge, and it was a mistake that I did it.

□ 2140

And how many checks may that have been? Perhaps 16, perhaps 20. But now, as I said, the whole game has changed. Now we are going to be judged, if Members follow the second resolution, based on what Members thought the rules should have been. If the rules should have been different, why were we not told they should have been different? If GAO did not like the way the operation was run, why were we not told they did

not like it? If the Speaker did not like it, why were we not told? If the Sergeant at Arms did not like it, why were we not told? I do not understand that kind of operation.

Most of us did exactly what was supposed to have been done, according to what we were told was the way the cooperative operated. Again, I have no problem whatsoever, if I am one of those 24, I deserve whatever I get because those were the rules by which the game was played. Those are the rules by which the cooperative was run. But I sure think it is total injustice to be judged now based on what somebody now thinks is the way that operation should have been run.

My hat is off to the committee for the way they handled the matter. I think that is where it should have stopped because that is justice done the way justice should be done. Anything beyond that could not happen in any court in this country. Now it means that we must go back and review thousands and thousands of checks and do that sometime and see about the sloppy operation. That is really interesting.

Sometimes if a deposit was not credited until the second, third, fourth, or fifth day of the month and, if a member wrote all their checks, like most people do, at the end of the month and assumed that they will be covered on the first of the month, all of a sudden we find the deposit was not put in until the second, third, fourth, or fifth of the month. Is that the way we should be judged? I hardly think so.

Again, no matter what we say, no matter what we do, we are now guilty. We are now convicted. It is just like trying to tell people that there is no such thing as a notch and all of my colleagues know there is not, but we sign a resolution because we know it will never come to the floor or it would break Social Security. This is the same thing.

We can go out and talk until we are blue in the face and as far as they are concerned, it has nothing to do with the operation. It has to do exactly with what members thought the operation should have been.

Again, I say what the committee did was fair and just. Anything beyond that is treating us in a manner no one else in this country would ever be treated in a court of law.

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

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do want to express my admiration for the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the others who serve in the unenviable position of sitting in judgment on these matters internal to the House. They have a tough job and no one here envies them. I appreciate what they have attempted to do over the last few months to bring some definition to this issue.

Their report does make it clear that there were some bad actors who evidently knew that they were playing games with the system. However, in another sense, they were given an impossible task. Because while they tried to make it clear that some abused and others did not, wherever one draws the line, the argument can be made that it is arbitrary.

I came to the conclusion sometime ago that the only way to approach this issue was with full disclosure. Initially, I was reticent to come forward and say that because I did not think I had any bounced checks, and I was a bit restrained by my sense that if I would come forward and insist on full disclosure, it would really be embarrassing to others. I did not want to put Members who had an inadvertent check problem in a bad light because they should not be put in that situation.

Last night I read the Ethics Committee report, after it was made available to all of us. Based on that report, I read for the first time about a red stamp in the corner of checks that was the only real indication that a Member might have a bad check. I had a little office account with an average of 130 bucks in it just to handle incidental office expenses. Until last night I was certain that there was not a problem with my account. But I told my office manager, "Check it again, because now I see this thing about a little red date that might be stamped."

Three were found. Three were found. Inadvertent, unintended, it might have been the bank's mistake. We do not really know.

But it did make me understand even more clearly how important it is that full disclosure occur. Every name must be exposed. The number of checks involved must be exposed, and every Member would be well-advised to talk openly and candidly about the circumstances involved.

That is the only way. That is the only way to clear this issue. That is the only way to restore this institution's reputation. That is the only way to deal with an American public that really has doubts about its elected leadership.

Tell the truth. It is going to hurt some. It is going to exonerate others. But tell the truth.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am one, at the very first, when this came out, yes, I used the system. I have written checks. That is not so hard to say. If my colleagues feel good within themselves that they did nothing in their own mind that was wrong, then this is not a hard task.

I want to compliment the committee and the work of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY] and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], all of my colleagues worked so hard because I think it was wrong for us to have that committee for 6 months in a hole in the ground making a good report and to have that report disregarded.

But I would like to speak on another aspect of this. I have read the report also. I do not agree with the committee in one aspect of it because the committee takes the Sergeant at Arms, Jack Russ, to great task.

Jack Russ served this House for 25 years and most of my colleagues in this House, and he served at the pleasure of the Speaker. I think it is very wrong to have Jack Russ blamed for what has happened in the payroll office.

This man has dedicated his life. He no longer has that job or that employment, but more than that, it hurts his family. He may have made a mistake. We all make mistakes. But I think it was wrong for the committee to pick him out as the villain in this whole sordid affair.

Each one of us in this room that has had the courage to say, yes, I have abused the system and, yes, I have written the checks and those that have not had the courage to say that, should not lay the blame on Jack Russ.

This is a young man that has dedicated his life to this House and is proud of working for this House, as we noted in his letter of resignation. So I do disagree with the committee on that, because it comes right down to the lead dog. If that lead dog is not leading the rest of his dogs, they never win the race.

So let us not blame the wheel dog or the swing dog. Let us blamed the lead dog.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I would like to respond to my friend from Alaska, if I may. I do hope the Members read the report because there has been no attempt in our report or in our committee to use Jack Russ, the Sergeant at Arms, as a scapegoat in this matter. Jack Russ was the Sergeant at Arms during this 39-month period.

□ 2150

We found that he did not exercise fully his responsibility to see that this bank was run in a more professional way. We did criticize him in that respect and we think the criticism is fully justified.

However, we also pointed out that Jack Russ did not create the system; he inherited it. He delegated much of the authority to the bank director, who must also assume responsibility, and we said so both in the report and, on the floor.

The Committee on House Administration had oversight responsibility,

and as a task force of that committee pointed out earlier in a report of its own, that oversight responsibility was not effectively used. So there are a number of mitigating factors with respect to Mr. Russ. However, that does not relieve him of responsibility. He was told on a number of occasions to implement reforms. He undertook to do so, and they were not undertaken either in a timely or effective way. He delegated, he had said, to someone else in the bank, and indicated that that was, therefore, not his primary responsibility.

This is all laid out in the report, I think, in a balanced way, so I hope that the record will clearly indicate that while there was responsibility on his part, and we point that out, it is not fair for anyone to blame him exclusively for this problem.

Finally I would say in that respect that the Speaker of the House does not have authority to fire an officer of the House, the Sergeant at Arms, or any other officer of the House. They are elected by the House of Representatives. Therefore, it is not entirely fair to suggest that the Speaker, who actually followed up with the GAO recommendations on a number of occasions, was derelict in somehow not dealing with this issue.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], as chairman, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], as ranking minority member, this question: Was any taxpayer money lost during this episode?

Mr. MCHUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MCHUGH. There was no taxpayer money lost as a result of the overdraft practices that we have identified with respect to the Members and their accounts.

Mr. GIBBONS. I would ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], does he agree with that, that no money was lost?

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

Mr. GIBBONS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. HANSEN. Absolutely. We investigated that as thoroughly as we could and there was no taxpayer money lost in this banking situation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Let me ask the gentleman another question, admitting that the episode did occur. Did the bank itself actually lose any money of the depositors in that bank?

Mr. MCHUGH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, at this bank, as in commercial banks, there are what are called underages and overages, which means that at the windows of the bank there are sometimes errors made by the cashiers. These errors are undertaken or have been in the normal course of business. In this case they had absolutely nothing to do with the overdraft practices associated with Members' use of the bank, but in that respect there have been over the years modest appropriations to make up for underages as a result of mistakes of the cashiers at the window.

Mr. GIBBONS. I would just ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] the same question, does he know of any taxpayer money having been lost in this overall operation?

Mr. HANSEN. If the gentleman will yield, I agree with the comments of the chairman and point out that the amount we are talking about is absolutely minuscule. We are just talking about a few dollars. It is actually less than probably we would see in a commercial bank over the period of time we investigated this.

Mr. GIBBONS. May I ask the gentleman this question, was it a bank?

Mr. MCHUGH. If the gentleman will yield, I will indicate, as I did in my opening statement, that this was not a bank. This was a disbursing office that provided check-writing and check-cashing services for well over 100 years, but it was not a bank in any other sense.

Mr. GIBBONS. Did it have FDIC insurance?

Mr. MCHUGH. It had no FDIC insurance.

Mr. GIBBONS. May I ask the gentleman from Utah the same question?

Mr. HANSEN. If the gentleman will yield, let me say I agree with the gentleman. We did not have check protection, we could not get an overdraft card, we could not get a line of credit. It did not have those same amenities one would expect to get from a commercial bank.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the two gentlemen for their responses.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT], another valuable member of our subcommittee who worked extremely hard during the last five months.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all, as everyone has, but I think it needs to be repeated over and over again, the chairmen, Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. HANSEN, performed what I think is a service to this House that most people will probably never understand.

We were faced with a situation where most of us, our first concern was, was any public money lost? As we have just heard, there was no public money lost. Then, since that was taken care of, the question then was how do we decide what is unacceptable behavior?

I made the planning error of scheduling five community meetings last weekend when I went home, and I must tell the Members that this issue did not come up except on one occasion in five meetings. People wanted to know about the economy and a lot of other things. Then I went home and talked with my mother, who said, "How did this happen?"

I think when we think about how can we explain this whole situation is when the real problem comes. When we look at the history of 130 years of this bank and realize that the GAO has been auditing this bank, as it is called, really the House Disbursing Office is what we ought to call it, has been auditing it for 40 years, and I would commend everyone, and I know Members have plenty to read, but I would suggest they read this report.

On page 6 in the 1964 GAO report, the GAO says, "The Sergeant at Arms considers that the Members are drawing against their accruing salary which will be paid on the first of the following month."

What we are dealing with here tonight is not something that started yesterday or last year or 2 years ago. This has been going on and has been reported on for an extended period of time. In fact, we had a case, and I was not here, I was newly arrived, but the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in this House dealt with a case where a Member used his campaign funds to pay overdrafts in the bank.

The committee ruled that it was inappropriate for him to use his campaign funds in that way, but made absolutely no statement whatsoever about the bank overdrafts or what was going on in the bank overdrafts or what was going on in the bank in the House of Representatives. This issue has been there and people have used it.

Many Members did not know. In fact, I think there are going to be some surprises on this floor when all these lists come out. When I came in here nobody told me what the banking privileges were. I was lucky. I asked could I do automatic payments of my mortgages. They said, "No, you have to go to a bank." I said, "Can I wire money to my kid at college?" They said, "No, you have to go to a bank." They did not pay interest. I said, "This is no bank. I am not putting my money in here." But most Members put their money in here because of the convenience and they wound up with this situation.

The way I explained it to my mother, and it is the only way I could figure it out, was to say it is as though a State patrolman stopped you on the highway and then asked you, "How fast were you going?" And you said, "I was doing 59." And he said, "Well, then, I am going to write you up for 14 miles over, because the speed limit is 45." And you say, "Where were the signposts?" And he said, "Well, I made it up right here. This is the rule."

That is what this committee struggled with. Anybody on this floor, in-

cluding this Member, can argue with the standard we used. There was no way to come up with a rationale, coherent standard. We did the best we could, and I understand why Members are upset, but I think that the chairman and the ranking member made every effort to be fair to the Members, including due process.

I would encourage the Members to vote for this resolution.

□ 2200

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, tonight, the very reputation of the House of Representatives is at stake.

Tonight, we vote on whether to disclose the names of all those Members and former Members who have written bad checks on their accounts at the so-called House bank.

The choice is clear; we should disclose the names of all those involved, along with the relevant information.

To do otherwise would cause the strain caused by this scandal to spread.

To do otherwise would leave the lasting impression of a cover-up.

To do otherwise would erode even further what little respect the public has left for this institution.

And to do otherwise would be patently unfair to Members, like me, who have never bounced a check, and to Members who may have innocently overdrawn their account by 20 bucks.

After all, it was their account balances that were used to cover the rubber checks and it is their reputations that are every bit as much at stake.

The public has every right to know how the taxpayers dollars were spent and who benefited from that spending. And taxpayers dollars were involved.

According to the committee report, five employees of the Sergeant at Arms office were involved in running the bank. Each of them was paid by the taxpayers.

And the bank was housed in the Capitol, the upkeep of which is provided for by the taxpayers.

Come to think of it, if this so-called bank hadn't had much of its overhead covered by the taxpayers, it wouldn't have been able to extend what amounted to interest-free loans to its customers. And we couldn't be in this mess.

But, we are in this mess and one reason we are is that the public wasn't told about it until last year—and then was told only enough to trigger an Ethics Committee investigation.

Prior to 1977, the General Accounting Office [GAO] alerted the Speaker to the problem but not the public; after 1977, reports were made public but they were not specific enough to alert people to the problem.

But now we can change all that—and we should. Now we can disclose all the pertinent information as to who was involved and to what extent there was a problem.

And the sooner we make such disclosure the better. It is not enough to close the bank. What is required is that we come clean as to who is responsible so that the public can pass judgment as it has every right to do.

The people have every right to know whether their Representative has been acting in a fiscally irresponsible manner. After all, if that Member is being fiscally irresponsible personally what does that say about his or her conception of fiscal responsibility for the Government.

Whatever it says, we should not be afraid of the people's judgment. After all, that is what freedom and democracy is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution calling for full disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, what I am very much concerned about is those innocent Members, and I believe there are some innocent Members that will appear other than innocent simply because of the practice of not telling them when a check bounced, and that concerns me a great deal. That is the biggest problem that we have.

What I would like to point out is it has been accepted that our leadership was responsible for the instructions to the Sergeant at Arms. Our leadership should explain specifically why there was not specificity directed toward all of us as to what was illegal, what was improper, what would be criticized in regard to these issues. I hear many contradictory statements about what was acceptable or not as far as an overdraft. Believe it, believe the Members who thought it was acceptable to draw into that extra month, even though it probably was an illegal loan. But where was our leadership? I think the leadership needs to explain why it was not corrected earlier, as early as 1977 or 1978 if that was the first they knew of it.

Members can check the annals and the case law and they will find that we have had problems with Sergeants at Arms through our whole history. It is not a new problem. As early as in the 1930s it was decided by a court very specifically, very clearly that those were public funds. You cannot get by with the argument that those were just funds of other Congressmen. The courts have ruled that, and it has been quite clear knowledge to all of the attorneys here on the Hill that have been advising us on these committees. The House Administration Committee has to take responsibility and the leadership, and the leadership from there on up have to take responsibility as well as the Members.

But unfortunately, it is those Members who knew the least about the problems and the sensitivity of it who will be punished the most, and that is indeed regrettable. But we must have full disclosure, and I encourage us all to vote on the proper course in that direction.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Ethics Committee report.

The chairman, the ranking member, and all of the committee members had a difficult task to perform. This committee has thoroughly conducted itself in a proper and appropriate manner to carry out H.R. 236, which was passed by this body on October 3, 1991. That resolution directed the Ethics Committee to determine whether the use or operation of the so-called House bank raised questions of potential violations of the rules and standards of the House.

The committee report concluded that the House bank was really not a bank. It was a disbursement office with check-writing and check-cashing services. In essence, this so-called bank was a cooperative. Only the funds of Members were involved. Not one penny of taxpayer's money was spent. In a sense, it was Members borrowing from Members.

According to the committee report, it appears that no funds were lost as a result of these overdrafts. There is no way, and there should be no attempt, to try to justify the practice which took place over many, many years. The so-called bank is closed, it does not exist anymore.

My colleagues, there is an old saying, "This, too, shall pass." I say, let the past be the past and let us begin anew.

I know there are some who are trying to use this predicament which we are in, for political gain. I do not quite understand the position of some who are hellbent on the idea that you must destroy the institution in order to save it. Now is the time for us to come together, not as Democrats, not as Republicans, but as Members of this House that we love. How, in good conscience, can we knock, kick, and attempt to destroy the institution which we are a part of.

Do not be sidetracked by those who see this as an opening, as an opportunity to beat up on the Congress or as a means to shift the attention from the difficult issues and problems facing this Nation.

As Members of Congress, we are public servants, not perfect servants—mistakes and blunders have been made. This committee has completed a most difficult task. Let me conclude by saying, as Members of Congress, we do not give up certain basic rights as citizens.

Something should be said about the right to privacy. Where is it going to stop? Personal financial matters today—will it be medical and dental records tomorrow? Will it be credit ratings next week? Will it be a urine specimen next month?

Now is the time for us to bring closure on this matter—let us do it now and do it once and for all.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the full disclosure resolution.

As a Member who never bounced a check at the House bank, I am appalled at the activities of some of my colleagues.

Regrettably, the U.S. Capitol has become our castle on the hill—the Potomac River, our moat that separates us from the people who elected us.

I'm saddened to say, but in the wake of bounced checks, unpaid restaurant tabs, and fixed parking tickets, it's apparent that some of our colleagues have forgotten what it's like out there in the real world.

Today's vote for full disclosure is a small but significant step we need to take to get ourselves back on track and regain the trust of the people who elected us.

But I wouldn't stop there.

We need to enact other reforms that will help us regain the trust of the American people who have given us this wonderful opportunity to serve in the U.S. Congress.

First, there was no choice but to release the names of all check bouncers. The American people are entitled to learn the full scope of this problem.

In my opinion, it is the only way that voters will be able to determine whether they have misplaced their trust in Members of Congress.

Second, we should review the privileges enjoyed by Members of Congress. Health insurance and pension, benefits similar to those offered in most corporations, are acceptable, but frills that make the public cynical serve only to undercut the credibility of this institution.

Third, we must pass the balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Americans are anxious and angry about our Nation's $400 billion deficit.

Their anxiety and distrust of Congress will continue unless we undertake a serious effort to balance our books, and quit spending more money than is collected from taxpayers.

Fourth, the time has come for national term limits. Congress wasn't intended to be a lifetime job. It was envisioned as a place where farmers, merchants, teachers, and community leaders were sent to do the public's business for a few years, and then they were expected to return home to give someone else a chance.

And last, in light of the pressing domestic agenda, it is an embarrassment that the stated goal of the Democrats is to pass legislation that the President will have to veto * * * in order to embarrass him, rather than have the Congress argue and debate the merits of various proposals.

Democrats, let your candidates do the sparring with the President. That's why we have primaries and a general election in November.

We were elected to work together for solutions that will create jobs, dramatically reform our health care system, and provide retirement security to American families.

That is what the people sent us to do.

I urge the adoption of the full disclosure resolution, and urge us to take steps that will wash away the mistrust and anxiety most Americans feel about the Congress of the United States.

□ 2010

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

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and also the ranking member for the fine job that they have done, but I also want to commend again the chairman of the subcommittee for the excellent demeanor that he displayed on television the other night in upholding the principles of this institution when the worst of demagogery was being placed upon him, and I think that his statesmanship was certainly something that we all can look to.

I rise this evening to support the efforts of my colleagues to force full and complete disclosure of the names of those Members who had insufficient funds to cover checks drawn on the House bank. I will be supporting both resolutions.

As this Nation faces significant economic challenges, it is time for Congress to dismiss the business as usual mentality. Members who knowingly and blatantly abused the bank privileges have further injured an already wounded reputation of this public institution.

Bank officials who knowingly and willingly allowed these abuses to continue should be immediately removed.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS].

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of full disclosure of the Ethics Committee inquiry into the operations of the House bank.

All Members of the House of Representatives have been tainted by the revelation that some Members regularly wrote checks for amounts in excess of their account balance without penalty. This is an outrageous example of special privilege that has led to further cynicism and lack of respect for our Government; and I am angry. Not angry toward those Members victimized by bank internal errors or by an isolated human mistake on their part—but darn angry at those continually taking advantage at the expense of the rest of us.

Because of this and other episodes, Congress is rapidly losing the respect of the American people. But I believe we are on the verge of losing much more. I believe that inaction in this matter risks the continued support of the American people for the very institutions of our democratic republic, the system of government which made our country great, and which carried this Nation through times of adversity.

Everyone here knows that the American public will not be satisfied with partial disclosure. Asking Members to vote on anything less than full disclosure is unfair because it puts us in the position of having to vote in favor of a resolution that the American people will view, plain and simple, as a cover-up. I will vote for the partial disclosure because any type of disclosure has too long been delayed—but will also vote for and prefer full disclosure.

Nothing but full disclosure, nothing but a full list of names and actions, will stop the ongoing erosion of trust between the American people and their elected Representatives. I believe that people have the right to know the truth of this whole matter—and to make their own decisions based on the available evidence.

We were elected to do the people's business. It is an honor to be a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives. The honor brings with it the responsibility to act properly in both our public, and yes, certain private affairs. All Members need to remember that fact.

We are human. We make mistakes. We may use poor judgment at times or fail to fully appreciate the consequence of each and every action we take.

But we must put our faith in the American people to judge both our virtues—and our mistakes. We cannot shy away from this scrutiny any more than we can correct our past misdeeds.

In all this, in today's proceedings, we must act to restore this House and this institution. We must earn back the trust of those who elected us. If nothing else, we must show that this Congress has nothing to hide, that as we stand in the well of this House, we stand with our heads held high.

Indeed, to me, there is no choice but to have full disclosure. To do otherwise would violate the very faith and trust that our constituents placed in us when they cast their vote.

As in everything else, we must let the people decide. We must let the citizens of this country be the final judge of our actions. Thank you.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that a few members of the freshman class had the courage to push the banking issue. I was not one of those original members, but they, even then, got chastised.

I first asked for a letter and found one discrepancy, and I released that to the press. The press came back and said, "Well, how do we know that is all?" I got another letter and expressed in full disclosure to the press.

I know there are other Members that told the press that that information was not available. All they had to do was walk down and ask.

They say integrity is at stake. That is why people are mad. People are tired of Congress covering up, and let us admit it.

I ask my children to accept responsibility for their actions. The American people do not want the top 24 or the top 26. They want to know. Let them be the judge.

We say the rules have changed. Our game, our game should be the same game as the American public.

We said no, there are no taxpayer dollars invested. Well, the Capitol Building is paid for by taxpayer dollars. Who pays for the staff? There are 10 GAO auditors. Who pays them? And if we appropriate enough money to make this in a timely manner, that is going to cost taxpayers.

I was CO of a fighter squadron and used to hold captain's masts for indebtedness and bad checks. If I had to sit before those same troopers, I would like to be judged on the same merit that I judged them. This House is not.

People are tired of the 1986 tax raise, the 1990 tax raise, a Congress that spends $4 trillion and then contributes money from S&L's, and votes, and costs us another trillion dollars in junkets and leases cars at three times the norm so they can get kickbacks or even buy the car at the end with the taxpayer dollars.

When we talk about a fair game, all the public wants is the same game that we operate under.

We have got defense cuts looking at California. Let us get on with those; wetlands and endangered species, trade, and, yes, even Saddam Hussein. Our game should be the same game as the public, and full disclosure is the only answer, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of both resolutions that will guarantee full disclosure of check cashing records of all 435 Members—including me—and that's the way it should be. Mr. Speaker and Members, I'm the ranking Republican on the House Rules Committee and I'm glad that those who were urging my committee to block attempts to prevent a vote on full disclosure, did not succeed. We saw to that.

As for my own record, I don't know if I ever, in 14 years, ever had a check that wasn't covered. When this first came up last year, I wrote to the Sergeant at Arms and asked him if the GAO report showed any such checks in my name. He wrote back and said that their records did not indicate any checks for that period were not covered sufficiently. However, from what I've heard here tonight, I'm not sure that's accurate. Like every other Member, my paycheck is deposited in the House bank by the Sergeant at Arms and at the end of the month. I transfer most of that paycheck to my personal checking account in the Glens Falls National Bank in my hometown. Mr. Speaker, although I didn't know for sure, I'm now told that some of those transfers may possibly have been insufficient because the Sergeant at Arms may not have got around to depositing paychecks until sometime after the first of the month instead of at the end of the month which I thought they always did.

If that's the case, then I may also have some checks that appear on that list, even though none of them could ever have exceeded the amount of my paycheck. If any of them do appear on that list, I'd sure be embarrassed, but still, they should be made public, as should the record of all 435 Members.

That's why I hope both of these resolutions pass and I urge all of you to vote unanimously for them.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have never had an account at the House bank, and when I tell that to the press, they are surprised. The think that all of us have to have an account at the House bank. But let the record show that some of us have never had an account there and, therefore, have a little bit different situation here tonight.

To me, full disclosure is the only answer, and full disclosure is what the House is going to vote for tonight.

I have heard a lot about my colleagues talking about the operation of the bank and how it was slipshod, how their deposits were not stamped correctly at the right time, how the information they got back on their accounts was sometimes late in arriving and really kind of an unprofessional way.

One of my colleagues referenced here the fact that maybe it is like somebody driving down the highway without any sort of signs posted for the speed limit. If there are not any signs posted, you are supposed to drive a prudent speed. A reasonable person should be driving a prudent speed down that highway, and a patrolman would not have stopped you.

It seems to me a lot of people here who now have problems should have and could have seen the imprudent operation of this bank downstairs through the years.

So, yes, the question as to whether or not our accounts and all the people here are in question, but the real question tonight is whether we can restore in some way confidence in the institution of the House of Representatives.

□ 2220

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I think that our constituents have become so infuriated by the House bank because it symbolizes what they hate about Congress: Its lack of accountability, its perks, and the double standards it sometimes lives by.

The full disclosure being voted on tonight, as painful as it is, will not restore the credibility of this institution unless it leads to a reexamination of the way we have come to do our business.

Let us bind ourselves by the same obligations that we impose on others. Let us not create special benefits for ourselves that are not available to our constituents. Above all, let us open up our activities to more public scrutiny. Sunlight is the best disinfectant.

Our constituents should not have to watch us like hawks, but they should be able to.

We are doing the right thing by ordering full disclosure of the bad checks tonight, but it is not enough. Unless we fundamentally reform this institution, we will relive tonight's humiliation again and again.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the full disclosure of those of our colleagues who have written overdrafts on their checking accounts in the House bank. Only if all the facts are fully revealed can the American public make an intelligent and informed decision on how to deal with this situation.

We should all bear in mind that when an individual, especially a Member of Congress, undertakes a career in public service, he or she is waiving a good portion of their right to privacy.

It must be further understood that the good of the Congress and the continuing good will of the American public for all our institutions of government far outweigh any personal embarrassment which individual Members of Congress may experience.

The Ethics Committee proposes that only the 24 most grievous offenders be revealed to the public. Many of us believe that is patently unfair. As has been pointed out by many constituents who have called my office, a great shadow of doubt will be over the heads of all Members of Congress unless disclosure is complete.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt the American people are concerned and angry about this issue. I sense that anger from the calls and letters to my office, as I know my colleagues have; however, as angry as they are, the American people are neither malicious

nor are they stupid. Those individuals who overdrafted their accounts due to minor bookkeeping errors will find that the American public can readily discern between the type of accidental activity and a blatant disregard for propriety. The American people will readily understand the difference and will act accordingly in fair and judicious manner, but only if all the facts are presented to them.

I fully understand that the check depositing and cashing services of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms were not a bank in any traditional sense of that word. No interest was paid on deposits in the bank. No savings accounts or other customary services of banks were available. This, however, is no longer the point. The issue is what amounts to interest-free loans to Members of Congress is a matter of public concern and should be a matter of public record.

Several of us have used the argument that no taxpayer funds were involved with the House bank. Several of my constituents have pointed out that this is not correct. Who paid the salary of the Sergeant at Arms, his assistants, and staff?

No, there is no getting around the fact that taxpayer moneys were indeed involved and that this, accordingly, is a matter of public interest.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that our colleagues will do the right thing, that the American people demand a full disclosure and that is what they deserve, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time.

I do not want to be redundant. I think everything that needs to be said has been said.

I was back in my district this past weekend and the No. 1 issue of concern is the credibility of the House. We have had a drug problem in the post office, and sale of drugs. We have had theft down there. We have the check kiting that they are talking about right now.

If we are going to restore the credibility of this House in any measure at all, we are going to have to have full disclosure. We could do it piecemeal, or we could do it all at once. I think the most painless way is to get it over, here, tonight. The American people are demanding it. The media is going to hound us until it is done, and so it needs to be done expeditiously.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, the most painless way to deal with it is to get it over with tonight.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a gut wrenching experience for those of us who both feel that we have to have full disclosure, as well as those of us who, after reading the committee report, have discovered that we may have in fact engaged in the inadvertent practice of having some overdrafts and, of course, looking at the records of the Ethics Committee will determine that.

This is not a time to be self-righteous. If we did those practices, it is time to admit carelessness, and if we are honest and open I think the folks at home will understand it.

But this can also be a time where we can make a constructive change in the operation of this institution. There has been no question that we have had a series over the last several years of problems of shoes dropping, whether it is restaurants or post offices or other kinds of things, some of which tend to be overblown by the media, but in many cases represent real problems in the way the House of Representatives has operated over the years. In some respects, we operate as if we are a feudal institution with operations of patronage and the kinds of things that do not belong in a 20th century institution.

So what I am hoping is after this is done and the great work of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] is appreciated and those of us who find that we have problems go home and explain them to the folks at home, after that is done, that what we then do is take a look at how we operate this institution, how it is managed, how it is organized, and make the kind of constructive improvements we need to make so that the public will not be looking at shoes dropping; instead, the public will be looking at energy bills and health bills and budget deficit reductions and doing the kinds of public business that the Founding Fathers had in mind.

This is a great institution with great Members. Let us use this earthquake that we are going through right now to change ourselves and change the institution so that generations to come will know that what we did tonight and what we will do in the next few months can make this place a better and more competent and a more humane institution of government.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time on the minority side to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, this is not the darkest day this House has ever seen. We moved into this Chamber just a few months before this Nation was torn apart by the Civil War and the Members in this Chamber then were screaming "traitor" at one another. There were fistfights, and during the months of December and March of 1860 and 1861 as one State after another, starting with South Carolina, withdrew from the Union, half the Members left never to return.

This is not the greatest ongoing scandal even in this period, because I believe going into debt, this is if we hold the budget deficit to $400 billion, and remember that it was only President Kennedy who had a normal full budget that passed $100 billion, the whole budget in his second year. This is $400 billion of just deficit spending. That is $1,093,000,000 a day. That is a scandal far worst than what we are discussing now, but because of that other problem and the $4 trillion debt and the runaway spending and the expanding of our staff by six times just in the last 20 years or so, the American people are angry at us.

Now, I am going to vote for full disclosure, not because I had one and I released it 4 months ago, I am not feeling cocky about this at all. I could have had a lot more, because I did not know that such a perquisite, such a privilege existed, and there are a lot of friends involved now that I did not know about last night.

□ 2030

And it hurts to see people that you planned on serving with for a few more years get into this kind of trouble. But as we said, as one of our members said at our caucus, so far we are handling this worse than a Republican White House handled Watergate. And something popped in my mind right away: John Dean was not a very big man, but he had a very deep voice, and I thought instantly of the one sentence that I remember more than any other out of the Watergate. He was telling the truth, appearing before a Senate committee, because it was confirmed by videotapes, those infamous audiotapes later. John Dean said, "Mr. President," to Nixon, "Mr. President, there is a cancer growing on the White House and it will destroy us unless we cut it out."

Well, no matter how this is perceived, and as we speak, the east coast is seeing Members interviewed very carefully with edited tape to make them look as bad as possible by Mr. Sam Donaldson, who I will bet has kited many a check in his day with his multimillion-dollar salary. And as is the wont with media, it will go to central time, then mountain time and play out in California at 3 hours, 2 hours from now, then in Hawaii, sweeping across the country, a firestorm, tearing this institution apart, building the cancer. The radio talk shows, the television talk shows, this is grist for their mill to beat up on this institution for weeks to come.

So, I went to one of my colleagues on the other side, JOHN LEWIS, and as far as I know, he and I were the only two when Martin Luther King spoke to us, JOHN spoke. I said, "JOHN, what do you recommend? You are not a bad man on ethics." He said, "Vote your conscience. We don't want to hurt friends, but let's get this behind us." Full dis-

closure is the way to do that, and I am going to try to vote my conscience.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire if the time on the other side has fully expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR]. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. Hansen] has expired.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, to close debate on this side, I would like to recognize and give the balance of our time to the distinguished Speaker. In recognizing him, I would like to express my own personal appreciation for his support for this investigation. At no time did he intervene in any way in this investigation. His support was important to its credibility, and I want to express that publicly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to our Speaker.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the hour is growing late and we are only considering the first of two resolutions. But I would strongly urge that all Members of the House support the resolution, House Resolution 393, which is brought to us by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct under the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to repeat, although it bears repeating, the justifiable credit that has been given here time and time again to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, to the subcommittee of six that spent so much time, hard work and effort on this report, and especially to the chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], and to the ranking member, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. Speaker, they served the House well.

And I think their report deserves our full support. We will reach another, later issue on the so-called full disclosure issue, and I suspect that that will also carry strongly.

This resolution before us carries out the instruction that was given to it by the House last October to identify not only the practices of the bank but those Members who may have consistently, repeatedly, significantly overdrawn their resources in the bank.

We call it a bank, but it was not a bank, as has been said time and time again. It did not accept deposits; you could not have a deposit unless you were a Member. It did not pay interest on those deposits. It did not provide overdraft coverage. It did not make loans; it was not insured by the FDIC; it was not under the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency and Federal Reserve.

Mr. Speaker, words can be tyrannical, and the common practice of calling this a bank has created a misimpression in the country that is a serious problem by itself.

This was a disbursing office which began its operations in 1837, 1837. Prior to that time, Members were paid by the Treasury by messengers delivering their salary and allowances from the Treasury Department.

The Speaker was at that time the informal fiscal officer of the House of Representatives. Later, when the payroll function was moved to the House; the Speaker entrusted that responsibility to the Sergeant at Arms, without any particular authority. And by the action of the House in the 2d session of the 25th Congress, the House bank became the official disbursing office.

For many decades now since the 1950's, for 40 years, it has been the practice, right or wrong, to treat Members as having an accruing claim on their next month's income and salary because Members here are paid after the fact, not in the first part of the month for services to be rendered, but at the end of the month for services already rendered. And it became the practice of the bank to consider that as a kind of overdraft insurance that Members could meet if they did not exceed.

We have all heard reports, sad but true, that the practices of this bank were not to the standards of any commercial bank.

There was not only no interest paid to Members on their deposit, but sometimes the deposits themselves were not properly and timely credited. And there were mistakes made in the posting of checks and claims on a deposit that led to circumstances where Members had technical overdrafts that would never have been the case in a commercial bank.

Having said all that, the committee undertook the difficult responsibility of trying to determine what had been excessive abuse or abuse of that banking privilege. They undertook this responsibility without any rules or laws to guide them. They have done the best job that any six people could do, Democrats and Republicans, three on each side, the most upright and honest people we could find in both parties to serve in this committee.

And I think we owe them not only our thanks for the hard work that they have done, but recognition of the good job they have done in this report, by supporting it.

It is true that the House of Representatives has come under attack and under criticism, and we all sense that and feel a sense of responsibility and concern about it, as we should. We all have the honor of serving here.

But we should not misunderstand that when we take the next step, as we will, and we release the names of all Members together with their checks, as many urge that we do and as we clearly will, with an overwhelming vote on both sides of the aisle, there will be injustice done and unfairness done to some Members where checks will be listed as overdrafts even though they would never have been so listed if those accounts were in a commercial bank properly managed and undertaken.

That is one of the circumstances that we will have to face. But I hope it will be clear to the country, that we are not hiding any information, embarrassing as it may be, misleading as it may be, in many cases unjust to Members as it may be; we are going to release it.

This bank has been closed after 154 years, this bank has been closed as of January 1 by a bipartisan decision of this House. I think that was a wise decision.

This report comes to us as a result of a bipartisan resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], as will the next resolution. And we are going to adopt this and the next resolution, I am sure, by strong bipartisan majorities. We are going to take the actions mandated by the resolutions.

Let us not go on and take steps that many Members think, as Mr. GLICKMAN and others have called for, and should be undertaken, to modernize the operations of this House, to put them on a strong and stable and businesslike footing and to proceed to go back to work that we were elected to do, to the responsibility we were elected to undertake, to the concerns that we were elected to consider, to the value and goals that we seek to achieve. Let us put this matter behind us with the confidence that we have done the best we can. We are determined that this House will move forward in a better circumstance, toward a better and stronger operation. And let that be by joint decision of the majorities of our two parties.

□ 2240

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think it is very important that this committee's work be recognized, not only for the individuals involved here, but for the importance of the committee itself to the Congress. It is the only committee we have in which there is no majority other than a majority of conscience, and judgment, and concern and responsibility. Each party has seven Members that serve on this committee. As they undertake the most difficult and disagreeable responsibility we give to any Members, they deserve our respect and our support. They are an important part of this institution's reputation and character, and I think we ought to underscore today that we recognize that, respect it and admire the work that is being done in this case.

My colleagues, let us adopt this resolution by a strong majority and proceed to the next matter of business.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). All time having expired, pursuant to the order of the House of today the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. McHUGH. 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 391, nays 36, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—391

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Archer
Aspin
Atkins
AuCoin
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Dooley
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dreier
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Ireland
Jacobs
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roe
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff

NAYS—36

Allard
Allen
Applegate
Armey
Bacchus
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Camp
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Duncan
Gekas
Gilman
Gonzalez
Inhofe
James
Jones (GA)
Kyl
Lightfoot
Meyers
Nichols
Packard
Quillen
Riggs
Roberts
Roemer
Rohrabacher
Santorum
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Sundquist
Walker
Washington
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Coleman (TX)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
Miller (CA)
Moran
Savage
Whitten

□ 2301

Mr. ROHRABACHER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. ZELIFF, YOUNG of Alaska, and HERGER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

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.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. 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 Missouri?

There was no objection.

FURTHER INQUIRY INTO THE OPERATION OF THE BANK OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution (H. Res. 396), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 396

Whereas House Resolution 236 directed the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to review the use and management of the Bank of the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives for the period July 1, 1988 to October 3, 1991;

Whereas the House has adopted H. Res. 393 relating to the release of account information for certain Members and former members: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That not less than ten days after the Committee completes the public disclosure ordered by the House in H. Res. 393, the Committee is directed to make public the following information regarding the account of each Member or former Member at the House Bank during the period July 1, 1988 to October 3, 1991: the name of any such Member or former Member and the number of insufficient fund checks written.

Mr. GEPHARDT (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

Mr. Speaker, last fall the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct was directed by a bipartisan vote of the full House to review the operations of the bank and to identify routine and repeated abusers.

The committee followed the directions of the House, we closed the bank,

and now we have set in motion the release of the names of the Members identified by the committee.

In about 10 days time, the identities of those Members—past and current—will be disclosed.

We have ratified the work of the committee, and I believe we owe them our thanks for a difficult job done well.

Our consideration of this second resolution in no way disparages or diminishes the excellent work performed by the Standards Committee.

At the same time, we now know more about the operations of the bank, and the extent of the abusive practices, than we knew in October when we initially authorized the investigation.

The committee has done its job, and now we must do ours.

We will now vote to have the committee disclose the names of all Members—all Members—who wrote checks—knowingly or inadvertently—with insufficient funds in their accounts.

Their names, and the number of instances this occurred, will be made public by the committee no less than 10 days following the release of the initial 24 names.

It is the belief of the bipartisan leadership that what the Members want, and what their constituents want, is full disclosure, and this resolution provides for full disclosure.

I will repeat for the record information with which Members are already familiar but nonetheless bears repeating. The bank was not a typical financial institution. It paid no interest on accounts. The accounts were not insured.

No taxpayer funds were at risk or lost. Records were not, in many cases, computerized, and they were maintained in an incomplete and shoddy manner.

The bank had no rules, and it never provided any written advice to Members on its overdraft and check-cashing policies.

The clerks and tellers did not exercise the same degree of diligence that employees in a commercial institution would apply when insufficiencies occurred. Members who inadvertently wrote checks against insufficient funds were often not told of overdrafts. The bank apparently operated in this manner for a century or more.

It is unfair, but it is nevertheless the case, that most Members are today being held responsible and accountable for a flawed system over which they had no control.

While this reality does not excuse the activity and behavior of Members who clearly abused the system, it does mean that Members with no insufficiencies in their records, and Members with inadvertent overdrafts, are caught in the same net.

That is why this process is so difficult and, to a large extent, unfair. There are complex and competing issues involved, and we are not able to untangle this predicament with the speed that Members and the general public would like this resolved.

And resolve it, we will, understanding the balance we are trying to strike.

We have an interest in treating Members fairly, but we have an equal interest in the principles of Member responsibility and institutional accountability.

We would like to deal with this promptly and protect the public's rights to know, but we have an equal interest in due process and protecting the Members' rights to privacy.

We know how the bank operated historically, but we have a larger interest in meeting the highest standard of conduct and behavior that we expect today.

And so we believe that we have an obligation to make a full disclosure and a responsibility to honor the procedural rights of Members as we do so. That's what this resolution does.

□ 2310

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

Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] be given permission to allocate the time on our side after I have concluded my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, may I first compliment the House on that overwhelming vote in support of the committee's recommendation. I think it is a commendation to the members of the committee.

I know on our side, the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the other members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT], those six Members who had to spend so much time going into this problem and matter, and how many times have I said that the most distasteful assignment we can give anybody in this body is to serve and be confined to that duty on the so-called Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

Personally, I guess the most abhorrent part of this job, if there is one, is sitting in judgment on the ethical behavior of our contemporaries. I did not get elected to Congress in the first place to have that as an assignment. It is the most distasteful thing.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker. Once again the House of Representatives is grievously wounded, and once again the wounds are all the more painful for being self-inflicted. Scandal after scandal, abuse after abuse, headline after headline, the institution we love stumbles its way deeper into shame and dishonor. The American people will no longer tolerate explanations and excuses and rationalizations. Full disclosure is the only answer.

That is why the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and I have coauthored, with the members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, who chose to be coauthors, this addendum to what we have just passed.

Early on in this investigation I decided to keep my own counsel until I had the chance to sit with our members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, who have done such a fine job, as I indicated.

Incidentally, this is rather unique, breaking new ground, because before the committee was dealing with individual cases of indiscretion of some kind or another. This, for all practical purposes, turned out to be a class action because of the numbers involved in our body and to have it so widespread in its implications.

When the subcommittee reported to the full committee, I got my first full-fledged briefing on the severity of the problem. Bear in mind that whatever was privy to the majority at one time over the course of the history of this thing, that I want to make the point that GAO reports are not automatically sent to the minority. They only go to one place. So this Member was in the dark, as the leader of this side, for a good long time.

I listened, though, after I heard of the subcommittee's report to the full committee. I learned. I was shocked and found it hard to believe what I was actually hearing.

This is my 44th year on the hill. I did the bookwork for my predecessor as his A.A., and all through those 8 years of my 36 years, never once did I hear that it was permissible to do anything other than keeping my books balanced with the so-called Sergeant at Arms. That was my understanding of how we operated here over the years. Others thought otherwise.

After listening to the members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, I emerged with a feeling that limiting disclosure to the 29 egregious offenders was not enough, that we had to go beyond that number and probably settle for no less than full disclosure. We simply do not have the luxury of deciding if we are going to play peep show with the American people here. We cannot just lift the veil discreetly to display a titillating but limited glimpse of the bank scandal. That option has long since been taken out of our hands by the outrage and the revulsion of the American people.

That is why in this resolution we are calling for full disclosure. Let facts be

submitted to a candid world, as Mr. Jefferson once put it.

There are three major problems that we are confronted with on this issue. First there is the problem of the big offenders. All of the facts about them have been covered by the Members who preceded me to the dais this evening. Let them explain their conduct, if they can.

The second is the problem of the other Members and former Members who knowingly or unknowingly have been perceived as bouncing checks. With full disclosure each Member or former Member will have to address the particular facts of his or her case.

I feel, I do feel, for those non-abusing Members who were laboring under a false illusion that they were doing nothing that was at odds with what came to be, I guess, an ill-defined, accepted practice around here.

The third problem, of course, is the inexcusable and ultimately disgraceful condition of the House bank itself before its unmourned demise.

The bank came to symbolize what happens when unchecked power runs amok. Yes, Mr. Speaker, let us have full disclosure. But what we really need is swift and total and immediate reform of the House.

Several Members have alluded to it earlier this evening. It is not a question of one side being sinners and the other side being saints. Members on both sides are involved in this episode, although in widely varying degrees.

I believe in my heart that the vast majority of Members who bounced a few checks were victims of the bank's stewardship. But none of that matters now. In the old Foreign Legion there was a slogan, "March or die." We might modify that for the reputation of the House tonight, "Reform or die."

I recall the day when I first stood on the floor of this House taking the oath of office with my buddy, the gentleman from Michigan, BILL BROOMFIELD, my newfound friend, who I had just come to know at that time 36 years ago. Yes, we are the only two left from that 85th class. I am sure that the gentleman from Michigan felt, just as I did, that sense of pride and exhilaration that we had at the time.

Now that we have reached this sorry state, one might ask, I guess, as the poet did, "Whither has fled the visionary gleam, where is it now, the glory and the dream?" I will tell you where the glory and the dream of this institution are for me. After all these years, they are still in my heart.

I love this institution. It has been my life for over 40 years.

□ 2320

I want to help it recover, and I extend my hand to the other side and say together let us begin to carry out the reform this great place needs and deserves. We have got to open up this House and come clean.

I would ask for your support in taking this first step that has to be taken now, tonight, by adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my leader for yielding the time and thank the committee for their hard work and their diligence.

It has all been said here tonight. This was a bank that was not really a bank. It paid no interest to depositors, it provided no insurance protection for depositors, and only the deposits of Members of Congress were accepted, and only the deposits of Members were at risk. No tax dollars were involved, and the Ethics Committee report indicates no dollars were ever lost.

Yet, clearly the management practices of the bank were a mess. It was a disaster. The GAO recommended changes, and those changes were never implemented.

Last fall we voted to shut the bank down so this kind of flagrant mismanagement would never ever be repeated again, and we voted to have the Ethics Committee review the situation. The committee was charged by this House to determine if there were Members who routinely and repeatedly overdrafted their accounts by significant amounts, and after months of sorting through the records the committee has found that as many as 24 current or former Members have abused the bank.

Tonight we will also vote shortly to disclose the names of all Members who had overdrafts at the bank.

My colleagues, for four decades thousands of elected officials, some whom may have gone on to be President, or Vice President, some of whom may have gone on to become senior officials in this administration or other administrations, people who are admired, people who are respected, people who are in fact individuals of very high principle have used this bank under the standards that have been applied year after year after year. And now the tables are being turned. Members who acted in good faith will now have their actions questioned according to a standard that was established after the fact.

We have heard all of the horror stories. We heard some during the previous 2 hours. Many Members were never, not even once, informed that they had insufficient funds. Checks that should have been recorded as deposits were not recorded for days and days after they should have been, and recordkeeping mistakes were made at the bank. Checks drawn on one account were charged to another. To this day the vast majority of these records have not yet been sorted out, and may not be able to be sorted out for months to come.

Accurate, full disclosure and detailed explanations will be very, very difficult. But in the end, I think most of us have come to the conclusion there is no other way. We must support full disclosure.

And each of us must take personal responsibility for our actions, and we as a whole must take responsibility for this institution. We must act to restore the people's confidence.

I have said that I have had overdrafts at the bank, and I take responsibility for them. I should have been more careful with my own account, and I am sorry.

But in the end, what does full disclosure mean? It means each of us will take our case to the people, to the people we represent. Each of us, no matter what our partisan differences, have sought public office because we wanted to serve people, and because when all is said and done we believe in the fair judgment of those people. We believe that even in the most trying times, sense will prevail, and when we vote for full disclosure we vote with the confidence that common sense will not be swept away by exaggerated headlines, and by cheap tabloid type tactics, or by petty partisan politicians who would gleefully use this sad situation for their own political advantage.

That is the bottom line. We enter political life because we trust people, and we vote for full disclosure today because we believe in the good sense and the good judgment of those people.

Let us vote for full disclosure. Let us get this issue out in the open once and for all. And as we vote tonight, let us remember still more Americans are wondering where their next paycheck will come from, still more families are wondering if health care is secure, and still more families are wondering if their company will survive until this economy gets moving again.

Let us vote for full disclosure, and let us get on with the business of this country.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the time and I rise in strong support of complete disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution offered by my colleagues Messrs. MICHEL and GEPHARDT. I support the full and complete disclosure of all names of those members who have consciously or inadvertently abused the check cashing privileges at the office of the Sergeant at Arms, the House bank.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a vote that any of us takes lightly. At stake is the reputation of the institution in which we serve. And there is not one of us who is immune to its implications. However, in order to salvage that reputation and restore the confidence of the American people, we must request full disclo-

sure. To do less is unacceptable. The American people have a right to know.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to clean house. The U.S. House of Representatives. It's time to remove the cobwebs of mismanagement. It's time to expose those who have swept the dirt under the rug by grossly and routinely abusing their check cashing privileges. In short, Mr. Speaker, it's time for Spring cleaning.

I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bipartisan effort and vote for full disclosure.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution and to commend my chairman, the gentleman from New York, Mr. MATT MCHUGH, and my ranking member, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and all of those on the subcommittee for their really outstanding work. This House, and it has been said before, owes our colleagues a great debt of gratitude. Painstakingly, over many months and many hours of meetings, these gentlemen developed the very best data they could to make the very difficult judgments they were required to make to assure that this House could hold itself to the highest ethical standard. I have great respect for the work they have done and voted for the resolution they proposed.

I will, however, vote for this resolution because I believe full, direct disclosure, even with all its very real problems, is preferable to indirect disclosure as provided by the committee. And remember, this is not a debate about full or partial disclosure. This is a debate about full, direct disclosure versus full, indirect disclosure.

I support full, direct disclosure for two reasons. First of all, it is the only equitable way. It means everyone will disclose, not just those pursued by energetic press. It means that disclosure will not be stopped by remarkable stonewalling capabilities which some Members possess. It means disclosure will be timely, and for all. Those are the strengths of direct disclosure.

The difficulties, the disadvantages of direct disclosure are equally real. Look at what we are disclosing, because it will impose very significant responsibilities on the citizens of our Nation and on the media of our Nation. We are disclosing in part because they want us to disclose, they have asked us to disclose, and we care what they think. We are giving them knowledge, and with knowledge comes responsibility and burdens.

□ 2330

And so it matters that we all understand what it is we are disclosing. We are disclosing so-called NSF checks, not sufficient fund checks. Do you know what those checks are? Those are checks in part that were returned because they were not signed, that were returned because they had no date, that were returned because the teller could not read the number, the amount of money on the check. They were not necessarily checks returned for insufficient funds but simply checks recorded on the daily settlement sheet for that day. That is important. While we hope to be able to rectify some of that data, we will not have the time or the ability to assure that only checks that bounced are reported. Therefore, it is critical to understand clearly how contaminated the data is that will be released.

Some of the data the committee collected, that has unfortunately been disclosed, is equally invalid and outright misleading. It was grossly irresponsible for a newspaper in this city to publish dollar figures that implied that anyone ever overdrew that amount, because no one ever did. We do not have one figure for one Member that represents a net overdraw amount.

If we are to disclose fully, which we have decided to do, it is incumbent upon the press to now take responsibility with us for the proper, fair, deliberate evaluation of the data to be disclosed. That means that the people of America must not only look at the numbers released but listen to the explanation of them. With knowledge does come responsibility.

I support full disclosure, because to restore the trust of the American people in this institution and, in fact, to restore our trust in our constituents, we must provide full disclosure and challenge America's people to look rationally at this information and listen fairly to the explanation of it. Sometimes they will be faced with a deposit slip that gives a date and a bank statement that shows that deposit was not made for 10 days.

Honesty matters. That is why we are doing this. Our constituents need to have a full disclosure. They need also to take responsibility for joining with us in honestly understanding that disclosed data.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA].

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution for full disclosure.

My preference, I have to say at the beginning, would be that the Ethics Committee in its good judgment could have resolved this issue in a single resolution, but for whatever reason, that did not happen, and so we are left with the firestorm that is occurring throughout the country fed by the frustration of not only this issue but of problems that have gone unresolved and by a President and a Congress that somehow cannot find the solutions to those problems.

It leaves us really with only two realities that we have to confront now. The first is that there is no way that we can limit the information that needs to be provided on this issue.

The worst approach would be to have this information dribble out bit by bit, leak by leak, over the next few months, devastating Members and devastating this institution. That is why all of this information, as flawed as it may be, has to be released as soon as possible, because there is no other way.

The second reality is that this institution is no longer an issue for the Ethics Committee or for the House. It is an issue that belongs with the people. Ultimately we answer to only one group of people, and that is our constituents. We answer to them for our votes. We answer to them for our positions and for our behavior, and that is as it should be. That is really the only jury that ultimately counts.

All of us, all of us have to trust in their sense of fairness, their sense of decency, and their sense of justice that when they are given all of the facts they will make the right judgment. In this House of the people and in this democracy, that is as it should be, and for that reason this resolution should be supported.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, aside from the day I was married and the birthdays of my four children, I've probably never felt more proud and privileged, than the day I stood in this Chamber, and took the oath of office.

That day, only about 14 months ago, was followed almost immediately by one of the historic and most impressive debates of this body. The House enjoyed one of its finest hours, as we debated the Nation's course in the Persian Gulf.

The first votes I cast as a Member of Congress, other than the organizational votes as we got underway last January, were our votes to commit U.S. troops to war.

It was an intense and sobering initiation for those of us who were only 9 days into our congressional careers. But let me point out that no matter how tough that day, 14 months ago, I could feel good about the work we did in this Chamber, and how we represented our constituents and the interests of the Nation.

What a contrast, Mr. Speaker, with where this House stands now, and how I feel, taking the floor this evening.

I am saddened. I am mad. I am thoroughly frustrated with the way this Institution is run. I certainly have no sense of pride whatsoever, with the way in which we deal with the internal problems of the House.

I am saddened that scandal after scandal, whether real or only perceived by the public and media, has so deteriorated the reputation of Congress that the public has little, if any confidence or trust in their elected representatives.

I am frustrated that those running the House don't want to deal with this image problem and the scandals, head on. I am pleased that we

now have a bipartisan agreement to vote on tonight, but why all the footdragging, agonizing, and maneuvering of the last few days.

I cannot help but note, that only when public pressure became unbearable, did the powers that be decide to do the right thing. Apparently, some of my colleagues only want to pitch congressional reform back home and do not like to translate their rhetoric into the votes needed to make reform a reality.

I wrote no bad checks at the House bank, and I am mad that I have had to defend my financial integrity because of the hesitancy to disclose the names of those who did.

While I am saddened that some of my good, honest, hard-working colleagues will be labeled check bouncers and check kiters, because of the slipshod banking operations run by the Sergeant of Arms, any chance has long passed to debate why the bank existed, its history, and the rationale behind its operations.

The bottom line is that the public wants and demands a full disclosure of the House bank. And for the future integrity of this institution, and our ability to do our work, there should never have been any doubt or hesitation, that full and immediate disclosure was the proper course of action.

When the names are released, individual Members can then explain to their constituents why and how they have a record of writing bad checks at the House bank. And for those Members who did not abuse the system, repeatedly and significantly, I believe their constituents will be understanding.

These scandals and internal problems, and the missteps in handling them, are distracting the Congress, public, and media. What is so tough about putting reforms in place, so we can operate in the manner that is expected by our constituents, and which they so rightly deserve?

It is long past time for reform—this scandal and the hesitancy in dealing with it, should be the convincing evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I join my many colleagues who have already spoken this evening in support of the bipartisan resolution for full and immediate accounting of each member who wrote bad checks at the banking operation run by the House Sergeant of Arms.

Full disclosure today, is a real step toward meaningful congressional reform, and perhaps its passage will clear the air enough for us to get on with our work on the economic issues, health care, trade, and the other real bread and butter issues that make a difference in the lives of our constituents.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING], a great member of our committee.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I am entering into the RECORD, dated January 3, 1978, the rules and regulations governing the House bank that was sent out by the Sergeant at Arms at that time in direct contrast to a lot of testimony we have had here today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for full disclosure. It is the least we can do—it is what we owe the American public. It is the right thing to do.

And I am proud that we won this battle for honesty—honor—and integrity.

Abraham Lincoln once said, "Public opinion is everything." And God bless him, he was right.

A week ago—this body was prepared to stonewall the American public on bad checks. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct approved a resolution to set up that stone wall.

But fortunately, that resolution and that stone wall did not pass muster with the American people.

It didn't pass the smell test with the American public.

The American public decided that if it looks like a coverup and if it feels like a coverup and if it smells like a coverup—it must be time for a change.

And that opinion started things moving.

Public opinion moved the mountain—the mountain of congressional arrogance.

If you quit listening to the people—if you start thinking you are above the law—if you start to believe that you are too good, or too powerful, or too important—you are going to take a fall.

This vote tonight is also a major victory for this Institution. It was—and is—a tough issue. People are going to be hurt. Careers are going to be damaged. It is a painful episode in the history of this body. And personally painful for me, serving on the Ethics Committee.

But tonight, after this vote, at least and at last, we can hold our heads up high for the first time in months.

It started out as a trickle of falling stones in the Ethics Committee. But it turned into a groundswell of public opinion that set off an avalanche on that mountain. And this resolution tonight is the result.

Tonight, the arrogance of power in the U.S. House of Representatives has crumbled just a little. It is not gone—we still have to keep chipping away—but this resolution tonight has put some serious cracks in the surface.

And this resolution tonight broadcasts a pretty important meassage—the message is simple.

We can hold our heads up, because for the first time in months, the House of Representatives is being honest and open—the way it should be.

I urge my colleagues to support full disclosure.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, DC, January 3, 1978.

Memorandum to Members.

Subject: BANK STATEMENT.

We ask that you examine your Bank Statement carefully and to help you understand some of the red symbols that may appear, we submit the following explanation:

A—after the balance. This means you have a stop payment on your account.

R—after the balance. Due to mechanical trouble, this balance had to be reconstructed to post a check.

EC—error correction. Amount deposit posted in error.

RT—returned check. This means that on this date you did not have sufficient funds to pay this check. The amount will appear in red. This check will be returned to the main office; you will be notified by phone the amount needed to cover the checks in question. Checks with the RT symbol for insufficient funds must be covered by a deposit within 24 hours or be returned the following day to the Federal Reserve Bank. We can not hold them for a future salary deposit if more than 24 hours.

We request you not to send out *post dated checks, unsigned checks* or *checks in excess of your deposit balance.* This will help us with our work load and save any embarrassment for you.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the full-disclosure motion.

Mr. Speaker, while the current controversy surrounding bounced checks at the Sergeant at Arms Office does not involve the loss of any public funds, the instances of mismanagement and abuse of checking privileges at that office are nonetheless outrageous. I am pleased that the checking account functions of the Sergeant at Arms office has now been totally abolished. Frankly, I find myself better served by a branch of the local Federal Employees Credit Union than I ever was by the Sergeant at Arms—at least now I have the benefit of interest earnings on my small deposit, as well as the confidence that the funds are professionally managed and accounted for.

But simply abolishing the old bank is not enough, and simply disclosing the names of only the worst offenders of the old system is not enough. Many Members, such as myself, had no bounced checks and others had only a few. Ironically, the Sergeant at Arms office was run so badly, that many Members were never told of their overdrafts, and deposits into Members accounts were often delayed by days, thus resulting in overdrafts that were not the fault of the Members. But still others, routinely and significantly abused the checking privileges at the Sergeant at Arms office.

The only way to clear the air and restore public confidence in this democratic institution, is to publically divulge the names of all Members who wrote overdrafts, along the number of checks and the amount by which they were deficient. Anything short of that full disclosure will be unsatisfactory and will cause this controversy to be needlessly draw-out.

The voters in each congressional district have a right to know with certainty how their own elected Representative has handled his personal financial affairs. It must ultimately be left to the citizens themselves to decide whether the conduct of their particular Representative has been satisfactory. The citizens of some districts may apply a more severe standard of financial rectitude than in others, but that simply reflects the diversity of views that naturally exists among our 435 congressional districts.

Besides the abolition of the House bank and full disclosure of past checking practices, we need still more reform in the way the administrative functions of the House of Representatives are managed. I support the establishment of a professional, nonpartisan chief operating officer to oversee all the administrative functions of the House, from dining rooms to postal services, et cetera. This new management, however, should not amount to yet another layer of costly administration for the House. The cost of a new bipartisan administrator ought to be offset by reductions or elimination in existing offices currently appointed by the Speaker. The administrative functions of the House of Representatives should be competently and efficiently run as a business, not as a vestige of the old days of political cronyism.

Mr. Speaker, we need full disclosure, but beyond that, we need full-blown reform of the administrative functions of the House.

□ 2340

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, with tonight's vote, we have begun to put behind us a most unfortunate matter. I have always thought that the best disinfectant is sunlight, and I feel that this notion applies today. At each moment in history when our Government appeared to be withholding the whole truth from its public, that public demanded information. We must begin to be our own best critic, our own best investigator, and our own best adjudicator. Hopefully, this is the beginning of that process.

Even though I have had no overdrafts at the House bank, I am deeply concerned about the loss of trust in this institution which this controversy has caused. It is clear that the anger of the American people at the handling of this matter goes far beyond the role of the House bank. It involves anger at what is perceived to be an abuse of privileges not accorded to average Americans and, as such, symbolizes in the minds of many the isolation of the Congress and the Government as a whole from the needs and concerns of the American people. The action taken by the House of Representatives when this scandal first surfaced to abolish the House bank was a positive step in eliminating unnecessary privileges. Tonight's vote to disclose the names of Members who overdrew their accounts was a necessary response to concerns that the House was attempting to conceal wrongdoing by some Members. Perhaps by the action we have taken here tonight, we have begun a larger process of increasing accountability which will, in time, help to restore public confidence in this institution.

The controversy surrounding overdrafts by some Members of Congress from the House bank has been widely misunderstood and misrepresented to the American people. The House bank was not a bank in the normal use of the term: Members were required to receive their pay through the House bank; the bank did not pay interest on accounts; the bank did not make loans; the bank was not FDIC insured; and no taxpayer money was involved—only the funds deposited by Members was drawn upon to cover overdrafts by other Members. However, this does not relieve Members from the need to be accountable to their constituents for abuse of privileges in their use of the bank.

From the first day that this issue was raised, my recommendation was full disclosure. The real issue here is what constitutes full disclosure and the method of that disclosure. I am concerned about the precedent we set in making private financial records public when no laws or rules of conduct were violated. However, the political fury surrounding this issue threatens to damage the House of Representatives as a institution. We have all taken the solemn oath attendant to this office and thereby assumed the sacred responsibilities of our office.

In my opinion, this resolution, which will result in the public disclosure of the names of Members and numbers of overdrafts, is the beginning of full disclosure. At the earliest possible date, the General Accounting Office should complete its audit of the accounts of each Member that had overdrafts, and the Ethics Committee should submit an audited statement of account to each member. Then each Member should accept responsibility for completing disclosure of their record in this matter to their constituents' satisfaction.

The damage done by disclosing Members' private financial records pales in comparison to the loss of credibility of the House of Representatives if the information were to be withheld.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I support full disclosure of the names of each individual who overdrew their bank account during the audited period of time at the House of Representatives bank.

I would hope that each person's—whether they are Members, former Members, spouse, staff, press people, or others who utilized the bank—would be listed. Also, I would ask that the number of checks and total dollar amounts be identified.

It is becoming clear that the House bank under the Sergeant at Arms did not practice routine bookkeeping procedures. As a result, deposits were not posted on a daily basis, thus sometimes creating the appearance of overdrafts where deposited money actually covered the account. I believe each individual Member must be given the chance to call for a full review of their account by the General Accounting Office. This would exonerate those Members who suffered overdrafts due to sloppy banking procedures.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives belongs to the people, and they deserve to know who has had overdrafts. Failure to provide full disclosure will place a cloud of suspicion over all Members, even those who did not routinely abuse the privileges afforded them. Currently, the public believes the House as a whole is guilty while, in truth, a majority are not.

The House should require full disclosure so there will be no questions about who was involved and the amounts of money involved.

To my knowledge, I have not overdrawn my account, and my records confirm that. The following letters, which I am submitting for the record, also indicate that I had no overdrafts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 30, 1991.

Hon. JACK RUSS,
Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Dear Jack: I would like to request verification in writing from your office that I have never overdrafted my account in the House of Representatives bank.

The recent GAO report has disclosed large quantities of checks that have been covered without adequate funds. To my knowledge, there have been no incidences of this in my account, and I would like to verify this fact.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

RICHARD RAY,
Member of Congress.

OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS,
Washington, DC, October 9, 1991.

Hon. RICHARD RAY,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RAY: As you have requested, my office has reviewed your bank account records for the period July 1, 1989 through June 30, 1990. These records indicate that the presentation for payment of checks drawn on your account did not in any instance exceed your available balance of funds on deposit with this office.

If I can be of further service to you, please contact me.

Sincerely,

JACK RUSS,
Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution and in support of full disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, the credibility of this great institution, the U.S. House of Representatives has been shaken by the House bank scandal. The trust that has been bestowed upon every Member of this House hinges on our actions and what conclusion we bring to this matter.

Today I join in the effort calling for full disclosure of those Members who have abused the now defunct House bank, something I favored when the issue first came to my attention. The public has a right to know their names, the number of overdraft checks they wrote and the amount of the checks. No where else in this country can such practice be tolerated and it should not be tolerated here. To those who knowingly have chosen to misuse and abuse this House, I say let them defend their actions to those who elected them. Greed has its price and it is time for those Members to pay for it.

Not only did these Members apparently continue to write overdraft checks, they followed a policy, not known by many of us, that allowed them to write insufficient fund checks that amounted to their next payroll check. They knew the Sergeant at Arms would cover them

until their next payroll check was deposited and in all cases without paying a penalty. This total disregard of a privilege established by the House in the early 1800's is an embarrassment to all Members of Congress.

The public has a right to know who made simple bookkeeping mistakes, as I did, but even more so to know those who took advantage by constantly writing checks they knew would bounce but would be covered.

I enjoy my service in this institution. I continue to be overwhelmed by being a part of this great Nation's history. But most of all, I am proud to serve the people of the Ninth District in Missouri. They, as all Americans, deserve a Representative they can trust.

The people who elected those Members to the House who have abused the system should be made aware of this abuse. It will take action by fellow colleagues to make this information known. The House should not delay this action. Those Members who abused this privilege now have to explain their actions. The task of restoring the ideals and tradition to this great institution should begin immediately and it will begin with those of us who still believe in preserving the integrity and honesty of the House of Representatives by not taking advantage of the system.

I hope my colleagues join with me in opening the records and cleansing this House of this scandal.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the Leader for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I served for 6 years on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. It was a great privilege and an honor to serve with people who were willing to devote so much of their personal time to the institution. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY], with whom I served. They continue to serve this body with such distinction. And of course I echo the comments of my colleagues in their accolades for Mr. MCHUGH and his colleagues in the majority.

Mr. Speaker, we are all together tonight finally in a common conclusion that we need to trust the public enough to trust them with all the information about us. We cannot be sure they will judge us fairly, but we know that we have to give them the responsibility to judge us.

But something else exists in this chamber tonight that is very troubling to me, and that is a division which continues to be evident on this floor, as it was just a few moments ago during the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky. And that is the test of this institution over the next several years.

Can we reform ourselves? Can we change ourselves in the way that has been discussed on both sides of the aisle tonight, by Mr. GLICKMAN and by the leader, Mr. MICHEL, and by the Speaker?

Can we do it without turning on each other, destroying further the credibility of this institution? Can we do it in a way that puts aside the vigilantism and the passionate partisanship that continues to infect our debate?

Because if we cannot do that, we will not exhibit the self-confidence and the self-respect, the mutual trust that the public demands of this institution. We cannot expect them to have much to say for us, we cannot expect them to trust us to do their business as the centerpiece of a representative democracy, if we cannot believe in ourselves, if we cannot trust the people to do the dirty work on the Ethics Committee, if we cannot trust our leaders to lead, if we cannot trust ourselves not to demagogue issues that we know cut to the quick, cut deeply into the core of this institution.

People know I am a partisan. There is nothing wrong with being partisan. But there is a lot wrong with destroying an institution to, in effect, say that any means are justified if the end itself is so worthy.

Victories are something all of us around here know well, and so is defeat. Those of us who do not know both are not well rounded and do not well serve ourselves, our institution, our public, our constituency.

But there is more to service in this institution than partisan victories. There is a lot more that is really at stake in trying to instill in the public a belief that we can do their business here.

And so I conclude my brief remarks tonight by saying to my friends who have led the charge on the Republican side, I congratulate you for, in effect, your willingness to confront something you thought was wrong. You brought us to a broader awareness tonight.

But, please, put away, put away the excessive zeal to root out evil, because this House is still full of good people. It is not a House of evil people, it deserves better from those privileged to serve here.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution for full disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday a Washington Post-ABC news poll recorded a lowest ever 22 percent approval rating for Congress. Is it any wonder public confidence has been shaken so? For the last 6 months the House of Representatives has treated the Nation to a series of scandals worthy of daytime soap operas. But the resolution we will be considering today tops the charts.

Like everyone else in the country, I was both surprised and outraged to learn that Members of the House of Representatives had overdrafted thousands of personal checks totaling millions of dollars which were covered by other Members' deposits in an operation grossly mismanaged by its Sergeant at Arms. The feeble defense of this outrage has been that it wasn't a bank, everyone was doing it, or that Members were merely borrowing from one another. That just doesn't cut it. Mr. Speaker, this means that my balanced account shielded the abusers. It's the equivalent of having your local bank honor all the checks you write up to the amount of your next paycheck—enabling you to live constantly above your means on a float of other people's money.

Even more distressing is the lax and haphazard management of the House bank that occurred over the years—even after GAO, the Speaker, and outside consultants from the banking industry made concrete recommendations for reforming the system. The result is that now the entire House is impaled on the sword of public ridicule—even at the expense of those who never wrote a check with insufficient funds or did so without knowledge.

The first resolution today identifies only 24 of the 66 current and former Members of Congress who wrote about 20,000 bad checks totaling more than $10.8 million. The criteria used by the committee to define abuse is drawn too narrow. Scores of others who, by any commonsense standard would qualify as abusers, would escape designation and disclosure.

Fortunately, however, this resolution from the Ethics Committee is accompanied by another resolution, this one requiring full disclosure of every individual in the House and their record at the House Bank. I know that some Members, totally innocent, will find their names on this list, victims of the incompetence of the House Bank operation. Their checks might have been held because the bank failed to credit a deposit, or because a date was inadvertently wrong on the check. But I believe the public will be able to make a distinction between the pattern of abuse—and make no mistake about it, there is a pattern of abuse for some Members—and this occasional slip by the Member or mistake by the bank.

Mr. Speaker, we have no other choice. We must get this information to the public. We cannot proceed as "business as usual". Full disclosure is the only action that can be taken to restore a modicum of public confidence in this institution.

Let us get this behind us and let's get on with the business of the Nation, the business we were elected to do.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL], a member of the committee.

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing we can do tonight is to begin to restore the credibility of the House. And that is why I strongly support this resolution for full disclosure.

There are two issues before us. The first is to try to define who may have abused bank privileges. Under the majority report of the committee, a definition was used which essentially revolved around one criterion, namely: Did a Member have overdrafts more than 8 months exceeding his next month's net salary deposit?

The result of that narrow definition was to identify 24 individuals, 19 cur-

rent, 5 past Members, as having abused banking privileges.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who dissented from the majority report could not defend that result. I will not cite exact statistics; you have all heard some of the orders of magnitude involved. An individual who wrote over 850 so-called "bad checks" with a face value total of over $150,000 did not make that list of abusers. People who wrote over 700 checks, over 500 checks, over 400 checks, in many cases beyond $100,000 total face value, did not make the list of abusers.

And, with no joy, those of us in the minority felt that that simply was unacceptable and indefensible; and we had to dissent as a result.

Using all of the various criteria that the committee had available, we would have expanded the list to approximately 55 people. I voted against the first resolution for this reason, Mr. Speaker; it was too narrow in that regard.

By supporting this resolution, however, we can partially rectify that error, because, by laying on the public record the name and at least the number of so-call bad checks for every single Member of the body, the public can judge for itself who actually abused the banking privileges and who did not. That is why I have helped to author and cosponsor this resolution.

Now, we must understand that full disclosure does not include certain things that a lot of us would like to include.

For example, it does not include dollar amounts, because we do not have accurate dollar amounts. That has been pointed out before.

As a matter of fact, even the number of checks which will be exposed could well be an inaccurate number. We do not know what these records will show, because the records were so sloppy. In fact, I do not know what the records will show about my account. I have a letter which says that I wrote no bad checks. I do not believe I wrote any bad checks. But the bank records could show that I have had some checks held by the bank, frankly either because of my error or because of sloppy procedures or practices of the bank itself. And I am willing to make my records available even if it shows an error on my part in order to insure that those who were the real intentional abusers are exposed. And there are more than 24 who abused their banking privileges. I believe, frankly, that many of them would stonewall if it were strictly up to them. And that is what the original majority report would allow.

I could have moved to expand the list from 24 to 55, but we all know that that would have failed. So, the only way to insure full disclosure for the worst abusers is by this resolution which lays it all out for all of us. It is hard for any of us to expose ourselves to criticism if we have had any checks held up by the bank. But it is a price we must pay, and that I am willing to pay in order to begin to restore the credibility of the House. And, ultimately, that is more important than any one Member.

This House can no longer conduct business as usual.

While the imperfect bank records may be subject to misinterpretation, I have faith in my constituents and in your constituents that they can discriminate between honest errors and abuse, between bank errors and Member abuse of banking privileges.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, as one who helped lead this fight for full disclosure, I think I have the credibility to also urge that the media have a responsibility to report fairly that some of the overdrafts attributed to Members were not their fault, that they were the bank's fault. Members were rarely, if ever, told of any inadvertent overdraft by the bank. But, again, Mr. Speaker, if we do our part and the media continues to do their job, I am confident that the American people will respond by distinguishing between the inadvertent and the intentional. They would rather judge us on the basis of how well we respond to the big issues that really confront us as a nation, addressing issues dealing with the economy and the health care, just to name two.

By supporting this resolution for full disclosure, we begin to restore credibility and get this issue behind us. Mr. Speaker, I think that is what the American people really want.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

□ 2350

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the majority leader yielding this time to me, and I rise in strong support of the resolution now before the House. I commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the members of this committee on nobility, and excellence and honor in the work that they did for us.

Mr. Speaker, as I said yesterday, the integrity of the House is at stake, and, therefore, as I said yesterday, a fuller, rather than a narrower, disclosure is necessary, and, therefore, I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], our majority leader, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] on bringing forth full disclosure. This is very much to the credit of those two gentlemen and the House.

I will say this: I read every single word of the committee report, I read and listened to all of what took place in the caucus and the debate tonight, and it is shocking and really disquieting to learn of the lax, and unprofessional and error-ridden practices of the House bank.

It is clear to me that full disclosure means that many Members, and our friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL], said it, many Members with inadvertent errors on their part or for whom bank practices created errors in their accounts will hurt. They will suffer. They will be penalized. Some may lose their careers.

But, the people whom we represent are entitled to have full information about these accounts, their interests supersede our interests.

So, I intend to vote for full disclosure even though it may not be accurate disclosure.

I do hope the admonition of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] to the press is listened to and is taken to heart by the press and by everyone and that they make discreet judgments here between intentional misuse of the bank and the innocent miscalculation.

Let me say this: I hope we have learned something from this sad affair. If we just go this far tonight and disclose, this will have been a wasted effort. We must reform the practices of the House, and there are many interesting suggestions before us to do that. We have to demand more professionalism of House employees, and of ourselves. The fullest measure of how well we serve the people who are observing these proceedings and the people whom we are honored to represent, the fullest test of that will be not be just fessing up tonight and making the disclosure. It will be how well we handle this change and make other changes for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to make this House better, to bring honor to this Chamber, and let us start tonight.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the minority leader, Mr. MICHEL.

The reputation of this institution is already battered.To try to limit access to account information will only prolong and intensify public mistrust of the Congress and the Government.

Each and every Member of the House has a responsibility to conduct himself or herself in a manner that does not erode in any way the confidence of the American people in their Government. Those of our colleagues who failed to recognize this responsibility have tarnished the reputation of the House, probably for years to come.

As is often the case, there is plenty of blame to go around. Without diminishing the responsibilities of the Members of the House, we cannot ignore the fact that the officers and employees of the bank carried out their duties with gross negligence. The shoddy bookkeeping practices at the bank have immeasurably complicated this investigation. It has proven difficult to reconstruct the account records of those who clearly abused their privileges. It would be a travesty if these

records suggest that one of our colleagues was financially careless when, in fact, he or she acted responsibly.

This resolution sets out the proper course of action. The bank is already closed. The Sergeant at Arms has resigned. Full disclosure of the records is at hand.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, as a freshman member of the House Ethics Committee, I must say that attempting to resolve this crisis has been a very difficult and painful process. The weight of this responsibility compares only to that in my first few days in office when I voted to support the President and send American men and women to the Persian Gulf. I have spent numerous hours in committee and many sleepless nights struggling with the most appropriate way to address abuses of the House bank.

This is a difficult situation. How this Congress handles this issue will dramatically affect the lives of certain past and present Members of Congress, as well as the integrity of this institution.

The House bank scandal has hung a cloud of doubt and distrust over the U.S. House of Representatives. The polls tell us that the majority of Americans have lost their faith that the individuals they elect to Congress act on behalf of the good of their district and the Nation. This cloud will not break until we disclose the names of those who abused the House bank privilege.

Secrecy only breeds suspicion. Therefore, we must shed light on this issue, so that we can begin to restore our public's trust.

I commend the Ethics Committee, particularly the subcommittee for their tremendous work. The subcommittee faced the difficult task of reconstructing Members' accounts and making recommendations on what they felt was the most appropriate manner to handle this situation.

As one of the dissenting Members of the full committee, I support the full, accurate disclosure of all the abusers of the House bank. The American people have a right to know—and have demanded to know—how the bank was operated, and the names of those who abused and betrayed the trust of this system. The names of those individuals who repeatedly and consistently bounced checks.

There are many who are concerned that full disclosure will hurt individuals who were not abusers, but had just a handful of checks for small amounts. However, I have faith that, when presented with all the facts, the American people will know the difference between the major abusers and those who made small mistakes.

The Ethics Committee's final report details the inadequate operations of the House bank. The report reveals the bank routinely failed to notify Members of overdrafts—and, in fact, as a general rule, only notified those Members who overdrew their accounts for amounts greater than their next months salaries. Clearly, the operation of the bank is a significant part of this entire scandal—and was the cause of many of the mistakes made by Members.

As a new Member receiving my first paycheck last February, I can personally attest to the problems in the bank. In my situation, the bank incorrectly calculated the amount of my first deposit. Since then, I have received a letter from the bank recognizing its mistake, accepting responsibility and apologizing for its error.

But these minor instances are not what led us to this debate today. This debate is over those who bounced checks repeatedly for large sums of money * * * those individuals who bounced more than 100 checks for more than $200,000 for 7 months. These are the cases that have ignited anger among the American people. These are the actions that the public has demanded come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, it is the tremendous respect I hold for this institution that draws me here to this debate tonight. As a Congressman who spends a great deal of time in his district with his constituents, I can tell you the public has had enough. They are demanding change and they are demanding accountability among their elected officials.

By passing this resolution tonight and granting the American people full disclosure, we can begin to rebuild the public's trust in this great institution. While this will affect many Members of this body, it is simply the right thing to do. Let's get this information out in the open and put this scandal behind us.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of full disclosure as provided in this resolution. Full information on this issue can provide the facts to make proper judgments. Anything less than full disclosure would be a big mistake, in my opinion.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the highest honor that can be bestowed any individual in a democracy, except perhaps to be called to the priesthood, or to be a minister or a rabbi, is, in my view, to be called to public service.

Mr. Speaker, I do not talk about private things very often because I think public and private lives are very different. But I never thought that I would be here in a place like this.

I remember one Christmas when my family was so broke that we had to rely on groceries brought in by my mother's friends, and in times like that I never dreamed that I would be part of the greatest legislative body in the world, working with people like my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to try to make people's lives in this country better and to try to make our country better. And like the distinguished minority leader who spoke earlier tonight of his love for this institution, I revere this institution. Not for what we are and who we are. I revere it rather for who we represent, and I revere it because of the fact that people from the least of circumstances and the poorest of backgrounds can come to a place like this and participate in the most important decisions that affect the well-being of every single human being in this country, and very often the world. That is why this incident is so painful.

I want to personally thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] because they were given a very tough job along with the other members of that committee, and they were operating under a restriction imposed by the House in its first resolution which required them to focus on the need to distinguish between Members. That is a very tough thing to do. I supported that committee resolution because I think that the committee was given an obligation by the House to try to distinguish between the worst abusers and those who, through carelessness or inadvertence, find themselves in an embarrassing position.

But I also support this resolution for full disclosure of the names of all of the persons who wrote an overdraft because I think it is the fastest way, on a bipartisan basis, to get it out into the open and to then get us back to the business that we were elected to deal with on a day-to-day basis.

□ 2400

But I have several words of caution. In September, when we were reviewing the situation at the bank for 1990, I was, I believe, the first Member of Congress to reveal that I had had some checks that were overdrafts. I revealed, for instance, that I had written one fairly large check for airplane tickets, forgot to record it, and as a result caused a number of other smaller checks which we thought were fully good when we wrote them, to in fact, become overdrafts.

I would, therefore, urge Members to be careful about the numbers because these numbers are going to mean very different things to very different people.

Second, I would caution every Member to be careful because some of the numbers are simply not going to be accurate. For example, I found one $5.00 check which was written on December 29, 1988. It was stamped as having insufficient funds on December 13, 1988, some 16 days before the check was written, and it was found in the envelope from the bank for the month that contained all of the checks from January of 1990, not of 1989 but of 1990. If you can explain that one, you are a whole lot smarter than I am, and I do not think the bank can explain it.

So my point is, whatever kind of disclosure we have, I ask Members to recognize that the instrument is going to be imperfect and it is going to do some injustices to Members. I would urge you, as soon as you can, to get accurate information involving your own situation, get it out, and level with people.

Then I would urge Members to do two other things. I would urge you to follow up on the comments tonight that this House needs dramatic change in the way it is administered. I deeply believe that if this House had had a professional administrator, as was recommended to the House in 1977 by a commission which I chaired, I deeply believe that if we had adopted that resolution, then the House would be in a lot better position today.

The second thing I would urge us to do is to then get back to the business we were elected to deal with. This country is in trouble. People are desperate for jobs. They are desperate for some signal that their Government recognizes their fears and their pain about their economic future, about health care, and about the quality of education for their kids and their neighborhoods.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members to vote for this resolution tonight and get it behind us, get it behind the country. Let us end this distraction and get back to the work we were elected to perform on a bipartisan basis, not just in an election year but every single day and every single hour that this House is in session.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. NICHOLS].

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution for full disclosure.

Yesterday, I stood here on this floor of the House of Representatives. I called upon my fellow Members of Congress to take a courageous stand on this problem of abuses at the House bank—a stand for full and complete disclosure.

I am certain there will be many Members of Congress who will be compelled to openly and honestly address their constituents regarding their abuses of the House bank. Unfortunatley, it appears most of these Members are only coming forth in the 11th hour when full disclosure is imminent.

This appalling situation was brought to the attention of the American people 6 months ago. They wonder why it has taken so long for these Members to come forward. At any time Members had the ability, and I believe responsibility, to check the records, and to be honest with their constituents. It appears to many, many people that these Members, sadly, placed their careers ahead of the truth.

I believe this speaks to an even larger problem in this Congress. Perhaps it is true that this scandal will be career-ending for many Members. But Congress was never meant to be a career. Our founding fathers envisioned a government of citizen legislators to come and serve the people and then return back to private life.

That is how it was meant to be, and that is how it should be again.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr.NUSSLE].)

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of full disclosure.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to express my appreciation for the work that has been done by the Ethics Committee. It has been a very, very difficult task, to say the least.

As most of the Members know, I have been a sponsor of a resolution for full and direct disclosure of the accounts of all of those Members who have had problems with the former House bank. That resolution was not designed simply to make certain that those who repeatedly abused the privilege of the bank have their records made public. Certainly the committee's work has gone a long way in that direction. We knew clearly that there were a number of Members who are concerned that perhaps enough names were not disclosed in their initial report, but there are a number of other reasons to consider going further, and there is a reason for this additional resolution that involves full disclosure of all Members who had problems with the bank.

First and foremost, for me it is the public's right to know. It is very apparent that this is the people's business, and the moment that the people heard we were about to display a problem with the bank and disclose only 24 names directly, the moment they heard there was additional information regarding others who might have abused the bank, they were outraged. But the outrage is not simply for the number but because most of our public believes deeply in this House, and they believe that if given proper information, they are perfectly capable of evaluating that information and separating those who are serious abusers from those who have made mistakes or errors in their bank accounts. They believe they should have the right to examine those differences.

Second, Mr. Speaker, full disclosure is important to me for another reason. There are a number of my colleagues who are put into a large basket and are there in part because of errors or mistakes that may have been inadvertent on their part or maybe even errors of the bank itself. It is my judgment that the best possible protection for those Members who are caught in this basket as a result of inadvertent error or even bank error is by way of having a vote for full disclosure. With that as a foundation, the credibility of one's explanation at home is much clearer to the constituencies to which we all have to speak.

Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent to me that this evening the Congress by voting for full disclosure is laying the foundation to allow the people to reestablish their confidence and belief in this institution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr.SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to the U.S. Congress, I received some important advice from former Speaker Carl Albert from my great State of Oklahoma. He told me, "Always trust your constituency, they will find the truth."

It has been that charge that has directed my career. The truth is that this is a sad and embarrassing chapter in this institution's history. We cannot deny it, nor should we hide it. The truth is that this problem is serious, principally because it tears at the fabric of confidence in government that is essential for any democracy to be successful.

□ 0010

The truth is, is that once we have completed full and accurate disclosure—and begin to rebuild that public confidence—the public expects us to use that confidence to revive the economy, to develop an energy strategy, to provide affordable quality health care, and to build for this country's future. Then, and only then, will we have served our institution correctly, our constituents honorably, and our country and this precious democracy faithfully.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON].

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the full disclosure resolution.

This is not a happy occasion for anyone, but it is an opportunity to begin a process of restoring confidence in this institution.

Last October when we voted for the resolution to commence an inquiry, I told my constituency that I thought we'd find some serious

abuse on the part of a few, and some honest mistakes on the part of many, mistakes lacking intent of wrongdoing. But I also said then and I say now that to achieve a restoration of confidence we would have to have full disclosure, because we should have full disclosure; because ultimately the people will be satisfied only if they know the full facts have been put before them. The people are discerning. They will distinguish between willful misdeed and poor arithmetic. Full disclosure is the only way to get where we want to be from where we now are, because it is the only right way.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize and say I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. Lord knows we need some bipartisan cooperation in this House. But I want to remind my colleagues in the majority that part of what we are is what you allow us to be. With all due respect and all candor, I think what we have enabled you to do now is stand in the sunshine. So let us both stand in the sunshine as we go forward to public disclosure.

My second point is a memo dated January 3, 1978, 14 years ago. Tip O'Neill was Speaker. It states:

> Checks with a symbol for insufficient funds must be covered by a deposit within 24 hours or be returned the following day to the Federal Reserve Bank. We cannot hold them for a future salary deposit more than 24 hours. If you do this, it is going to save you any embarrassment.

This has not been going on for 40 years.

One other point: As a Republican on the Committee on House Administration, I have worked with House officers, the House officers you select. They do precisely what Members tell them to do. Think about that with the unfolding events of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are worried about being judged in the same category as others who have actually abused the bank. I know that. And, listen, if there is anybody out there that has not checked their checks now, who somehow believes that the letter from the Sergeant at Arms is accurate, or that their bank statement is accurate, welcome to the party.

The main point is you have to trust the people back home. They will understand. They can comprehend the difference. If you have some questionable checks because of sloppy bookkeeping or personal errors and they are a small number, they are going to recognize the difference between the abusers and those who did not really abuse the system.

Mr. Speaker, the basic message I have for all of us is to trust the people back home. They can make that judgment. Support full public disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, seldom in this institution's history have events focused public opinion to the degree that this House cannot conduct its business. Yet that is where we are this evening and it is no wonder.

Incredibly enough, some Members just don't get the message. Mr. Speaker, this issue strikes to the very core of our honesty and integrity, individually and collectively, as Members of this institution. This House is suffering a crisis in public confidence.

What to do. The good news may be that with all of the differences of opinion as to how to get this mess behind us, we at least are united in concern and a sense of outrage. But, I submit there is only one course of action.

I know that many fear that full disclosure will result in many innocent Members being tarred and feathered with the same brush as those who abused the bank. Taking that one step further, there is fear of a full scale voter purge of House incumbents this November.

While that certainly is possible, I offer this certainty: Anything short of full disclosure this evening will result in damage to this institution's credibility so severe as to render the House impotent and sentence us all to shame. And, that is true in regard to the House bank, the restaurant or our current investigation of the Post Office, and with efforts to reform the system.

The answer is very basic and simple. We have to stop this internal handwringing and this bunker mentality and do what our founding fathers suggested: trust the people who sent us here.

I submit that attitude would go a long way toward curing most ills of the Congress, including this one. The people have the right to know, plain and simple.

In my years of public life, I have attempted to act within a principle that can be summed up generally as follows: Is this vote, this course of action, this decision something that I can take back to Dodge City, KS, and explain to the satisfaction of my friends, family and constituents? If the answer is "no", then the vote or the course of action or the decision must be reconsidered or abandoned.

Now, I know my colleagues are rightfully worried about being judged in the same category as those who truly abused the bank. Many are just now finding out that due to the questionable management practices of the bank, their bank statements are not accurate; and worse yet, the letter they received from the bank stating they have no problem is not accurate either.

The message I have for these folks is simple. Trust the people back home. If a Member has but a few checks with overdrafts or bookkeeping mistakes and a large part of that responsibility lies with the bank's past policy of operation, that is understandable and defensible. What they will not understand is continued stonewalling and whitewashing of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, full disclosure is the cleansing light of democracy. It ensures that our democratic institutions continue to survive with full public confidence. That confidence and trust is a two-way street. Let's trust the folks who sent us here, the folks who pay taxes and in return expect good government. Only then can we ask for their trust and, hopefully, a restored sense of confidence in the job we do here.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is an unhappy night. The House and its Members have been the object of the anger and the opprobrium of the American people. And in their anger, they have understandably demanded to know the facts about a situation which has outraged them and many of us.

I supported, as almost everybody in the House did, the work of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Like so many others before, me, I want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], the House owes you a debt of gratitude, as well as to the Members who serve with you, who did a job well done. I believe these Members have responded to the charge that was given them. It provided for the disclosure of those it deemed to have abused their use of the House bank. None in this House would say that they were incorrect in what they did, but many would say and have said that they did not go far enough. As a result, we have wrestled with the balance between the right of a Member to have the privacy most Americans expect, and the very critical necessity to reassure our fellow citizens that we are committed to operating their House, the people's House, in a fashion that will increase their confidence, rather than erode it.

Frankly, I believe that in moving to close the House payroll offices that we call the bank and in initiating the investigation into the alleged abuses that have occurred, and with a bipartisan recommendation, supported by a significant bipartisan majority, we could accomplish that objective, the objective of stopping clearly unacceptable practices by Members, of identifying Members whose practice was such as to be clearly an abuse of this service, and, most importantly, to reassure our fellow Americans that their chosen Representatives are committed to operating their House in an honest manner. We have overwhelmingly adopted the committee's report, a testimony to their work.

It became, however, very clear that such action would not be sufficient to accomplish the lateral objective. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is necessary that we do more. The full disclosure established by the Gephardt-Michel resolution responds to the need to let the American public have the facts, and, as so many have said, trust their good sense and judgment.

I have concluded that there is no way short of the full disclosure provided for by the Gephardt-Michel resolution that we can effectively move on with the confidence of the American people to the critical task of addressing the problems confronting our Nation and our people, its economic health and competitiveness, the health of our peo-

ple, the soundness of our infrastructure, the integrity of our environment, the quality of our education, the safety and security of our people, and the critical objective of reducing our budget deficit.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that each of us will learn from this unfortunate debacle, and that this House will again earn and enjoy the confidence of our people.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. Speaker, I would just tell Members that the gentleman from Oklahoma will be explaining a motion he intends to make after the vote on this motion, and there will likely be a vote very soon after that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK). The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the majority leader [Mr. GEPHARDT] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard one Member after another tonight take the well and talk about how we are going to hold faith with the American people by revealing all, by full, fair, complete disclosure. That is what the American people deserve, it is what they demand, and it is what the Members deserve. But it is not what this resolution does.

Mr. Speaker, if any Member in this Chamber believes that they are about to vote for full and complete disclosure and intend to tell the people back home that they did that, I will tell you that that is not true.

This resolution would allow you to know two things: who had an overdraft, and how many they had. Not how much they were for, not how long they were held by the bank.

Mr. Speaker, that does not tell the American people what they want to know. It does not identify who the abusers were. It is not full disclosure. It is partial and selective disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, only 66 accounts out of 435 Members were reconstructed. We never had time, I am told, to get around to the others. Fairness requires full reconstruction and disclosure, and that can be done quickly by using outside, objective, independent auditing firms.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I repeat, is not full disclosure. If one Member, believing that he had overdraft protection under the rules and practices of the bank, wrote 40 or 50 checks in the amount of $10 $12, or $14, that Member will have been seen as having 50 checks, and that Member will be an abuser. Another Member who wrote 3 checks for $10,000 each, held by the bank for a year, will get off as somebody who had a minor miscalculation, because all the constituents will see is that that Member had 3 checks.

□ 0020

My resolution also, which I am going to ask for a vote on, would require a continued complete investigation of the bank practices and procedures, including the failure of bank employees to follow their procedures, and would force the release to Members of their own records. Have you tried to get your records back from a bank so that you can reconstruct them? Those are my records, and I want them back. I want a chance to see my own records.

So I am telling Members, I think the committee has worked hard, the committee has made a good effort. We have heard many good remarks here tonight about the need for full, open disclosure. But we cannot on the one hand attack the bank for poor management, which it certainly was guilty of, and then bring to the floor a report that even the Members of the committee admit is unfair, incomplete and inaccurate.

Members deserve due process and accurate comparisons with their colleagues, and the public deserves full, complete, total, honest disclosure. I hope that when the motion is made to table or refer my resolution that Members will vote no.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, last weekend as I was wrestling with this question, as many Members were in this Chamber, it became apparent to me that full disclosure was going to be the only answer. The outrage of the citizens and my constituents certainly required it. But more importantly, the integrity of the institution demanded it and any individual concerns had to give way to the integrity of this precious institution. And yes, early news stories and other accounts suggest a pattern of abuse by some, and there are going to be some who have never received a written communication from the Sergeant at Arms' bank, never received a telephone call on an overdraft, never saw it in their statements, had no indication for years. Yet, when they go through their checks they are going to see a little red date stamped on one of those checks, and that is going to mark for the first time an indication that they had a problem.

But full disclosure is the only way to sort through this now. Full disclosure of all overdrafts is what I support. Full disclosure is the best answer, the only answer not only for this institution, but full disclosure is the only answer for all of us as individual Members.

I hope that this full disclosure provides the momentum, and for the wrestling and the anxiety that all of us have gone through in this Chamber, I hope it provides momentum for full disclosure and a desire to take on other problems in this House and to confront those other things that are challenging the very integrity of this body and its ability to function, because there are a lot of other problems out there that the public wants settled. But they want to have full confidence in this body to believe that we can settle that.

Finally, I just harken to what a constituent told me Monday in Hurricane when I talked about full disclosure and I announced my support for it. She said, "BOB, the public is smart enough to handle it. We can figure out who abused the system, and we can figure out who made a mistake. Trust the public."

That is where it ought to be.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of full disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, full disclosure is the only way to go.

The real question at stake here is not just the banking habits of Members of Congress. The real question is whether or not we, as elected public officials, should be held fully accountable to the public.

My answer to that question is "absolutely yes!"

As Members of Congress, our greatest responsibility is to be fully accountable to the voters who freely chose to send us to Washington. Our accountability for our actions is the very foundation of the free election system.

No Member of Congress should be powerful enough to keep the truth from his or her constituents. To do so is truly the worst abuse of democratic power.

Telling the whole truth is not a delicate matter—it's just the truth.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the full disclosure of any inappropriate behavior by Members of Congress regardinq the House bank. Our constituents deserve the full truth, and should not stand for any less.

This is the only way the American people can distinguish between those who were the real abusers and those who made inadvertent mistakes or are the victims of House bank mistakes.

It also is the only way the credibility and integrity of the House can begin to be restored.

I also urge my colleagues to join me in supporting an end to the abuses of power exercised by the Democratic majority in the House.

A Federal budget with a $400 billion deficit, a debt of over $4 trillion, and a House bank where the rules allowed for millions of dollars of bounced personal checks with no accountability—these are some of the results of 38 years of Democratic majority rule in the House.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, I am wholeheartedly supporting efforts for full, public, and prompt disclosure of all those who bounced checks at the House bank.

Before I explain why, let me first tell the members of the Ethics Committee—you had a tough job. An almost impossible job. A lot of people forget why you're on that committee in the first place: Because of all your peers, you are entrusted to be the most fair and most ethical. There are very few people in this body I have come to respect more, for instance, than Representative HANSEN, the ranking minority member of the Ethics Committee.

Having said that however, I must tell you that the proposal to only disclose 24 names out of the hundreds who bounced checks at the House bank isn't going to sell.

Over the past several weeks many of my colleagues have mentioned that they cannot understand why people are so upset over the House bank.

Let me share my belief why this issue has festered to the point where it now dwarfs everything else we are doing. First, we keep dragging our feet and only acting after it is too late.

Second, but most importantly, the American public is zeroed in on the House bank because they understand the issue.

We spent most of the early part of today talking about the intricacies of the 1990 budget agreement—and that's something most people don't understand and can't relate to. I happen to believe that if people did understand what we did today they would be equally outraged, but that's a different subject.

The difference on the House bank is that almost every adult in America has a checking account. They know what it means to write a check for insufficient funds. And most of all, they know that they can't do it without penalty.

You know, throughout the course of this debate I've tried to maintain a reasonable position. I don't want to be perceived as a grandstander. I don't want to tar and feather another Member who may have bounced a couple of checks now and then. No one wants to violate people's privacy by forcing them to disclose financial information that's inappropriate.

But the opportunity for us to selectively police ourselves disappeared months ago. The flat out truth is that the public doesn't trust us to make the judgment call.

All over America people are watching to see what is going to happen. The venom. The anger. The feelings of betrayal are rampant among the American public and yet, here we stand tonight, debating the fine points of how to disclose a self defined group of worst offenders in the House bank.

We are all—worst—offenders. At least that's what the American public feels. By our inaction. By our slow action.

You know, in the interest of fairness, I would think that every Member would want full disclosure. The general public can distinguish between accounting mistakes and minor overdrafts.

But most importantly, less than full disclosure will lose elections.

It will lose elections for innocent and guilty alike. It lumps everyone together.

So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this should be a simple vote. Let us vote to end it. Let us vote to get it over with.

We need to vote for full disclosure.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. OBERSTAR].

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding the time. I, too, want to join my colleagues who preceded me in complimenting the gentleman from New York on his leadership and the gentleman from Utah for the manner in which both of them have conducted themselves on this issue.

We were, all of us, elected to Congress because the people trusted us to vote in their best interests on the public policy issues before this body, to use sound judgment and to conduct ourselves honorably. They also ask us to trust them.

If we appear to be withholding information, especially unpleasant information, our actions will be seen as failing that trust. Full disclosure, with all its shortcomings, and all of the incompleteness as described by other speakers repeatedly, is unpleasant. But it is the way to fulfill the trust vested in us and to say to our constituents in return that we trust you to judge us fairly on the merits, individually, and collectively as an institution.

I believe that the leadership has taken the responsible steps last fall in coming to this body when the problem was discerned and proposing corrective action. And this body voted, and corrective action was taken at that stage. A process was set in motion, and that process reaches its fulfillment today, thanks to the gentleman from New York and those who served on that committee.

By voting this next step we will complete the circle, restore and keep faith with the trust vested in us and that we expect of the people who elected us. So let us take, however unpleasant it may be, however incomplete it may be, this step and do the right thing for this institution and for the people that elected us.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time we have remaining on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BONIOR). The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has 24 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, there is only one overriding reason for full disclosure, and it has been stated many ways by different speakers this evening, and that is that the public demands it. That is it. The public demands it and we must do it. The same public that created the Congress in the first place, erected the buildings which house it and selected the Members of this institution are the ones who are saying we are holding you to a higher standard than we would expect of the ordinary citizen. We have elected you to do constitutional duties. We have given you a high honor of being an elected official in the Nation's Capitol. We demand full disclosure. That is it. We do not have to go any farther and try to find different kinds of rationales for full and fair disclosure.

But then, on a personal basis, each one of us has a different kind of reasoning that we can state for that full disclosure. The part of the public that happens to be in my district, the part which I represent I think have a right to know whether their representative has done any over drafting in this nonbank that we had known for so many years. For that purpose, no matter how often I tell them, no matter how often I display the letter I got from the Sergeant at Arms that says that I did not overdraft, they will not be satisfied I believe, nor will I be satisfied that they will be satisfied until there is full and fair disclosure so that they will have confirmation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and as part of the public record that indeed public disclosure for their representative and for all has been accomplished.

□ 0030

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, and I commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], and the committee for its work.

Mr. Speaker, it has been most distressing that some Members have chosen during this controversy to attack so viciously the institution in which we serve.

I recall that John Quincy Adams served in the House following his term as President, noting it was never a dishonor to serve in the people's House, and history tells us that a giant of this Nation such as Henry Clay could choose between service in the Senate and a variety of other posts, but always preferred the honor and privilege of the people's House.

Regardless of what other endeavors we as individuals may go on to pursue, election to the people's House is the capstone of our career. This is the institution where the economic, regional, and cultural diversities of our Nation

come together for resolution. There is no more important calling in public service than service in the people's House.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution requiring full disclosure, but I do so with some reservations, because I know that some Members will be unjustly listed as having bounced a check that they did not. This resolution will allow an opportunity for them to challenge that listing by giving them the time to analyze their records.

More importantly, however, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, I dearly pray, will allow us to begin the healing process. We must stop the erosion of the House's credibility. We do that by adopting this resolution and putting this incident behind us. We restore the credibility of the House, however, by doing the job for which we were sent to do, that is, to address the problems facing this Nation, to deliberate and to debate potential options for solution, and then finally to make a choice, to use the legislative process for which it was intended.

It is time to get back to the true work of the House.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCCANDLESS].

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

Mr. Speaker, I note that very little new can be said here. However, I would like to share with you a couple of thoughts, because I brought a prepared text which I think is inadequate and inappropriate in view of many of the remarks that have been made.

First, the ethics committee discharged its responsibility in conformance with what it was we told them we wanted them to do. They brought back their recommendations. We know what those recommendations are. I compliment those gentlemen and lady for what they did.

It is a problem here of the House that the House now feels that they want to go beyond what their original discharge was. We need to keep that in mind when we talk in terms of what we are doing here now and what the Ethics Committee has recommended to us, and that is why we go to the next step.

Our constituency out there has seen the straw that has broken their camel's back, one thing after another in recent times dealing with the House of Representatives, and now all of a sudden we have this.

The problem here then is a solution that is acceptable to the public which might put us back on the same track, and that solution is necessary, because when you and I were elected to public office, whether it was BOB MICHEL, during that period, or somebody since like myself, you automatically gave up your private life, whether you agreed to or not, and you are living in a fishbowl and, therefore, because you live in a fishbowl, you no longer have the rights and privileges of the average person that you say hello and goodbye to in a town hall. We need to accept that point, and, therefore, we cannot have a dual standard of conduct.

We have to have a conduct equal to or better than our constituency. An old-timer told me one time, "When you are in elective office and you are wondering whether to do it, don't," because that is the best decision you are going to make.

Here this evening I am going to support full disclosure, because it is kind of like a boil on the arm. Unless you completely lance that boil, there is no way that it is going to get cured unless you completely lance it, because if you do not, it will continue to fester, and we will continue to have problems.

I support the full disclosure.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

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

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, and as the previous speaker indicated, there is not much more I think that one could add to what has already been said.

But as the only independent in the Congress, the only Member who is not a Democrat or beholden to the Democratic leadership, or a Republican beholden to the Republican leadership, I just want to share a few views with you.

I rise in strong support of full disclosure. We have heard tonight over and over again how poorly this so-called bank was run, and I think that is true. We have heard that there are individuals who bounced checks who never knew about it. That is true. We have heard that the records being kept by the so-called bank were inaccurate. That is true. But we also know that there were people who for a number of years systematically abused the system.

It is appropriate that the sun shine in and let the people get all the facts. I strongly support full disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question, I think, that the people of this country are outraged. They are outraged at the U.S. Congress, the House, the Senate controlled by the Democrats; they are outraged at the President of the United States who happens to be a Republican.

What makes me very sad tonight and why this is a very sad evening is that I know what the headlines in the papers tomorrow will say. They will deal with what we are talking about tonight, and I know what the headlines will say for the next month. They will talk about Members bouncing checks.

Do you want to talk about banking? How many of you know, how many citizens know that the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs voted another $25 billion bailout for the savings-and-loan institutions to fall back on the working people and poor people? It is not going to be in the papers tomorrow. This bank instance will be in the papers.

The people are outraged, and what they are feeling, what they are expressing about this issue is the tip of the iceberg.

Do you know why they are outraged? They are outraged because this country almost uniquely in the world does not have national health care, and we are talking about bounced checks right here. They are outraged that the rich get richer and do not pay their fair share of taxes.

If we want to be honest with the people, we need full disclosure. Let us bring this out. Let us get if over with.

Mr. Speaker, but we will never regain the confidence of the American people unless we have the guts to stand with working people, elderly people, and poor people, take on the moneyed interests that are dominating this country and this institution, and let us go forward. If we speak for the people, they will have respect for this institution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, the greatest deliberative body known to man is faced with a crisis of credibility. It seems to me if we are going to govern we must come forward with full disclosure.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE].

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I support full disclosure, because I believe in this institution and in the need to restore public confidence in it.

But after large tax hikes on people who can ill afford it, significant spending increases despite massive deficits and major job cutbacks throughout America is a recession, people do not appreciate what amounts to interest-free loans to House Members.

□ 0040

In addition to that controversy, allegations of unpaid restaurant tabs and allegations of drug dealing and other improprieties in the House post office and, perhaps most significantly, perhaps most significantly here, Mr. Speaker, congressional inaction on many of the most pressing problems that confront America have combined to give the Congress a historically low public approval rating by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, the House is a great institution in serious disrepair. The road to reform must begin with full disclosure. I urge an "aye" vote for this resolution.

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

Mr. WEISS. I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this full-disclosure resolution. I too want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the work that they have done and to compliment the leadership on both sides of the aisle for bringing this resolution before us.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear that the people of this country demand full disclosure, and I think we have an obligation to give it to them.

Those of you who heard me at the opening of today's session know that this is the 54th anniversary of my arrival in this country, and what an exalted place I consider the people's House of Representatives to be.

I think we have a long way to climb back to justify our being considered worthy of serving in such an exalted place. I hope that, as full disclosure takes place, that the Ethics Committee would undertake one more difficult and onerous job, and that is to provide some guidance to the people who will be interpreting all of those records, the media, the press and the public at large.

Mr. Speaker, we have already created one category in the 24 people who were the subject of the first resolution. I hope you find it possible to create some other categories so that we know what the separations are between people who abuse and people who are caught up either because of bad bookkeeping by the bank, or by bad inadvertent bookkeeping by Members.

Again, I thank the distinguished leader for yielding time to me.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I just came from a series of press conferences that I have done with my media from San Diego for the last 10 hours or so, telling them that I would strongly oppose the full disclosure because of what I saw, with respect to the damage that was going to be done to innocent families and to people who relied on a practice of using the House bank assuming that they had overdraft protection and having their overdrafts in fact protected, and now, those people are going to have that overdraft protection retroactively pulled away. That is going to hold them up to great danger, and difficulty in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I have come from 10 or so press conferences. I in fact disclosed fully myself yesterday, and left the press knee-deep in my paperwork and requested the House bank for anything that they want. I have disclosed fully, and I did that so I could come out here today, right now, and oppose full disclosure.

Well, I heard 3 speeches. I heard BOB MICHEL'S speech when he said we have to open up this House of Representatives with this vote. I say to the gentleman from Illinois, "Thank you" for making that speech.

I heard my friend, the gentleman from Virginia, FRANK WOLF, in the back, along with the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, and the gentlewoman from Maryland, HELEN BENTLEY, and several others tell me that I did not have the right regardless of how I feel about the unfairness—and there is unfairness in this vote—to make my son have to explain that vote. And finally, I heard a last speech, and it was a speech that occurred just a minute ago in the cloakroom when my model, my father, Robert Hunter, called me up and said these words. He said, "The issue is now public trust. Ye must vote 'yes.'"

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote "yes."

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what we are voting on tonight is not about bounced checks of some Members. I think the people already know about that. The real issue we are deciding upon tonight is America's right to know. For any member of any committee of the House to drag their feet or in any way hold up disclosure of this matter completely disregards the will of the people as well as the trust they place in this institution.

And do not try to kid the American public by saying that taxpayer dollars were not involved. That is an insult to their intelligence when Members say that. These funds were in an account at the U.S. Treasury, not the Members' treasury, the congressional treasury, but the U.S. Treasury. And the fact is taxpayer dollars were spent on the House bank. First, by GAO estimates, employee expenses associated with running the bank cost the taxpayers more than $720,000. Second, the Treasury Department, the U.S. Treasury, paid compensation to private banks that administered the Members' payroll accounts. How much that cost we do not know.

Third, between 1981 and 1991, the Committee on House Administration put more than $6,800 of public funds into the House bank to make up for shortfalls.

Those were taxpayer dollars, pure and simple, and I believe that we have to protect the taxpayer dollars.

You know, there are people who get put in jail for writing bad checks. Whether this thing was a legal bank or not is immaterial. When I was in the military, guys got kicked out of the military for writing bad checks. Today they are booted out of our academies for one bad check.

Here in this House it has been overlooked. You know, this is a great institution. The whole of this great Nation is greater than any of its parts. And likewise, this House of Representatives, I believe, is stronger than the Members in it.

This institution needs reform, and we need to bring the whole episode into light. Let us show faith in this country and vote for full disclosure.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CHAPMAN].

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the full-disclosure resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SLATTERY].

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening just very briefly to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and all the members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct who have worked so hard on it. I deeply appreciate what they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution for full disclosure. I have eminent confidence in the common sense of the people of this country, their ability to look at all the information when it is given to them, and to arrive at a sensible conclusion.

I conclude by observing this is one Member who was told by officials in the bank, when I inquired about deposit and overdraft protection, that it was not available in the House. However, they went on to say that the practice was to advance a Member's pay for the next month. That is what this Member was told a number of years ago. I just want that to be very clear to some people here this evening, that some of us were told that was the overdraft protection plan of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate everybody's participation here this evening.herd

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, first let me commend my good friend, DUNCAN HUNTER, who just spoke, for what I think is one of the best speeches that he has ever made on the House floor. I would also like to commend many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who, after this vote, are in all probability going to be subjected to quite a bit of personal pain. But I must say, as I stand here, that each of us, each of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives represent approximately half a

million Americans; and collectively we represent 250 million Americans. We have an obligation as Members, of what we proudly refer to as the people's body, to conduct ourselves as most of the people that we represent conduct themselves. We are here tonight to debate what to do about the operations and the disclosure of the individual accounts of what we commonly refer to as the House bank. The House bank was originally created as a convenience to Members so they would have a place to deposit their salary checks and draw on these checks because they did not have the time to go downtown to the Treasury Department.

□ 1250

What was originally a well-intentioned convenience became some sort of a monster in which many Members thought it was an acceptable practice to write checks that they knew they did not have sufficient funds to cover and that they knew, because of informal arrangements, those checks would be covered for an extended period of time.

Now I ask my colleagues, "How many Americans that we represent have that convenience?" Not many.

I also would ask my colleagues, based on the resolution that we have already passed, if those Americans would accept as a normal standard of abuse or of conduct 8 months in a 39-month period having over a month's salary extended. That is certainly a standard, but I do not think it is a normal standard.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the fullest disclosure possible, and in doing that I would like to point out something that no other Member has yet pointed out.

We are the first Congress, the 102d Congress is the first Congress, that is willing to do something about the imprudent checking practices that have been going on for years, and years, and years. This Congress should be commended for doing something that is long overdue.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise again, as I did on Wednesday, in support of full public disclosure of all Members who are involved in the House bank scandal. While the majority has tried to forestall consideration of this very issue, if my colleagues believe in superstition, we have now ominously had this delayed until Friday the 13th. For this body, integrity is very important, and public trust is important. It is also important to clear the record for those Members who had nothing to do with any of this scandal.

Mr. Speaker, we need to attempt to improve the reputation of the House of Representatives, and the committee's resolution alone is unacceptable and must be replaced in attitude with this one which is requiring public disclosure. The people and the resolve of a few Members have embarrassed the ruling party into doing what is the right thing, which is full public disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the first step in a marathon of steps that will be necessary to reform this body and restore public trust.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], the minority whip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BONIOR). The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 9½ minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to those who just hissed that I can get through in 6, and, if they want me to go on for 9½, they just feel free to start.

I rise to support full disclosure. I am going to talk of controversial things. I make no apology for this.

Mr. Speaker, I have been talking about ethics for 18 years, starting with my announcement in 1974 for Congress.

This House has a legitimate tradition of an honorable Ethics Committee, and I commend both the chairman and the ranking member for upholding that tradition. Compared with the other body we have been extraordinarily tough for over a decade, and I believe they honorably met that standard.

But this process tonight on this floor is just plain outrageous. The chutzpah, the hubris, the gall of Democratic leader after Democratic leader coming to the floor tonight and wrapping themselves in bipartisanship and referring to the, quote, bipartisan leadership, close quote.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "Possibly you have no idea how you behave. Possibly you truly are so overwhelmed by the arrogance of power to such a degree that you simply cannot understand the gap between your words and your actions."

While waiving the bipartisan banner, the Democratic leadership opened this evening's session with a purely narrow partisan action. The Democratic leadership tonight appointed an interim Sergeant at Arms. There was no consultation with the Republican leaders. There was no bipartisanship. Frankly, if we had been asked, we would have objected to the appointment of a man who may have been involved in actions stopping the Capitol Police from investigating cocaine selling in the post office.

Mr. Speaker, we were not consulted by the Democratic leadership, but, if their choice leads to another scandal, I am certain they will seek bipartisan cover to avoid responsibility.

This failure to be candid about power and responsibility extends to the generally fine report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. On page 11 it states, and I quote:

The Sergeant at Arms is an officer of the House elected by vote of all Members.

That sentence, Mr. Speaker, is simply misleading. The Sergeant at Arms is a Democratic patronage position appointed by the Democratic caucus and reporting to the Democratic Speaker. We Republicans had no choice, no control, and no oversight. But we Republicans become coresponsible during the cleanup, and many Republicans will be hurt by the actions of the Democratic leadership and the Democratic Sergeant at Arms.

Consider the case of my dear friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HOPKINS], and I have his permission to talk about this. When the House bank scandal broke, LARRY was running for Governor and stated confidently that he had never written a bad check. Then he found, to his shock, that the Democratic Sergeant at Arms had never told him, but he had written checks with insufficient funds. The gentleman from Kentucky kept his word to the press and told the Kentucky reporters, and my colleagues may ask LARRY who is sitting on this floor. Then two reporters told him they had already been given the correct number by a Democratic source. So I say to my colleagues, "You want to know how bitter we are? You want to know how deeply we feel this? Talk to LARRY."

Tonight we have Democratic cosponsorship of full disclosure. Yet last fall the Democratic Speaker declared the matter closed. All this week the Democratic leadership tried to block full disclosure. Only when public outrage had mounted and the Democratic back benchers had rebelled did the Democratic leadership agree to full disclosure.

And I might say to those who just talked about the Washington Times that even that commitment to full disclosure was less than the original Johnston-Kyl resolution because the Democratic leadership told us the Washington Times has already printed the 66 accounts and we could match them up.

Tonight we have a post office cocaine selling scandal, a House banking scandal, and other scandals are coming, and those who are responsible hiss. Tonight we have heard partisan Democrats claim bipartisanship to get through the scandal. Yet we have already heard these same partisan Democrats talk about a new House Administrator. As currently proposed, that Administrator will be chosen by Democrats, report to Democrats, and be controlled by Democrats. Republicans will be consulted only after the next scandal, and then bipartisanship will be invoked to cloak the Democrats' responsibility for this scandal.

I feel sorry for the innocent who will be hurt in the disclosures and for the bank staff who will suffer because they obeyed the Democratic leadership's orders.

Tonight the Democratic leader called it, quote, a flawed system over which they had no control, close quote. That was simply not accurate. The Democratic leadership always had control over a flawed system which they maintained and protected.

Yet the Democratic leadership seeks scapegoats to sacrifice. They found one today in Jack Russ.

Back in 1989, when we were in the last cycle of House Democratic scandal, Meg Greenfield wrote a remarkably perceptive analysis. Let me quote Meg Greenfield.

It always seems to me that the congressional punishers have got it exactly wrong. They undermine their own acts. And retroactively cast doubt on the integrity of their own motives when they say, as they nearly always do, God, that was enough, now let's just let the next ones go through to show what amicable souls we are. They highlight the arbitrariness of what they have done. They deprive it as standing and meaning. It sometimes seems to me as if we have a kind of neo-Aztec cast of mind in this city. Periodically we seem to need to perform a ritual political execution. Usually, though not always, there is a fairly respectable case against the unfortunate one, but there is a blood lust of sorts. Then it's over.

Greenfield closed by saying this:

This habit itself is what accounts for much of the contempt in which our capital is held. The careful, and I think responsible indictment of Jim Wright will ultimately be judged by whether it helps to create new standards rather than merely to finish off another old pol.

We stand here tonight, and I beg of all my colleagues, Democrat, Republican, if we go down the same road to the same one-sided appointments, the same lack of accountability, the same secrecy, the same arbitrariness, we will be back at this same stand with another scandal, and another scandal, and another scandal.

□ 0100

But I am perfectly prepared if anybody on the other side wants to work together to talk through how we can truly open this place up. I know it is hard for you who have controlled this place since 1954, to contemplate it, but you cannot stand many more blows like in the last year. If you want them, you just keep being secretive, you keep it covered up, but the American people are not going to tolerate much more of this.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, can we have the words taken down?

Mr. GINGRICH. Nice try, fellow. It doesn't work.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, of all the events that have occurred in this Chamber in recent days, the one I regret most is the event that has just taken place. We can have an opportunity to disagree, we can disagree fundamentally on some philosophical issues, and we can disagree on policy, but at least we have usually had the decency not to attack an individual of blameless reputation and absolutely sterling service to this House as the gentleman from Georgia just made on Werner Brandt.

The law provides that I as Speaker have the responsibility to make an interim and temporary appointment in the event of any vacancy in the office of any of the officers of the House, pending election by the House of Representatives. To suggest some misbehavior without proof, without validation, and without cause by a man of sterling reputation is a despicable act. There is a point at which the patience of decent people ought to say: "Enough."

We should work together, but to suggest that we can work together in an environment of innuendo, suspicion, and suggestions of impropriety is not helpful.

I have the greatest respect for the Republican Minority, and during the time I have been in office I have said repeatedly that one responsibility of the Speaker is to deal fairly with both sides of the aisle.

I want to hope that we will not have a repetition of the kind of address that has just been made by the Republican whip. The suggestion that we have sought to block this resolution is patently untrue. It is patently untrue. I will ask the Republican leader of this House if we have not said from the beginning of our conversations that there would be a clear opportunity for a resolution to be offered for full disclosure. There was never any question that that would be offered on the House floor. There was never any question it would be voted tonight. The objection seems to be that it is bipartisan. The complaint seems to be made that the majority leader is joining with the distinguished Republican leader in its sponsorship. Is that wrong? Is that unwise? Is that unfair? Is that unprincipled?

We have the task of repairing the reputation of this House. We have the task to show to the American people that we intend to see that deficiencies in its operation are corrected. I am determined to see that that happens, and I am willing to work with anyone on the Republican side, including the whip from Georgia, if he is serious in his offer. But he ought to set aside the cruel and unfortunate tendency to blame and to confuse in his desire to seek political ends. If we can do that, then we can advance the interests of our body and the interests of the responsibility which we jointly share.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan resolution to disclose all overdrafts at the House bank. I would like to commend the distinguished majority and minority leaders for bringing this resolution to the floor. I was proud to support Ms. JOHNSON and Mr. KYL in their legislation to obtain full disclosure and commend them for their efforts.

It is important that the people of this Nation know what their Representatives are doing in Washington. I believe full disclosure is the only way to satisfy the questions the American people have about their Representatives.

Let the people decide who has abused the House bank.

The American people demand full disclosure.

The American people deserve full disclosure.

The American people should get full disclosure.

That is why I feel full disclosure is so important. We need to make sure that Members of Congress know that they are no different than their constituents at home. Full disclosure will ensure that Members will face the consequences of having written overdrafts. I have great faith that our constituents will be fair in determining which Members abused the house bank and which did not. I can think of no better standard than the judgment of the American people.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). Pursuant to the order of the House today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HANSEN. 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 426, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—426

Abercrombie	Blackwell	Coleman (MO)
Ackerman	Bliley	Coleman (TX)
Alexander	Boehlert	Combest
Allard	Boehner	Condit
Allen	Bonior	Cooper
Anderson	Borski	Costello
Andrews (ME)	Boucher	Coughlin
Andrews (NJ)	Boxer	Cox (CA)
Andrews (TX)	Brewster	Cox (IL)
Annunzio	Brooks	Coyne
Anthony	Broomfield	Cramer
Applegate	Browder	Crane
Archer	Brown	Cunningham
Armey	Bruce	Darden
Aspin	Bryant	Davis
Atkins	Bunning	de la Garza
AuCoin	Burton	DeFazio
Bacchus	Bustamante	DeLauro
Baker	Byron	DeLay
Ballenger	Callahan	Dellums
Barnard	Camp	Derrick
Barrett	Campbell (CA)	Dickinson
Barton	Campbell (CO)	Dicks
Bateman	Cardin	Dingell
Beilenson	Carper	Dixon
Bennett	Carr	Donnelly
Bentley	Chandler	Dooley
Bereuter	Chapman	Doolittle
Berman	Clay	Dorgan (ND)
Bevill	Clement	Dornan (CA)
Bilbray	Clinger	Downey
Bilirakis	Coble	Dreier

Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Dymally
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gradison
Grandy
Green
Guarini
Gunderson
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (OH)
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Owens (UT)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—9

Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Dannemeyer
Lehman (FL)
Miller (CA)
Moran
Savage
Whitten

□ 0122

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I missed the previous rollcall inadvertently. Had I been here, I would have asked to be recorded aye.

INSTRUCTING SPEAKER AND COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT TO TAKE CERTAIN STEPS TOWARD FULL DISCLOSURE IN THE MATTER OF INQUIRY INTO THE OPERATION OF THE BANK OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 397), and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 397

Whereas, disclosure of the banking activities of House Members who held accounts in the House Bank during the period under investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should be full and complete; and

Whereas, full disclosure is not possible now because not all accounts have been adequately reconstructed to reflect action taken by the account holder and by Bank officials and tellers; and

Whereas, the Report of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to accompany H. Res. 393 cited irregular and unprofessional practices by House Bank employees that may have contributed to the frequency of overdrafts; and

Whereas, a full accounting is needed of official House Bank policies, routine informal practices of House Bank employees that deviated from or were not covered by official rules, and each case in which employees failed to follow official or informal procedures, and the effect of such failures on Members' balances; and

Whereas, Members of Congress are now being denied access to their own personal bank records: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) immediately upon passage of this resolution, the Speaker shall direct the House Sergeant at Arms, the General Accounting Office, and any other body under his control with information relevant to Members' House Bank account histories, to reconstruct the complete account histories of all Members and former Members who had accounts for the 39 month period beginning July 1, 1988 and ending October 3, 1991 that have not already been reconstructed in coordination with the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and

(2) that, after giving each Member an opportunity to be heard by the subcommittee which conducted the inquiry and 20 days after passage of this resolution, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is authorized to publicly disclose the reconstructed account history of every Member of the House, and

(3) that, within 20 days of passage of this resolution, the Speaker of the House shall direct the House Sergeant at Arms, the General Accounting Office, and any other body under his control with information relevant to Members' House Bank account histories or House Bank practices, to provide a full and complete report of the official policies of the House Bank over the 39 month period in question; a full and complete account of the procedures that were not official but were informally and routinely followed by bank employees (including instances where informal practices deviated from official policies), and a full and complete account of every instance in which the Bank failed to follow either its own official procedures or routine and regular informal procedures, and a case by case report of the effect that such deviations have had on Members' account balances, and.

(4) that, within 48 hours of the passage of this resolution, the Speaker of the House, through the House Sergeant at Arms, the GAO, and any other body under his control with information relevant to Members account histories, provide to each Member of the House a full disclosure of that Member's account history with the House Bank.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution constitutes a question of privilege.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GEPHARDT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to refer the resolution to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has spoken on the subject matter of this resolution during the debate on the previous resolution. This resolution concerns the manner in which the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct must operate regarding records of the House bank, and is appropriately referred to that committee.

Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. I addressed the House on this matter earlier.

I want to first explain to the Members what is involved here, and secondly to say it is my understanding that the gentleman from Missouri has moved to refer this to the committee, and I am going to ask the Members to vote against that motion to refer this resolution to the committee. I am going to do so because, as I said earlier, it is only this motion which gives the Members of the House an opportunity to vote for full disclosure.

The resolution that was just passed provides for the release of names of persons who had overdrafts and the number of overdrafts. My resolution would, both in fairness to the Members who deserve due process and to our constituents, add to that the number of checks and the amount of the checks that were overdrawn and the duration for which those checks were held so that our constituents can really tell the difference between those persons who were merely paying their bills, and those persons who were abusing the system for some other purpose.

I would say, because I have been asked about the delay that might result, my resolution calls for this to be done within 20 days, a full reconstruction of the accounts. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], who I respect enormously, and who chaired this committee, has let me know that even prior to this point the GAO, if only the GAO auditors had been involved, could have had this entire thing done by May. So I am saying it is possible by going to outside sources to have all these accounts reconstructed. I am not trying to get into a delay, but within 20 days all of this could be done, and then we would have not a partial disclosure but a full, complete, honest disclosure.

So I would urge the Members of the body to vote against the motion to refer.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield such time as he may continue to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me. I know the time is late.

Let me just say this: The resolution is very well intended, and I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman from Oklahoma. We spent an awful lot of time going through this, and I personally do not think that it would be possible for the GAO or any group to put this together in 20 days.

□ 0130

We have 10 auditors, and they are almost standing on each other. We have got only one set of books. We have got only so much we can work with. If we went ahead, we would find ourselves in the position of going all the way to Christmas, in my humble opinion, before we could put this together.

I know it is well intentioned. My heart goes out to you. I wish we could accommodate you, but I have to speak against this at this time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume, for the purposes of debate only, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly concur with our ranking member on the committee, although I have supported in my remarks tonight fair disclosure, and I think the gentleman from Oklahoma is trying very hard to achieve that.

Even 20 days hence reopens this very painful issue, and I think all of us who unanimously supported the last resolution would not look forward to that.

Remember, the burden of proof is now on every Member of this body to provide that information in his own local court of public opinion, and, yes, there will be problems with the full disclosure of only the number of checks, but it has been the unanimous decision of the House to go forward with that.

I think it would be the unanimous decision of the House to keep the process going for each individual Member, and I would ask the body to reject this resolution.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman from Utah and the gentleman from Iowa, and appreciate their concerns.

We are talking here about the lives and the careers and the reputations of every Member of this body. We are also talking about the rights of our constituents to know who did what, who abused the system, who merely made mistakes, you know, what happened.

I would suggest, first of all, it is ludicrous to say that this would take until Christmas. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] himself said that the GAO could do it much sooner.

One final point, if we are talking about getting it done today or getting it done in 3 weeks accurately, fairly, and completely, it seems to me that that is the way we ought to go. The public deserves, and all of these Members deserve, through the right of due process, a complete, accurate, full disclosure, and what we have passed so far is not full disclosure.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to refer.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The question is on the motion to refer offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 150, noes 275, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

AYES—150

Abercrombie	Gallo	Obey
Ackerman	Gaydos	Owens (NY)
Alexander	Gejdenson	Oxley
Allen	Gephardt	Pastor
Anderson	Gibbons	Paxon
Andrews (TX)	Gingrich	Payne (NJ)
Annunzio	Goss	Payne (VA)
Anthony	Grandy	Pelosi
Aspin	Gunderson	Pickle
Baker	Hansen	Price
Ballenger	Hastert	Pursell
Barnard	Hayes (IL)	Rangel
Blackwell	Hefley	Rhodes
Billey	Hefner	Ridge
Boehner	Hertel	Riggs
Bonior	Hobson	Roe
Borski	Holloway	Rose
Boxer	Hutto	Roth
Brooks	Jefferson	Roukema
Brown	Jenkins	Rowland
Bustamante	Johnson (CT)	Roybal
Cardin	Johnston	Sabo
Clay	Jones (NC)	Saxton
Clement	Kennelly	Scheuer
Coble	Kleczka	Schroeder
Coleman (MO)	Kolbe	Serrano
Coleman (TX)	Kopetski	Shays
Conyers	Kyl	Shuster
Coyne	Lantos	Skaggs
Darden	Laughlin	Smith (FL)
de la Garza	Levin (MI)	Smith (IA)
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dicks	Manton	Swett
Dingell	Martinez	Swift
Dixon	Matsui	Thornton
Donnelly	Mavroules	Torres
Dooley	Mazzoli	Torricelli
Dornan (CA)	McCrery	Towns
Dwyer	McCurdy	Traxler
Edwards (CA)	McDade	Unsoeld
Fascell	McDermott	Vento
Fawell	McHugh	Visclosky
Fazio	McMillan (NC)	Vucanovich
Feighan	Meyers	Walker
Flake	Michel	Washington
Foglietta	Miller (OH)	Waters
Foley	Mollohan	Weiss
Ford (MI)	Murtha	Wolpe
Ford (TN)	Natcher	Young (AK)
Frank (MA)	Oberstar	Zeliff

NOES—275

Allard	Boucher	Costello
Andrews (ME)	Brewster	Coughlin
Andrews (NJ)	Broomfield	Cox (CA)
Applegate	Browder	Cox (IL)
Archer	Bruce	Cramer
Armey	Bryant	Crane
Atkins	Bunning	Cunningham
AuCoin	Burton	Davis
Bacchus	Byron	DeFazio
Barrett	Callahan	DeLauro
Barton	Camp	DeLay
Bateman	Campbell (CA)	Derrick
Bellenson	Campbell (CO)	Dickinson
Bennett	Carper	Doolittle
Bentley	Carr	Dorgan (ND)
Bereuter	Chandler	Downey
Berman	Chapman	Dreier
Bevill	Clinger	Duncan
Bilbray	Combest	Durbin
Bilirakis	Condit	Dymally
Boehlert	Cooper	Early

Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Gradison
Green
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Harris
Hatcher
Hayes (LA)
Henry
Herger
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones (GA)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kildee
Klug
Kolter
Kostmayer
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
LaRocco
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lent
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Mfume
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Mrazek
Murphy
Myers
Nagle
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Olin
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Pease
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Poshard
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Russo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Traficant
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Walsh
Waxman
Weber
Weldon
Wheat
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wyden
Wylie
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—10

Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Dannemeyer
Lehman (FL)
Miller (CA)
Moran
Savage
Stark
Whitten
Yates

□ 0154

Messrs. HAYES of Louisiana, McCLOSKEY, EVANS, MRAZEK, FROST and MONTGOMERY, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. PORTER, Ms. DELAURO, Messrs. ORTIZ, AUCOIN, RICHARDSON and GORDON, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Messrs. BOUCHER, HOCHBRUECKNER, DEFAZIO, MINETA, OWENS of Utah, HUGHES, MOAKLEY, LAROCCO, SPRATT, HOYER, and DERRICK changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. McCURDY, RIGGS, McMILLAN of North Carolina, PAXON, and ROTH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to refer was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONIOR). The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in claiming my time on this motion I will speak briefly on it, and then I would be glad to yield for a few minutes to the majority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], who, I am sure, will also want to be heard on it.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] is in charge of the hour's time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has the hour.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, we do have two or three speakers that we would like to have speak, if that would be all right with the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly will yield to Members.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that I have heard a number of comments to suggest that some Members are concerned that we may be, by doing this, creating an undue delay in presenting the results. I want to make it very clear that there is no intention to have a delay. I have told the people in my district through my press that I intend to release as quickly as possible all of my records, and the resolution which I present instructs the Speaker to fully reconstruct the bank account history of every current and former Members' bank account within 20 days.

Now this is very interesting. When this House wants to move, to do things that it desires to do, it can move very quickly, but now we are being told, with Members' reputations and careers on the line, "Oh, God, we can't do that in 20 days. How can we do that in 20 days?"

I say to my colleagues, "Well, you can make copies. you could retain outside firms rather than the GAO and have outside independent auditors look at these records."

Mr. Speaker, I have made it clear, I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH] that I said, when he told me that this could have been done by May, that he was referring to the GAO auditors. I understand that. But I am saying we are not limited to only using that operation and those people. The 20 days, I might say, is no longer than the period built into the previous resolution for Members to go through the appellate process.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have a curtain falling on us at midnight tomorrow night that says by midnight tomorrow night we act fair or unfair, accurate or inaccurate. It is a duty we owe to the people of this country, as well as to the members who deserve due process. It is a duty we owe for the people out there to know who wrote a small check to the local filling station or the local grocery store and who wrote a check for multiple tens of thousands of dollars held by the House bank for a year.

Mr. Speaker, what we have done earlier does not do any of that. It is not disclosure. It is partial, selective, tiny little bits of information that we hope will pacify the public and get them off of our backs. That is not what the purpose is here. The purpose is to give full, complete, public disclosure, and that is what they expect of us.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that, I am going to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH], who had asked for some time, for the purposes of debate only.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] for yielding this time to me.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman's concern about the prior resolution, and I expressed this also on the floor in my opening statement because it is partial disclosure, and it does not show deficiencies, as the gentleman from Oklahoma has said.

But I must say to the gentleman for whom I have great respect, and I must say to the House that it is, on the basis of our experience, totally unrealistic to think that all of the account histories of the Members of the House, 435 Members, less the 66 that have already been reconstructed, can be done in anything close to 20 days.

□ 0200

Now, we have been at work, as Members know, on these 66 accounts for 4 or 5 months. We wanted to speed up the investigation because we understood that all the Members were under great anxiety to have this matter disposed of, and we asked the GAO, "Would it be helpful if you brought in more people, either GAO people or contract people, to speed up your reconstruction of these accounts?" And we were told by the GAO—I am not an expert but I am relating what they told us—that it would not help to bring in more than the 10 people they had because there

were limitations in terms of using the information. This is a lot of information that is on microfiche. All the checks of Members were on microfiche. The monthly statements were on microfiche. There are limitations of space.

The fact of the matter is that I cannot assure the Members that it could be done in anything like 20 days, and based upon what I know, it seems to me highly unlikely that we could do anything like that.

They told us weeks ago that it would take until some time in May to have the 355 accounts, less the 66, reconstructed. The gentleman is now talking about a total of 435, less the 66. So it seems to me unrealistic, if I may say so, that this could be done in anything like 20 days.

Moreover, I do not have any idea of what this would cost. I share the gentleman's concern about disclosure. There will be mistakes. The gentleman is correct to express those reservations, but we are going to undertake an enormous amount of work which in my judgment will take a tremendous amount of time, and at what cost no one can say. Perhaps the gentleman has some estimate as to how much this would cost, assuming it could be done within the time limits.

But I think the Members have to appreciate that we are going into a black hole here in terms of work, time, and cost, and while in principle the gentleman raises an important point which I share, the inequity and unsatisfactory nature of what is called full disclosure under the prior resolution is, I am afraid, not the answer.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

First of all, the gentleman probably has more trust in the GAO's ability than perhaps some of us on this side might have. But I might suggest that the 10 auditors of the GAO saw this as the only way to proceed, as I indicated, the GAO said they could, with their small army, their mini-army of people, have done this by May. That is only 51 days from now, and I am talking about 20. And that is with their little group of people.

The gentleman from New York and I are both on the Appropriations Committee, and I would say to the gentleman that I appreciate his concern. I appreciate his concern that this might have some cost involved in hiring a firm to go into determining what the facts are. Nonetheless, when this House passed its resolution in the first place, it held out to the public that it was going to investigate and report. We did not say to the public that was listening and watching when this was on the floor the last time, "Well, we will look at maybe 50 or 60 guys and we will see what we can find. Maybe we can draw a line, and then time may run out and we will stop at 66." That is not what they want. They want full disclosure.

Everybody knows the stories that have been going around about what has been involved in the procedures of the House Bank, and the gentleman cannot tell me that if we disclose only the people and the number of checks, we have disclosed anything. If we do not tell how big those checks were and for how long those checks were held, we have not disclosed anything.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma, for yielding. I was one of the original ones who expressed the concern, and I still have the same concern. My question would be, what if at the end of 20 days we cannot complete this? What is the procedure? This could go on and on and on.

If I was an individual that had something to hide, I would want to extend it through December.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I might respond to my friend and say that if I was one who had something to hide, I would say, "Stop now. You haven't revealed anything about me. Let's call it off now."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. What is the procedure, then, at the end of the 20 days?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. It calls for it to be done in 20 days. The last time we did it, we put in a deadline. There are detailees. The committees have detailees from one agency after another over here. We have people we can put on this, and I am just saying, if you want to vote not to reveal all this other information, you have the right to do that, but you are going to have to explain it back home.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman, and I agree 100 percent that it should be disclosed. But my only concern is that at the end of the 20 days, if, as my friend over here says, it cannot be done or it possibly cannot be done, what is the procedure at the end of the 20 days so we can carry on with our business and get this resolved?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the gentleman what I am willing to do. This is not part of the resolution, but if 20 days from now the gentleman from New York comes back to us and says: "With all the detailees that are available to us, with the entire Federal Government at our disposal, with the GAO and with the ability to appropriate money for Arthur Andersen or any other company to do this, we just somehow cannot get it done." If they say, "I'm sorry, guys, but we can't find the information," then I will be glad to try to bring a privileged motion to the floor and get it released at that time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And revert to the original?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Sure. But I think anybody who does that will have to explain why there were somehow records of some Members we could not reconstruct, why there were a lot of other guys we just could not get done. I do not want to have to go home and explain that.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that I think the gentleman makes a good argument when it comes to some issues such as face values, for instance, but let me simply say that I think if anybody in this House who voted for the previous two resolutions tonight thinks that face value for each Member is not going to come out, they are smoking something that is not legal, it is.

And let me say something else. I am deeply concerned that if this motion passes, it will result in delay for two reasons: First, because I think it is apparent that to try to produce the kind of information the gentleman is talking about is simply going to take a lot longer than 20 days; and, second, because of that, I think it is likely to stop what I expect to see, a flood of disclosures from all kinds of Members over the next week to 2 weeks. I see on the wires individual Members are already disclosing tonight. A lot of others are going to be doing it early next week.

It seems to me that Members are going to slow down if this passes tonight because they are not going to want to walk into a situation where they go out and explain what they think is their situation and then they find out that because someone has come in with a slightly different accounting procedure, a slightly different organizational structure, they wind up being made a liar on technicalities. So I think the result may very well be that we are going to have a lot of Members who will decide to wait. They will say, "I am just going to wait and see what happens." That will mean that a lot of Members who would otherwise have been disclosing over the next week or 10 days are going to be delaying for a long time. I do not think you want that.

□ 0210

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say to the gentleman, first of all the result of this partial and selective disclosure that the House has already voted for is that you are not likely to see very many of the people who had a

small number of checks, even though they may have been for large amounts, rushing out to disclose anything, because they do not need to.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I was simply going to say that that certainly is not what I expect. I think Members who have very little to worry about are going to be the first ones to disclose, and they would be smart to do so.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me also say there are two other parts of this resolution, as I explained earlier. One of those parts is to require that the people who have our bank records give them to us. Every member of the press is going to know that we can no longer say, "I can't tell you what I did. I don't know how many checks I had because I can't get my records." So the press can be on everyone's case, because you will be allowed to get your records back from the people who have them.

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

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I offered to refer this motion to committee because I thought the ideas of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] were well-intentioned. But I want to bring to the attention of Members some structural flaws that I find in this resolution beyond the whole matter of delay.

First of all, as I understand the privileged resolution, and I will ask the Chair for a parliamentary opinion in a moment, but if this privileged resolution were to pass, this would preempt the previous privileged resolutions. Were that to be the case, then there is no provision in this privileged resolution to identify the 24 abusers that we have twice decided tonight deserve to be highlighted for their extreme abuse of banking practice. No provision is in this whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask if that is in the resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS]?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say that this does not in any way supersede the action that was taken previously, which instructs the release of the names and the accounts of the 24 Members.

Mr. Speaker, I might just say, I respect members of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but it is amazing how after the vote we just had, all the members on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, look, we respect the work you did. We know the constraints you were under. But do not be so desperate to defend your work that you are going to stand up here and argue against full disclosure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, nobody is a paragon of knowledge tonight. We are in new territory. It appears to me that the committee that has the jurisdiction of which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] is the chairman, has tried to bring to the floor a resolution that they felt fit the subject at hand. We have voted on that resolution in a positive way.

Wanting fuller disclosure, we have voted for the resolution that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] brought to the floor.

Now the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has brought to the floor another resolution that goes to the fullest possible disclosure.

It is this gentleman's opinion that there is no harm done to wait another 20 days to try to get the fullest possible disclosure. I will give the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] the benefit of the doubt. If the gentleman says he will come back on the floor at the end of the 20-day period, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] says they have not been able to accomplish the task, that he will offer another resolution to try to get the fullest possible disclosure available at that time.

Mr. Speaker, the world is not going to come to an end if we do not disclose everything we know, even if it is incomplete, tomorrow morning. So I would hope that we would vote for the resolution of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think I understand what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] is trying to do, and that is get the information relative to the amount of overdrafts for every Member, as well as to get the time that overdraft was outstanding.

But if I understand the charge that the gentleman has placed in his resolution, this is what I would ask, you would require the people to reconstruct the account of every Member, regardless of whether there are overdrafts or not, and to release information about their entire banking activities for 39 months, including the date and the amount of every check written for the past 39 months, the date and amount of every deposit made during the past 39 months, whether it is related or not to overdrafts or any irregularity in regard to the banking activities.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], am I correct that is the disclosure, the reconstruction and disclosure that the gentleman is seeking, that we reconstruct every check and every deposit, regardless of whether there are any insufficiencies during that period, for every Member and former Member of the House during the past 39 months?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] that it is obvious on the face of it that is not what was intended. The committee itself went into reconstruction and the committee did not reveal and does not propose to reveal on those accounts that were reconstructed every deposit and every check, regardless of whether there were overdrafts. Mine does nothing any different than that.

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen this many red herrings in one place in a long time. It is amazing the lengths to which people will go to try to avoid disclosing what they did, for how long and for how much.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I am just trying to get the intent of the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, my intent is that those overdrafts will be revealed. If you have no overdrafts, do not worry about it. But the people that had overdrafts, how much and for how long, just as the committee proposes to do with those accounts they already reconstructed.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, it is not the intent of this resolution to require what I indicated, that my reading of it, where it says we are supposed to disclose the reconstructed history for every Member of the House, the gentleman is only referring to it as it relates to overdrafts?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, absolutely. The reason that is not stated more clearly is that is the only purpose of this whole thing. That was the charge of the committee. It only refers to overdrafts, not where Members made their deposits or whatever.

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, my objection to the resolution goes to a different point. I wonder if I might ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] a question.

On two occasions in the resolution it provides that the committee is instructed that it may release, and this is on the top of the second page, the names, and then toward the bottom of that page, under paragraph 2 of the last "Whereas" clause, it says that the committee is authorized to disclose. But nowhere is it provided that the committee shall disclose or is directed to disclose.

Moreover, in the very last paragraph of the resolution, under paragraph 4, it is provided that the committee provide each Member a full disclosure of the Member's account history with the House bank.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I might like to ask the staff for the minority leader to stop working on the resolution while the Members have a debate.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I have two questions then for the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS].

First of all, nowhere in this resolution is the committee directed or instructed to make this material public. They are only authorized that it may be done. In my mind that is not the kind of full disclosure that we adopted earlier and that I support.

Second, instead of providing for full public disclosure as a mandatory matter, the last paragraph provides that a letter can be written to each Member of the House, which is essentially the kind of indirect disclosure that was originally recommended by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS], is that not correct?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] that the intent is clear that the committee, which I do have great regard for, would be instructed to do that. The word probably should have been "instructed." It is clear that is what I intended to be done by the committee.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, if I might just clarify it, the intention of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] is that it be mandatory, and not discretionary.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS] has frequently referred to overdrafts. I am not sure what the gentleman intends by the use of that word. Is it the face amount of the check, $50,000, or is it the deficiency, which if you had $49,900 in your account, is simply $100? What is it that the gentleman intends to have revealed? The face amount, or the deficiency?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very valid question. I did not make any attempt to change the standard being used by the committee in its work to date. It is my own personal view, as one individual Member, that the overdraft is the extent by which you exceed the amount that you had.

Mr. Speaker, if a Member had a $50,000 check and had $49,000 in the bank, in my opinion that is a $1,000 overdraft. However, I have made no attempt to try to impose upon the committee any different standard than what it has been using. All I am talking about is how much they reveal.

□ 0220

They are already planning to reveal that information about 24 people. All we are saying is make it everybody. That is all we are saying.

Mr. LAFALCE. Well which is it that would be revealed then, the face amount or the deficiency? You are saying they should reveal for all that which they will reveal for the 24. What is it then that will be revealed, the face amount or the deficiency? We ought to know.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I will get back to you in 1 minute.

Let me ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH], whose committee is investigating this and has reconstructed the accounts of other Members, and is planning to go forward with detailing the overdrafts of Members, and on the 24 to reveal more than just the names and the numbers of the checks, what do you plan to use as your standard? Is that standard the total face value of the check or the amount by which it exceeded the amount in the account?

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

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, the resolution that has been passed would direct the committee, after a period of appeal, to disclose for those who we find to have abused their accounts following due process, the number of checks during a 39-month period that were overdrafts, that is that overdrafted the account; second, the number of months that the Member's deficiency exceeded the next month's net salary deposit; third, any checks that the bank actually bounced; that is, returned to the Member for insufficient funds. And the bank did not often do that, but it did it in four or five cases. And fourth, if the Member bounced any nonaccount checks at the bank, that would also be disclosed.

One of my questions was the same as the gentleman from New York's question. In reading the gentleman's resolution, it would appear to me that we would be authorized to release publicly the full account history that has been reconstructed, however long it takes to reconstruct. But is the gentleman now telling us, despite what the resolution says, that he would be expecting us to release only what we release with regard to the 24 under the prior resolution?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. What the gentleman from Oklahoma has said, a number of times, is that I want to expand the number who are covered by the release to all of the people who had overdrafts. And I want to release not just the names and the number of the checks, but for how much those checks were and for how long they were held by the bank. That is really not difficult.

Mr. LAFALCE. The gentleman has just answered my question. You have just said the face amounts of the checks as opposed to the deficiency, so that contradicts your earlier statement.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I said to the gentleman I consider, in my own personal opinion, that a fair interpretation of what an overdraft is the extent by which it exceeds the amount in the account.

Mr. LAFALCE. Now you have gone back to your first position.

Mr. MCHUGH. Would the gentleman continue to yield to me?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have sat on the sidelines and not participated in this, but I also believe it should be a fair fight. Would you please look at the resolution. I have just read it. It says that it instructs the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that it may release the names and full account histories, and it seems to me that if we are interested in maintaining the honor and the integrity of the committee that within that "may" provision the committee itself, in its wisdom and judgment, can match up the information that is released, and more if they desire in this, or make sure it parallels the other resolutions. It is not "shall," it is "may."

Let us put the control back in the hands of the committee. This would simply tell them to do what they did on the other resolutions for every person who had an overdraft. Do not get into the game, please, at 2:30 in the morning of not reading the resolution, and then attempting to play word games. It says "may release all of the information." I think it is clear that the committee can release the information that it already has on the other Members, and it does not need to go into the full procedure if it chooses not to do so.

Let us leave the decision in the hands of the wise people on the standards committee.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, we have debated this for some time, early into the morning. We have heard the members of the committee defend their decisions, and I know agreements were made as to what we would go forward with and what we would not go forward with. But at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma withhold, and yield to me?

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Of course I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to interrupt, but I do appreciate the gentleman from Oklahoma yielding.

With the greatest respect, I think there is still some confusion about what the resolution requires. The gentleman has suggested that he wishes to have the same kind of information provided or that will be provided on the 24 for all Members, and the gentleman

from California has just said that the resolution is discretionary and not mandatory.

The resolution also requires a complete review of each account, day by day, for all of the Members' accounts for 39 months to be accomplished in 20 days. That I think is an extraordinary mandate which I would suggest would be difficult for an army of accountants to provide, but the gentleman requires it.

Section 4 requires that within 48 hours of the adoption of this resolution, namely, if it is adopted, about 3 a.m. Sunday morning all Members are to receive their complete bank records from the House bank. At that point, of course, I think Members will have to be prepared by early Sunday morning to make disclosures of that information, whereas under the resolution we previously adopted the disclosure date is 10 days after the first 10-day disclosure has occurred so that Members will have a reasonable time to prepare an answer to their press and constituents about the nature of any overdrafts. This will present an effective deadline of 3 or 4 a.m. Sunday morning.

There is no parliamentary reason, in my view, why the gentleman cannot, if this matter is referred to the Committee on Standards, bring the matter up again, next week, or the following week, if he does not believe that the Committee on Standards is proceeding to seriously consider the recommendations that he has made in the resolution. By referring the resolution to the Committee on Standards, we do not kill it. We do not vote against it. We do not disapprove it. We let the Committee on Standards have an opportunity to see what can be accomplished in a reasonable way to try and meet the gentleman's intentions. And if the gentleman is not satisfied, a privileged resolution would be available to him at any time to reassert the resolution.

So I would respectfully suggest that at this late hour we not adopt a resolution which has somewhat confusing instructions, somewhat demanding instructions that may be completely impractical to achieve and may actually work to the detriment of Members in the very short time in providing an orderly explanation of their circumstances. Let the Committee on Standards have an opportunity to review this. The gentleman's rights will be protected if he wishes to reassert the resolution.

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. I respect the Speaker of this House a great deal as a person and as the Speaker. I cannot agree, however, after hearing the concerns expressed by so many Members, including Members on his side of the aisle, that this would unduly delay things, that perhaps I ought to wait a week or 2 weeks and bring it back again. It seems to me that that defeats the purpose.

Ordinarily, when we require that things be made available at a certain time or take place after a certain number of hours, we refer to working days. If it fell at 3 o'clock on a Sunday morning, I for one would certainly be willing to acknowledge that we would wait until after the weekend has passed. I do not think it is unreasonable for Members to be able to get their own bank records. I have reporters who come to me and ask what my bank records show. I do not know what they show. You have them and I cannot get them.

So, I think the issue is very simple: Do we disclose, do we tell the American people we are disclosing tonight the names of the people who had overdrafts, and how much, or do we give them the full information that enables them to determine who abused and who did not?

□ 0230

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

MOTION TO COMMIT OFFERED BY MR. GEPHARDT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to commit the resolution to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES). The question is on the motion to commit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 133, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

AYES—244

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Baker
Ballenger
Bateman
Bentley
Bevill
Bilbray
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Camp
Cardin
Carper
Chandler
Clay
Coleman (TX)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Darden
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Donnelly
Doolittle
Dornan (CA)
Dwyer
Engel
English
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fish
Flake
Foley
Ford (MI)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Grandy
Green
Hammerschmidt
Hastert
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Holloway
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hutto
Inhofe
Ireland
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Kildee
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kyl
LaFalce
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lloyd
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (WA)
Mineta
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Natcher
Neal (NC)
Nowak
Nussle
Oakar
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickle
Rahall
Rangel
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roe
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Scheuer
Schroeder
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sikorski
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Snowe
Spratt
Stallings
Stearns
Stokes
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (GA)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Unsoeld
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walker
Walsh
Waters
Weiss
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolpe
Wylie
Yatron
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—133

Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Armey
Atkins
AuCoin
Bacchus
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bellenson
Bennett
Bereuter
Berman
Bilirakis
Bruce
Callahan
Campbell (CA)
Carr
Chapman
Clement
Costello
Cox (CA)
Crane
Cunningham
Davis
DeFazio
DeLay
Dorgan (ND)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Early
Eckart
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Fields
Gallegly
Gekas
Geren
Gilman
Guarini
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Harris
Hatcher
Hochbrueckner
Hopkins
Hubbard
Hunter
James
Johnson (SD)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kennedy
Klug
Kostmayer
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Levine (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowery (CA)
Machtley
McCollum
McEwen
McGrath
Miller (OH)
Mink
Moody
Moorhead
Mrazek
Myers
Nagle
Neal (MA)
Nichols
Olver
Owens (UT)
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Perkins
Petri
Pickett
Porter
Poshard
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Roberts
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rostenkowski
Russo
Sarpalius
Schiff
Schumer
Sharp
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Staggers
Stenholm
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thomas (CA)
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Volkmer
Waxman
Weldon
Wheat
Wolf
Wyden
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—58

Annunzio	Gillmor	Olin
Aspin	Gradison	Owens (NY)
Blackwell	Gunderson	Price
Brown	Hansen	Pursell
Bustamante	Hefner	Quillen
Campbell (CO)	Hyde	Savage
Clinger	Jacobs	Schulze
Coble	Jones (NC)	Shuster
Coleman (MO)	Kleczka	Stark
Collins (IL)	Laughlin	Thomas (WY)
Collins (MI)	Leach	Torricelli
Combest	Lehman (FL)	Traxler
Dannemeyer	Lent	Vucanovich
de la Garza	Lewis (CA)	Washington
Dickinson	Mavroules	Weber
Dooley	McCandless	Whitten
Dymally	McCrery	Yates
Edwards (CA)	McDade	Young (AK)
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	
Ford (TN)	Moran	

□ 0248

Mr. NICHOLS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the motion to commit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall votes 44 through 47. Had I been present during these votes I would have voted "yea" on rolecalls 44 and 45, "nay" on rollcall 46 and "yea" on rollcall 47.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. NICHOLAS MAVROULES MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HUGHES), laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NICHOLAS MAVROULES Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 4, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts.

After consultation with the General Counsel to the Clerk, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

NICHOLAS MAVROULES,
Member of Congress.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET REGARDING CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 THROUGH 1996

(Mr. PANETTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on the budget and as Chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

This is the fourth report of the 102d Congress for fiscal year 1992. This report is based on the aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 as contained in House Report 102–69, the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 121.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, entitlement authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, March 11, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, I am herewith transmitting the status report on the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending estimates for fiscal year 1992, under House Concurrent Resolution 121, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

The enclosed tables also compare enacted legislation to each committee's 602(a) allocation of discretionary new budget authority and new entitlement authority. The 602(a) allocations to House Committees made pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 121 were printed in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the resolution (H. Report 102–69).

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1992 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET, ADOPTED IN HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121 REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF MARCH 10, 1992

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1992	Fiscal years 1992–96
Appropriate level:		
Budget authority	1,269,300	6,591,900
Outlays	1,201,600	6,134,100
Revenues	850,400	5,832,000
Current level:		
Budget authority	1,276,896	NA
Outlays	1,207,499	NA
Revenues	853,364	4,829,000
Current Level over (+)/under(-) appropriate level:		
Budget authority	+7,596	NA
Outlays	+5,849	NA
Revenues	+2,964	−3,000

ANA=Not applicable because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure that provides new budget or entitlement authority for fiscal year 1992 that is not included in the current level estimate for that year, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in House Concurrent Resolution 121, to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure that (1) provides new budget or entitlement authority that is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal year 1992, and (2) increases outlays in fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate and exceeds $2,964 million for fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121. Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate for fiscal years 1992 through 1996, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for those years as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1992			1992–96		
	BA	OLS	NEA	BA	OLS	NEA
House Committee:						
Agriculture:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	3,720	3,540	4,716
Current Level	−2	−2	−1	−1	−1	(1)
Difference	−2	−2	−1	−3,719	−3,539	−4,716
Armed Services:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	−7	−7	0	−83	−83
Difference		−7	−7		−83	−83
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	28	28	0	177	177	0
Difference	+28	+28		+177	+177	

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—Continued

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

	1992			1992–96		
	BA	OLS	NEA	BA	OLS	NEA
District of Columbia:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Education and Labor:						
Appropriate level	0	0	56	0	0	20,153
Current Level	−46	−46	0	0	4	0
Difference	−46	−46	−56	0	+4	−20,153
Energy and Commerce:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Foreign Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Government Operations:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
House Administration:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Interior and Insular Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	−2	−2	0	5	5	0
Difference	−2	−2		+5	+5	
Judiciary:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	16	16	16
Difference				+16	+16	+16
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	(1)	0	0	(1)
Difference			(1)			(1)
Post Office and Civil Service:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Public Works and Transportation:						
Appropriate level	16,358	0	0	117,799	0	0
Current Level	18,514	0	0	113,048	0	0
Difference	+2,156	0	0	−4,751	0	0
Science, Space, and Technology:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Small Business:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Veterans' Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	484	0	0	6,811
Current Level	0	5	378	0	19	2,182
Difference	0	+5	−106	0	+19	−4,629
Ways and Means:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	620
Current Level	7,036	7,036	8,036	7,458	7,458	9,098
Difference	+7,036	+7,036	+8,036	+7,458	+7,458	+8,478
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current Level	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Difference	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	+1

[1] Less than $500 thousand dollars.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS

[Fiscal year 1992—in millions]

	Revised 602(b) subdivisions		Latest current level		Difference	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary	21,070	20,714	21,029	20,708	−41	−6
Defense	270,244	275,222	269,860	275,038	−384	−184
District of Columbia	700	690	700	690	0	0
Energy and Water Development	21,875	20,770	21,875	20,720	0	−50
Foreign Operations	15,285	13,556	14,262	13,200	1,023	−356
Interior	13,102	12,050	13,105	12,198	3	148
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education	59,087	57,797	59,085	57,832	−2	35
Legislative	2,344	2,317	2,343	2,310	−1	−7

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

[Fiscal year 1992—in millions]

	Revised 602(b) subdivisions		Latest current level		Difference	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Military Construction	8,564	8,482	8,563	8,433	−1	−49
Rural development, agriculture, and related agencies	12,299	11,226	12,299	11,223	0	−3
Transportation	13,765	31,800	13,762	31,799	−3	−1
Treasury-Postal Service	10,825	11,120	10,824	11,119	−1	−1
VA-HUD-Independent agencies	63,953	61,714	63,942	61,711	−11	−3
Grand total	513,113	527,458	511,649	526,981	1,464	477

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 11, 1992.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues for fiscal year 1992 in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1992 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 121). This report is tabulated as of close of business March 10, 1992 and is summarized as follows:

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level +/− resolution
Budget authority	1,276,896	1,269,300	+7,596
Outlays	1,207,449	1,201,600	+5,849

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level +/− resolution
Revenues:			
1992	854,364	850,400	+2,964
1992 to 1996	4,829,000	4,832,000	−3,000

Since my last report, dated February 18, 1992, the President has signed the American Technology Preeminence Act (P.L. 102–245). This action did not change the estimates of budget authority, outlays and revenues.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM,
(For Robert D. Reischauer, Director).

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992

[As of close of business Mar. 10, 1992]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions			
Revenues			853,364
Permanents and other spending legislation	807,617	727,237	
Appropriation legislation	686,331	703,643	
Continuing resolution authority	13,992	5,454	
Mandatory adjustments [1]	(1,208)	950	
Offsetting receipts	(232,542)	(232,542)	
Total previously enacted	1,274,190	1,204,743	853,364
Enacted this session			
Emergency unemployment compensation extension (P.L. 102–244)	2,706	2,706	
American technology preeminence (P.L. 102–245)			(2)
Total current level	1,276,896	1,207,449	853,364
Total budget resolution	1,269,300	1,201,600	850,400
Amount remaining:			
Over budget resolution	7,596	5,849	2,964
Under budget resolution			

[1] Adjustments required to conform with current law estimates for entitlements and other mandatory programs in the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H.Con.Res. 121).
[2] Less than $500,000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A Bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2344. An act to improve the provision of health care and other services to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2324. An act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to make a technical correction relating to exclusion from income under the food stamp program, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 176. Joint resolution to designate March 19, 1992, as "National Women in Agriculture Day"; and

S.J. Res. 240. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1992 as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 16, 1992, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3080. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to remove an obsolete section of that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3081. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Germany for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92–17), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3082. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 235 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246) and to amend section 701 of the U.S. Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1984, as amended (Public Law 80–402); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3083. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3084. A letter from the Secretary, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(e); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3085. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the "High Plains States Groundwater Demonstration Program 1991 Interim Report," pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 390g–2(c)(2); to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

3086. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Railroad Retirement Tax Act and the Railroad Retirement Act to ease administration of those acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3087. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3088. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report regarding the economic policy and trade practices of each country with which the United States has an economic or trade relationship, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 4711; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

3089. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriation for fiscal year 1993 for the U.S. Coast Guard; jointly, to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Armed Services.

3090. A letter from the Department of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appropriations of funds from the harbor maintenance trust fund to the Department of the Army for payment of administrative expenses incurred in administering the port use fee and to clarify funding from the inland waterways trust fund for rehabilitation costs of existing and future projects for navigation on the inland and coastal waterways of the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.

3091. A letter from the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Water Resources Development Act of 1992"; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Interior and Insular Affairs, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Science, Space, and Technology, and Energy and Commerce.

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. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. KENNEDY):

H.R. 4449. A bill to authorize jurisdictions receiving funds for fiscal year 1992 under the HOME Investment Partnerships Act that are allocated for new construction to use the funds, at the discretion of the jurisdiction, for other eligible activities under such act and to amend the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 to authorize local governments that have financed housing projects that have been provided a section 8 financial adjustment factor to use recaptured amounts available from refinancing of the projects for housing activities; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina):

H.R. 4450. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in conjunction with the Federal Reserve banks, to develop an automated access system for marketing U.S. securities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 4451. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 17, United States Code, to include in the definition of a cable system a facility which makes secondary transmissions by microwave or certain other technologies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH):

H.R. 4452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to first-time farmers for purchases of farmland and farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVANS:

H.R. 4453. A bill to amend chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, to extend cer-

tain guidelines for reductions in the number of civilian employees of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANTOS:

H.R. 4454. A bill to provide for the economic conversion and diversification of industries in the defense industrial base of the United States that are adversely affected by significant reductions in spending for national defense; jointly, to the Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, Small Business, Foreign Affairs, and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mrs. LLOYD:

H.R. 4455. A bill to amend the National Environmental Education Act to establish an environmental education clearing division to collect certain environmental information and make that information available to educational institutions in the United States and other interested persons; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

H.R. 4456. A bill to revise and extend the existing suspension of duty on certain small toys jewelry, and novelty goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4457. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of qualified mental health professionals services under part B of the Medicare program; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 4458. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to add bronchioloalveolar carcinoma to the list of diseases presumed to be service-connected for certain radiation-exposed veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 4459. A bill to provide for a community health center for medically underserved populations in the northeastern portion of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WALKER (for himself, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 4460. A bill to support full economic growth by maximizing U.S. energy supply and efficiency through technological innovation; jointly, to the Committees, on Science, Space, and Technology, Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4461. A bill to provide for efficiency in the performance of surveying and mapping activities in the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARNARD:

H.R. 4462. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to direct the Secretary of the Army to permit certain persons to construct boat ramps and docks in the J. Strom Thurmond Lake, Georgia Lake, GA; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4463. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit for sewer connection expenses required under Federal or State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. SYNAR):

H.R. 4464. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program of grants for rural health outreach; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4465. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to improve public accountability and public safety in the management of hazardous waste facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H.R. 4466. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to improve public accountability and public safety in the management of hazardous waste facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SUNDQUIST:

H.R. 4467. A bill to authorize the President to veto an item of appropriation in an act or resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4468. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a refundable credit for individuals who provide long-term care for family members at home; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H.J. Res. 440. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1992, as "Child Care Worthy Wage Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. YATRON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOSS, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H. Con. Res. 292. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to U.S. participation in the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development [UNCED]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL (for himself, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. GOSS):

H. Con. Res. 293. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Government and people of Venezuela on their demonstrated commitment to a broad-based and enduring democracy, and commending the agreement between the Action Democratica and COPEI parties to form a cabinet of national unity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KYL, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. IRELAND, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LENT, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. COX of California, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. COBLE, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. FISH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HENRY, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PACKARD, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. RHODES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DELAY, Mr. EWING, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. JAMES, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ROTH, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. SLATTERY):

H. Res. 395. Resolution instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to disclose the names and pertinent account information of those Members and former Members of the House of Representatives who the Committee finds abused the privileges of the House Bank, and to make public other information regarding their House Bank accounts; to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PELOSI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GRANDY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. KYL, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. HOBSON):

H. Res. 396. Resolution instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to make certain further disclosure of account information of those Members and former Members of the House of Representatives who the committee finds had checks held by the Sergeant at Arms bank; considered and agreed to.

[March 13, 1992. (Legislative day of March 12, 1992)]

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H. Res. 397. Resolution instructing the Speaker to within 20 days, fully reconstruct the 39-month bank account history of every current and former House Member's bank account at the House bank for the period beginning July 1, 1988, and ending October 3, 1991; provide Members the opportunity to appeal their records to the same subcommittee of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct which was charged by House Resolution 236 to conduct the preliminary inquiry; within 20 days provide a complete report on the official and unofficial practices of the House bank and all instances during the 39-month period in which those procedures were not followed; and to provide, within 48 hours, to each Member of the House a complete accounting of his or here House bank account history; and instructing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct that it may release the names and full account histories of all House bank account activities of Members and former Members of the House occurring during the period of July 1, 1988, and October 3, 1991; considered and committed to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H. Res. 398. Resolution to authorize and direct the Speaker to contract with an independent public accounting firm to conduct audits of all Members accounts at the House bank for the period beginning on July 1, 1988, and ending on October 3, 1991; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H. Res. 399. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the vet-

erans health care system administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs should be maintained within that Department as a system uniquely charged with the mission of providing health care for the Nation's veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

342. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to the Federal excise tax on vaccine production; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

343. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arkansas, relative to sexual harassment; jointly, to the Committees on House Administration, Education and Labor, and the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE:

H.R. 4469. A bill to clear certain impediments to the licensing of the vessel *Hazana* for employment in the coastwise trade of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

H.R. 4470. A bill relating to the petition filed with respect to certain entries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 66: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 606: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 662: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 722: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 723: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 841: Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 860: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 875: Mr. MORAN, Ms. HORN, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 888: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1468: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 1551: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1565: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 1598: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 1623: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. MARLENEE, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1624: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. GEREN of Texas, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1704: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 1860: Mr. COBLE, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. ROBERTS.

H.R. 1916: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2037: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 2075: Mrs. BOXER and Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 2200: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 2234: Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina.

H.R. 2286: Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 2492: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 2546: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 2625: Mr. CAMP, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2650: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2782: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. APPLEGATE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FROST, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. EDWARDS of California, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 2840: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 2872: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 2936: Mr. HENRY and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3067: Mr. LAROCCO and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3138: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 3221: Ms. WATERS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 3222: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3290: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 3373: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3380: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. SABO, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, and Mr. FISH.

H.R. 3473: Ms. HORN and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 3560: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 3592: Mr. BATEMAN and Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 3636: Mr. PARKER, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. OLIN.

H.R. 3642: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3654: Mr. OWENS of New York and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 3677: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 3702: Ms. HORN.

H.R. 3779: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 3780: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 3794: Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, Mr. YATES, and Mrs. BOXER.

H.R. 3857: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 3864: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 3887: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3924: Mr. HAMILTON.

H.R. 3941: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 3949: Mr. SANGMEISTER and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3958: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 3986: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GREEN of New York.

H.R. 4040: Mr. BLILEY and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 4077: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 4100: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 4121: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 4163: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 4178: Mr. OWENS of New York and Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 4207: Mr. SCHAEFER and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 4229: Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 4277: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 4280: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 4286: Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 4315: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. LAUGHLIN.

H.R. 4338: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GUARINI, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. STARK, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. PENNY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MINETA, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. SIKORSKI.

H.R. 4352: Mr. KOPETSKI and Ms. HORN.

H.R. 4366: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. STOKES, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4399: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 4405: Mr. OLVER, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. RUSSO.

H.J. Res. 334: Mr. HEFNER.

H.J. Res. 351: Mr. SPRATT.

H.J. Res. 371: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.J. Res. 388: Mr. MINETA and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.J. Res. 399: Mr. CARPER.

H.J. Res. 412: Mr. FISH, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TANNER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WALSH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.J. Res. 421: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. ESPY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JAMES, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WISE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. OWENS of New York, and Ms. HORN.

H.J. Res. 427: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. MFUME, Mr. WHEAT, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RITTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EARLY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Ms. WATERS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DAR-

DEN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. STARK, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. COBLE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. GRADISON, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. EWING, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BROWN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. ORTON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. WISE, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. BACCHUS.

H.J. Res. 433: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. HORN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PANETTA, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DELAY, Mr. SWETT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. BONIOR.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. BROWDER, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. LEHMAN of California, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. MAVROULES.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. COX of California, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PAXON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. RHODES, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. STUMP.

H. Res. 321: Mr. ANNUNZIO and Mr. BLILEY.

H. Res. 370: Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EWING, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H. Res. 376: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

143. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the State of New Hampshire, Department of Education, relative to the New Hampshire-Maine Interstate School Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. Also, petition of the State of Maine, Department of Education, relative to the New Hampshire-Maine Interstate School Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.