HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Wednesday, November 29, 1995*

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALLARD].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
November 29, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable WAYNE ALLARD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Gracious God, from whom we have come and to whom we shall return, we pray for fortitude in our personal lives that our actions will blend with our words and our words will harmonize with our prayers. May we express in our lives an authenticity of spirit that resists the pressures that come from a complicated world and conflicting loyalties. Remind us each day, O God, to follow the road that leads to justice for every person and to hear anew Your words of reconciliation and peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PALLONE 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 PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

WHAT DOES A BALANCED BUDGET MEAN TO THE AVERAGE CITIZEN?

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, during the next 2 weeks we will make the most serious attempt at balancing the budget that we have had in the last three decades. An average citizen probably says, "What is in it for me? So what if you balance the budget? I am doing OK in many ways." Here is what is in it. It is not just balancing the budget, it is doing fair and compassionate spending levels to meet the basic needs of this country as we have in saving Medicare.

What is in it for the average citizen was well said by Mr. Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in testimony before a committee of the Senate yesterday. What he said several months ago was in essence; if we can balance the budget, interest rates in America will be reduced 2 percent for the average mortgage on a house, for the average consumer loan, for the average automobile loan.

To summarize, here is what he said yesterday on the subject. It is something we should realize, that if we continue this commitment that we have to balance the budget, we will have the story of a prolonged growth in our economy versus a spurt that might not last. This is important to get this economy going.

We will keep that commitment to balance the budget, Mr. Speaker. We will keep that commitment.

PROTECT THE ENVIRONMENT

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, right now the budget negotiations have begun, and I was very pleased to see that President Clinton over the last few weeks specifically identified the environment and protection of the environment as one of the key issues or one of the key priorities that must be maintained and strengthened during these budget negotiations.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to vote on the appropriations conference report that contains the budget for the EPA. Unfortunately, inconsistent with the President's priorities and concern for the environment, this Republican leadership measure would actually reduce funding for the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency, by 21 percent over last year. And specifically for enforcement, the amount of money that is appropriated is even less; and for the Superfund Program, very important to my State and many parts of the country, the funding is reduced by 19 percent.

The President has already said that he intends to veto the EPA appropriations bill, and well he should.

THE REPUBLICANS WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the last 11 months here in the House have been an object lesson on keeping promises. At least on this side of the aisle. Last year, Republicans promised the American people that if we were given a majority here in the House, we would put all our energies into balancing the budget—something that Democrats failed to do even though they had the Presidency, and control of Congress.

Republicans made a commitment in the Contract With America and we kept that commitment. We passed a balanced budget. Even our opposition and liberal news media know that we are doing the right thing for America's economy and America's children.

Mr. Speaker, over 3 years ago, Bill Clinton said he would present a balanced budget. He never did. The American people deserve more than self-promoting politicians who promise, but never deliver. And that is why they voted for a Republican majority. We are doing what we said we would do, and we will balance the budget.

REPUBLICANS ARE SINGING THE SAME OLD SONGS ON THE BUDGET

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing the same old songs in this House.

It wasn't long ago that many of my Republican colleagues were singing the gospel of Voodoo Economics—that tax cuts for the rich and more money for defense that would magically add up to lower deficits.

The result?

A budget deficit that more than quadrupled during the 12 years Ronald

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Reagan and George Bush ran our Nation.

But now, many of my colleagues who stood in this Chamber and voted for 12 years to burden working Americans with 300 billion dollars' worth of deficits and now singing loudly in the choir of fiscal responsibility again.

They have a plan for getting our deficit under control.

But it is the same old song, with a new twist.

Tax cuts for the wealthy, more money for defense and devastating cuts in education, Medicare, and the programs that most Americans rely on every day.

I think it is time to change our tune to supporting a responsible budget that puts our children, our students, our families, and our seniors first.

My Republican friends might not know the words, but that would be a song that more working Americans could sing along to.

AMERICANS WORK HARD FOR THEIR MONEY AND OUGHT TO BE ABLE TO KEEP MORE OF IT

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of personal affection for the gentleman who preceded me here in the well, but the simple fact is when you talk about genuine cuts, about the only real cut we have seen is my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, shaving off his trademark mustache.

The fact is, for all the venom and vitriol about incredible cuts and draconian measures taking place, that simply is not the case. Rather, we are slowing the rate of growth of Government. To my friend who says, Mr. Speaker, that we are affecting seniors and students and families, I say he is right; we are affecting them in a positive way. We are making sure that the American people hang onto more of their hard-earned money. Indeed the tax cut, the $500 per child tax credit, goes to help 80 percent of families in this country.

Certainly there is a problem with facts and rhetoric. The fact is we are helping working Americans by this very simple premise: They work hard for the money they earn, they ought to keep more of it and send less of it to the Federal Government here in Washington, DC.

THE CONSTITUTION CALLS FOR THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH FROM STATE, BUT NOT OF GOD FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(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, Brittney Settle, a Tennessee ninth grader, wrote a paper about Jesus Christ. The teacher flunked her. The teacher said Jesus Christ is not an appropriate topic for a public school.

Appropriate? Other students are allowed to write about devil worship, reincarnation, the whole gamut; witchcraft. The Supreme Court, by the way, says Jesus Christ is not an appropriate topic. They sided with the school.

Mr. Speaker, is there any wonder our schools are so screwed up when the only time you can hear God's name is when it is taken in vain? Wake up, Congress. The Constitution may separate church and State, but the Constitution never intended to separate God and the American people. In God we trust. It would not be all over our buildings and all over our currency. Something is wrong in our public schools when the only time you can hear God's name legally is when it is taken in vain. Let us take a look at some issues here, Congress.

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS A PLAN TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, last week the Republican leadership here in Congress sent a letter to the President asking for specifics on exactly how the Clinton administration would balance the budget in 7 years as they agreed to do on November 19.

This is what the administration sent back—a set of talking points. No specifics, no numbers.

In his talking points, the President had the unmitigated gall to ask that Congress provide a legislative plan. Well excuse me, but it seems we have already passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. In that we spell out exactly how we will balance the budget in 7 years, including numbers, amounts, and specifics.

Mr. Speaker, it is understandable that the Clinton administration would have a problem with specifics. It already had huge problem keeping promises. The President totally lacks any plan to balance the budget with honest numbers. Without a plan, really, all they can do is provide talking points, and, of course, more hot air.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HEALTH EQUITY ACT

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I will introduce the Health Equity Act legislation that will address the problem of environmental discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing recognition that people in poor and working class communities, and particularly people of color, are forced to live and work in areas contaminated by opportunistic polluters that target these communities. Whether it is in the form of incinerators, industrial production facilities, pesticides, or radiation—exposure to such contamination represents a death sentence for black and Latino Americans throughout this country.

My legislation, which applies title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to the Federal environmental regulatory process, will allow minority communities to halt potentially dangerous action, before harm comes to them. Our society has slowly taken steps to end the burden of discrimination in areas ranging from employment to housing. This will give communities of color a chance to fight against this form of discrimination.

I would encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation and help end one of the most neglected forms of discrimination in America.

BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET AND HOPE

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is dedicated to restoring traditional values in our society. Common sense tells us this means living within our means. This means a balanced Federal budget.

These past few weeks we've finally reached one of the ultimate questions separating conservatives and liberals: Do we want to continue sacrificing our childrens' chances at achieving the American Dream? Or do we want to do the principled thing and balance our Federal budget?

The President doesn't think our children deserve a chance at this opportunity. My colleagues and I believe that this is wrong. We are willing to do whatever it takes to give them their chance.

To hear my Democrat colleagues talk, one would suspect that they oppose job creation, lower interest rates, and a brighter future for all.

To hear them talk, a balanced Federal budget is little more than a myth, a mirage, a Xanadu.

To hear them talk, saving money for future generations is a bad thing, but we can do it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a nationwide drama with the President and Democrats using our children as the stakes. This is wrong. I believe our Nation deserves better. America is about hope and the potential for prosperity, and America's leadership should lead us in this direction. Let us balance the budget and help restore this hope.

AMERICANS WANT STRONG ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, the public is finally becoming aware of what the antienvironmental extremists in this Congress are doing. Under the Republican leadership, clean water, clean air, and public health are being sold to the highest campaign contributor. While we are struggling to cut the budget, Republicans want to subsidize logging in the Nation's last rain forest. They want to continue the 1872 mining law that gives away millions to private companies, and to allow oil drilling on Alaska's true wilderness.'

The American people want strong environmental protection. Instead, the Republicans are jeopardizing the rivers we fish, the beaches we swim in, and the very air we breathe for the benefit of special interests. There truly is a contract with the American environment. That contract is becoming a bill of sale.

DEMOCRATS, START TELLING THE TRUTH

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, in a cynical ploy to distort reality for political gain, the minority party continues to decry the so-called student loan cuts in our budget. It is time to start telling the American people the truth.

My Republican colleagues understand the importance of helping low-income students pay for college. That is why we protect student aid in our budget.

Contrary to the battle cry of the minority, there are no student loan cuts in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. In fact, total student loan volume will grow from $24 billion this year to $36 billion in 2002. And more loans will be available next year than ever before.

Student loans are preserved. No student will be cut off. And no student will be required to pay more for his or her loan.

Mr. Speaker, it doesn't take a Harvard professor to figure out what's going on. Democrats are trying to regain power by scaring the American people with imaginary spending cuts. This is downright dishonest.

□ 1015

PRIORITIES FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was not planning to follow the other speaker, and I appreciate the changes that my Republican colleagues have made in the education funding, because they have come a long way. He is right. There have been some funding cuts restored, but the House Republicans do not deserve the credit. The Senate Democrats and Republicans deserve the credit for insisting that House Republicans not decimate education funding.

We have an opportunity over the next few weeks to work bipartisanly on a balanced budget bill. We have a responsibility to make sure the values and the priorities of the American people are maintained and that we balance the budget while protecting education, and Medicare, the environment, and veterans.

Our priorities should be, No. 1, to protect Medicare and Medicaid. We must maintain the high quality of health care we currently enjoy. No. 2, protect students and children. We must maintain current levels of education funding so that students, including those from Aldine High School in my congressional district who are here today from the Close-up program get the education they need to succeed in the 21st century. It is our obligation to make sure that those students have the opportunity to obtain a student loan or Pell grants. They are the future of our country and have a responsibility to make sure they are prepared. Finally, we need to protect tax fairness in the tax system. We do not need to punish low-income Americans by increasing their taxes.

I hope we will give serious consideration to a bipartisan effort to balance the budget. The time has come to get our fiscal house in order while maintaining the values and priorities most important to the American people.

UNITED STATES BOSNIA POLICY

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon debate a resolution of support for the President's decision to deploy up to 20,000 United States troops into Bosnia.

The President has placed himself and Congress into a lead box. If we decide to support the President, we'll be supporting a costly policy that won't be finished in a year—Bosnia, after all, isn't another Haiti. If Congress rejects the President's decision, our European allies, and others around the world, will come to doubt the United States resolve and commitment. The next time there is a Persian Gulf crisis, they may not answer our call for cooperation.

And so, no matter where we turn, we find our lead box sinking deeper and deeper into the Bosnian bog. This debate won't provide the right answers, nor will it provide an acceptable alternative, since the decision has already been made.

But, I must strongly object to the President's decision. I encourage my colleagues to join me in opposing that decision.

TRICKLE-DOWN ECONOMICS HAS FAILED

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I find wearisome this continual Republican litany that claims only Republicans want to balance the budget and somehow Democrats are opposed to it.

I have served here 17 years. In my early years here Ronald Reagan was President, and by count, no President, with the exception of Franklin Roosevelt, ever got more of his economic policy agreed to by the Congress than did Ronald Reagan. Mr. Speaker, you remember it. It was called trickle-down economics. What happened to the deficit? It tripled. It tripled under Reaganomics.

Under President Clinton, the deficit has come down every year of his Presidency, and this is the first time that has happened since Harry Truman was President. If the Republican balanced budget attempt passed and was put into effect, it would not decrease the deficit in its first 3 years of operation as much as Clinton's economics has reduced the deficit in the last 3 years.

LINE IN THE SAND ON SPENDING

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, the magic number is $730 billion. In this morning's congressional article, it said $730 billion is what the President wants to spend in excess of what the Congress has passed. We both want balanced budgets, but they want to use different numbers to get there.

We are preparing to spend $2.6 trillion more in the next 7 years than we spent in the last 7 years, a total of $12.1 trillion. It seems to me that we can fight on priorities within that number, but we should put the line in the sand: $12.1 trillion and no more.

If the assumptions that the President wants to use are correct and we do wind up with $730 billion more in revenues or less in spending, we can apply that to our children's debt. However, we should draw the line in the sand: $12.1 trillion and not a dollar more.

BREAK THE TIES WITH SPECIAL INTERESTS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

99-059 O—97 Vol. 141 (Pt. 24) 25

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, 11 months ago, a new Republican majority promised to drive special interest lobbyists from the halls of Congress. What they did not tell us was that the lobbyists would be out of the halls and into their offices.

In fact, instead of ending the cozy relationship between the corporate special interests and lawmakers, Speaker GINGRICH has elevated it to an art form. An article in Monday's Washington Post revealed how the Republican leadership has boasted of twisting arms to raise campaign contributions and rewriting legislation for the highest bidder.

The Republican Campaign Committee even keeps this book on what they call friendly and unfriendly PAC's. The unfriendly PAC's are those that contribute to Democrats. Simply put, those groups are told to give more to Republicans or else.

It is time to break the ties with special interests. This is the people's House. Let us return it to the people today by passing a clean lobby reform bill.

NO GROUND TROOPS IN BOSNIA

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, our side needs a leader or leaders with the courage to say clearly that we should not send ground troops into Bosnia. It is not in America's vital national security interests. And there is absolutely nothing to be achieved for America, but much to be lost. We will lose lives and a year later if we leave—which is questionable—full scale ethnic war will resume as during the previous 600 years. Thus nothing will be accomplished but a year-long experiment of the President to gain macho credentials and leadership demonstration.

Bosnia is the latest in Bill Clinton's foreign misadventures. There was Somalia and there was Haiti. And what was gained in those places. In Haiti under the not-so-democratic Aristide, the so-called peace is unraveling.

And America cannot afford in dollars or lives, what NATO and the Europeans have been unwilling to do. It is Europe's turn to look out for its backyard.

With the onset of winter in the mountains of Bosnia and Herzegovina and over a million land mines in place, we do not need American lives sacrificed before Christmas for some artificial creation called Bosnia. In the Congress, let us assert our authority and not fund the latest unwise, tragic foreign misadventure of an aspiring leader named Bill Clinton. No money to send United States ground troops to Bosnia, period.

SAY NO TO GOP DOPE

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, both Democrats and Republicans agree that the American worker is in need of relief. Stagnating wages, longer hours, corporate downsizing, and NAFTA have all taken their toll on what was once the world's highest living standard.

By contrast, the stock market is breaking new records, corporate profits are going through the roof, and corporate executives are making 30 times more than their lowest paid employees.

Yet the Republican solution to these inequities is to cut taxes for wealthy corporations, reduce worker safety, and increase funding for star wars and B-2 bombers.

This trickle-down strategy, Mr. Speaker, is the crack cocaine of bad economic policy. I urge my colleagues to just say no to GOP dope.

AMERICANS NEED BUDGET PLAN FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, it has been over a week since President Clinton committed in writing to an honest balanced budget in 7 years. The Republican majority has a specific plan—we have passed it in both the House and the Senate—now where is the President's plan.

But, the President has not submitted a specific plan. Sure, he sent us 22 pages of general talking points this summer, 10 of which were charts and graphs. And last week, his Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, sent us a 2-page list of general principles that contained no numbers or specifics whatsoever. The American people have heard enough talk about general goals—they want action now. They want the President to put his plan on paper.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do what is right for our children's future. Let us sit down, work together, no more rhetoric—no more excuses. Both the Republican majority and the President have promised to balance the budget. Let us keep our promise and let us do it now.

REPUBLICAN PLAN OFFERS TAX RELIEF TO AMERICAN FAMILIES

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

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I appear here today as a Member of Congress, but more importantly, I speak as the father of four children. I know firsthand what it costs to raise a family in middle America and I am glad that the Balanced Budget Act includes tax relief for families.

Tax relief for families should not be looked at as a cost to Government. Instead, we should consider it as a way to keep money in the hands of those to whom it belongs in the first place: America's working families.

Cutting taxes is also fiscally responsible. America's families deserve tax relief and Federal spending should be reined in and controlled. Reducing the growth of Federal spending is the way to get to balance, not by taking more money from families.

The bipartisan agreement to balance the budget in 7 years using honest numbers is a step in the right direction. The Government's constant deficit spending must be stopped. I also strongly support tax relief which allows American families to keep more of their own money.

Our Democrat friends claim that they want to balance the budget too. They say that deficit reduction is their goal and we agree.

Let us work together to reach a balanced budget with tax cuts and no new spending.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SIGN DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I have learned that the President of the United States has taken the defense appropriations bill to Europe with him and he will decide whether he will sign the bill or not sign the bill. I certainly hope he will sign it. If he does not sign it, I hope he will not veto the defense appropriation bill. I think it is a reasonable approach.

We have military forces all around the world today. We need as much money as possible to keep these forces in the different places. The President is talking now about Bosnia. So certainly I hope the President of the United States would sign this legislation and the money needed to take care of our troops.

About the only thing that we need in this country, to be sure, is that we have a strong military defense. If we have a good defense, we can just about do everything in this great country.

BALANCED BUDGET WILL RECHARGE OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our Nation needs a balanced budget, not because it's a good accounting device, but because it will help every American.

A balanced budget will recharge the economy. It will cause interest rates to drop. And reduced interests rates mean lower mortgage payments, lower car payments, lower student loan payments.

As part of the Republican plan to balance the budget in 7 years, there are income tax cuts for families. And there is a capital gains tax cut for job growth. This will generate more investments, more business expansion, and more jobs.

Before he was elected, President Clinton said he could balance the budget in 5 years. After the election he said it wasn't necessary. Now he says that he wants to balance the budget in 7 years but he still has not presented a plan.

The Republicans do have a plan. Let's balance the budget, cut taxes, and create jobs now.

AMERICANS WANT MORE INFORMATION ON BOSNIAN TROOP DEPLOYMENT

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I have profound reservations about the participation of United States forces in a Bosnian peacekeeping mission. So do the people I represent. Of the many calls I have received on this matter over the past several days, not one has favored United States involvement.

At the same time, I also recognize the dangers that are inherent in a policy of noninvolvement.

If the United States abandons NATO's peace efforts in Bosnia, we could weaken and even destroy an alliance that has helped deter multinational conflicts for half a century. The current peace initiative would surely collapse. And if this ghastly slaughter ever spreads beyond the borders of the former Yugoslavia, our country's economic and military security would be critically threatened.

Americans know that our own security requires a secure peace in Europe. When necessary, they support deployment of our troops as peacekeepers—but not as targets. They want more information about the military plan, troop security, the mission's goals, and the plan for withdrawal. So do I.

□ 1030

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule:

Committee on Commerce; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on Resources; and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION IN PEACEFUL USES OF NUCLEAR ENERGY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–138)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy Between the United States of America and the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) with accompanying agreed minute, annexes, and other attachments. (The confidential list of EURATOM storage facilities covered by the Agreement is being transmitted directly to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House International Relations Committee.) I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization and determination concerning the agreement, and the memorandum of the Director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency with the Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement concerning the agreement. The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the agreement and other attachments, including the views of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is also enclosed.

The proposed new agreement with EURATOM has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA) and as otherwise amended. It replaces two existing agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation with EURATOM, including the 1960 agreement that has served as our primary legal framework for cooperation in recent years and that will expire by its terms on December 31 of this year. The proposed new agreement will provide an updated, comprehensive framework for peaceful nuclear cooperation between the United States and EURATOM, will facilitate such cooperation, and will establish strengthened nonproliferation conditions and controls including all those required by the NNPA. The new agreement provides for the transfer of nonnuclear material, nuclear material, and equipment for both nuclear research and nuclear power purposes. It does not provide for transfers under the agreement of any sensitive nuclear technology (SNT).

The proposed agreement has an initial term of 30 years, and will continue in force indefinitely thereafter in increments of 5 years each until terminated in accordance with its provisions. In the event of termination, key nonproliferation conditions and controls, including guarantees of safeguards, peaceful use and adequate physical protection, and the U.S. right to approve retransfers to third parties, will remain effective with respect to transferred nonnuclear material, nuclear material, and equipment, as well as nuclear material produced through their use. Procedures are also established for determining the survival of additional controls.

The member states of EURATOM and the European Union itself have impeccable nuclear nonproliferation credentials. All EURATOM member states are party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). EURATOM and all its nonnuclear weapon state member states have an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of full-scope IAEA safeguards within the respective territories of the nonnuclear weapon states. The two EURATOM nuclear weapon states, France and the United Kingdom, like the United States, have voluntary safeguards agreements with the IAEA. In addition, EURATOM itself applies its own stringent safeguards at all peaceful facilities within the territories of all member states. The United States and EURATOM are of one mind in their unswerving commitment to achieving global nuclear nonproliferation goals. I call the attention of the Congress to the joint U.S.-EURATOM "Declaration on Non-Proliferation Policy" appended to the text of the agreement I am transmitting herewith.

The proposed new agreement provides for very stringent controls over certain fuel cycle activities, including enrichment, reprocessing, and alteration in form or content and storage of plutonium and other sensitive nuclear materials. The United States and EURATOM have accepted these controls on a reciprocal basis, not as a sign of either Party's distrust of the

other, and not for the purpose of interfering with each other's fuel cycle choices, which are for each Party to determine for itself, but rather as a reflection of their common conviction that the provisions in question represent an important norm for peaceful nuclear commerce.

In view of the strong commitment of EURATOM and its member states to the international nonproliferation regime, the comprehensive nonproliferation commitments they have made, the advanced technological character of the EURATOM civil nuclear program, the long history of extensive transatlantic cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without any risk of proliferation, and the fact that all member states are close allies or close friends of the United States, the proposed new agreement provides to EURATOM (and on a reciprocal basis, to the United States) advance, long-term approval for specified enrichment, retransfers, reprocessing, alteration in form or content, and storage of specified nuclear material, and for retransfers of nonnuclear material and equipment. The approval for reprocessing and alteration in form or content may be suspended if either activity ceases to meet the criteria set out in U.S. law, including criteria relating to safeguards and physical protection.

In providing advance, long-term approval for certain nuclear fuel cycle activities, the proposed agreement has features similar to those in several other agreements for cooperation that the United States has entered into subsequent to enactment of the NNPA. These include bilateral U.S. agreements with Japan, Finland, Norway and Sweden. (The U.S. agreements with Finland and Sweden will be automatically terminated upon entry into force of the new U.S.-EURATOM agreement, as Finland and Sweden joined the European Union on January 1, 1995.) Among the documents I am transmitting herewith to the Congress is an analysis by the Secretary of Energy of the advance, long-term approvals contained in the proposed U.S. agreement with EURATOM. The analysis concludes that the approvals meet all requirements of the Atomic Energy Act.

I believe that the proposed agreement for cooperation with EURATOM will make an important contribution to achieving our nonproliferation, trade and other significant foreign policy goals.

In particular, I am convinced that this agreement will strengthen the international nuclear nonproliferation regime, support of which is a fundamental objective of U.S. national security and foreign policy, by setting a high standard for rigorous nonproliferation conditions and controls.

It will substantially upgrade U.S. controls over nuclear items subject to the current U.S.-EURATOM agreement as well as over future cooperation.

I believe that the new agreement will also demonstrate the U.S. intention to be a reliable nuclear trading partner, and thus help ensure continuation and, I hope, growth of U.S. civil nuclear exports to EURATOM member states.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. The Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations and House International Relations Committees as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 29, 1995.*

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE FOR 5 MINUTES

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not entertain that request at this point.

LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 269 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. 2564.

□ 1032

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. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. KOLBE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to the bill?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the votes yesterday on this bill are very explicit. The committee has the steam and the power to turn back amendments.

Lobby disclosure, the field that I have been interested in for 5 years, our foreign interests, individuals from our Government and individuals who represent the interests of foreign entities, the law has been so vague and so weak that two out of every three agents representing foreign interests do not even bother to register.

Now, this bill addresses that to some degree, but there are still fines and penalties that are so huge it is like shooting a flea with a bazooka. As a result, the Department of Justice does not enforce it. We have many foreign interests lobbying the Congress of the United States. That basically goes unchecked, and when you try and change it, there is always a good reason why it should not be now.

I am not impugning the work of the fine chairman here, nor his intentions, but I would like to say this. Here is, in essence, what we are doing here in the Congress. To make a bill as good as it could be, maybe even make a bill great, that bill has no shot. If you want to pass it, send a mediocre bill to the other body who all of a sudden is the big decisionmaker on what our legislation should be.

Let me inform Congress that the first Senate was appointed by State legislatures to protect the interests of the States. The House of Representatives, the House of Commons, was to protect the people of the country. I think it is unbelievable to me that we would have these foreign agents running around, not even registering, and we have taken token steps to clamp down on that. I think it is time to change that.

In essence, I am taking a little bit of time away from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] to be here, and I am hoping somebody else is here to offer an amendment. I am not going to offer my amendment first unless there is nobody else and this committee rises.

If it is going to be defeated, then so be it, but here is what the Traficant amendment says: You will have to register. If you do not register, you will be subject to fines, anywhere from $2,000 to $1 million. You could be prosecuted. You could be subpoenaed in. To register and to extend, you will do so January 31 and July 31. You will have known dates to do it. And we will know who you are. The American taxpayer should know who represents foreign interests.

Technically in the past, when this law was written, it dealt with Nazi Germany. We were interested in spies. Well, now we have foreign agents whose interest is trade. Commercial interests. I would submit that that is a greater problem in this country today than anything else we deal with, with a trade deficit of $170 billion.

Who represents China, folks? Who represents Japan? Who represents the European interests? Who represents any foreign interest that has an interest in the legislation today or an interest in the legislation dealing with Bosnia or dealing with appropriation matters of defense? That is what the issue is about.

I am hoping that the Members of Congress will take a look at this. I think the committee has brought enough Democrats together to carry the load, that in fact they will accept no amendments because if there are amendments, the Senate just is not going to accept it.

Well, as one Member of Congress, let me say this to the Senate. Quite frankly, Scarlett, I think the Congress should draft only the best legislation and that is the legislation to be signed into law.

With that, it is good to see the venerable chairman here. I do not question the intentions of former Chairman FRANK and Chairman CANADY. I think you have done a fine job. I hope the Members realize that there are foreign interests that lobby the Government, and we are dealing with lobby disclosure, and we are not doing the best job we can with foreign interests.

Maybe the Members might just decide to do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 37, line 11, strike "AMENDMENT" and insert "AMENDMENTS", in line 13 insert "(a) REPORTS.—" before "Strike" and insert after line 21 the following:

(b) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) AGENT OF A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1(c) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U.S.C. 611(c)), is amended—

(i) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" each place it appears and inserting "representative of a foreign principal";

(ii) in paragraph (1)(iv), by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(iii) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) any person who engages in political activities for purposes of furthering commercial, industrial, or financial operations with a foreign principal.

For purposes of clause (1), a foreign principal shall be considered to control a person in major part if the foreign principal holds more than 50 percent equitable ownership in such person or, subject to rebuttal evidence, if the foreign principal holds at least 20 percent but not more than 50 percent equitable ownership in such person.".

(B) FURTHER DEFINITION.—Section 1(d) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'representative of a foreign principal' does not include—

"(1) any news or press service or association organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or any newspaper, magazine, periodical, or other publication for which there is on file with the United States Postal Service information in compliance with section 3685 of title 39, United States Code, published in the United States, solely by virtue of any bona fide news or journalistic activities, including the solicitation or acceptance of advertisements, subscriptions, or other compensation therefor, so long as it is at least 80 percent beneficially owned by, and its officers and directors, if any, are citizens of the United States, and such news or press service or association, newspaper magazine, periodical, or other publication, is not owned, directed, supervised, controlled, subsidized, or financed, and none of its policies are determined by any foreign principal defined in subsection (b) of this section, or by any representative of a foreign principal required to register under this Act; or

"(2) any incorporated, nonprofit membership organization organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States that is registered under section 308 of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act and has obtained tax-exempt status under section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and whose activities are directly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole by citizens of the United States.".

(2) POLITICAL PROMOTIONAL OR INFORMATIONAL MATERIALS.—Section 1(j) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(j)) is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (1), by striking "propaganda" and inserting "promotional or informational materials"; and

(B) in clause (1), by striking "prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, or in any other way" and inserting "in any way".

(3) POLITICAL ACTIVITIES.—Section 1(o) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(o)) is amended—

(A) by striking "prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way" and inserting "in any way"; and

(B) by striking "or changing the domestic or foreign" and inserting "enforcing, or changing the domestic or foreign laws, regulations, or".

(4) POLITICAL CONSULTANT.—Section 1(p) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(p)) is amended—

(A) by inserting "(1)" after "any person"; and

(B) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: ", or (2) who distributes political promotional or informational materials to an officer or employee of the United States Government, in his or her capacity as such officer or employee".

(5) SERVING PREDOMINANTLY A FOREIGN INTEREST.—Section 1(q) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611(q)) is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of clause (ii) of the proviso; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", and (iv) such activities do not involve the representation of the interests of the foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States other than providing information in response to requests by such agency or official or as a necessary part of a formal judicial or administrative proceeding, including the initiation of such a proceeding.".

(c) SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTRATION.—Section 2(b) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 612(b)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence by striking ", within thirty days" and all that follows through "preceding six months' period" and inserting "on January 31 and July 31 of each year file with the Attorney General a supplement thereto under oath, on a form prescribed by the Attorney General, which shall set forth regarding the six-month periods ending the previous December 31, and June 30, respectively, or, if a lesser period, the period since the initial filing,"; and

(2) by inserting after the first sentence the following new sentence: "Any registrant using an accounting system with a fiscal year which is different from the calendar year may petition the Attorney General to permit the filing of supplemental statements at the close of the first and seventh month of each such fiscal year in lieu of the dates specified by the preceding sentence.".

(d) REMOVAL OF EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Section 3(f) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613(f)) is repealed.

(e) LIMITING EXEMPTION FOR LEGAL REPRESENTATION.—Section 3(g) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613(g)) is amended by striking "or any agency of the Government of the United States" and all that follows through "informal" and inserting "or before the Patent and Trademark Office, including any written submission to that Office".

(f) NOTIFICATION OF RELIANCE ON EXEMPTIONS.—Section 3 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 613) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Any person who does not register under section 2(a) on account of any provision of subsections (a) through (g) of this section shall so notify the Attorney General in such form and manner as the Attorney General prescribes.".

(g) CIVIL PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS.—Section 8 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 618) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i)(1) Any person who is determined, after notice and opportunity for an administrative hearing—

"(A) to have failed to file when such filing is required a registration statement under section 2(a) or a supplement thereto under section 2(b),

"(B) to have omitted a material fact required to be stated therein, or

"(C) to have made a false statement with respect to such a material fact,

shall be required to pay for each violation committed a civil penalty of not less than $2,000 and not more than $1,000,000. In determining the amount of the penalty, the Attorney General shall give due consideration to the nature and duration of the violation.

"(2)(A) Whenever the Attorney General has reason to believe that any person may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to an investigation regarding any violation of paragraph (1) of this subsection or of section 5, the Attorney General may, before bringing any civil or criminal proceeding thereon, issue in writing, and cause to be served upon such person, a civil investigative demand requiring such person to produce such material for examination.

"(B) Civil investigative demands issued under this paragraph shall be subject to the applicable provisions of section 1968 of title 18, United States Code.".

(h) CHANGE IN SHORT TITLE OF THE ACT.—Section 14 of that Act (22 U.S.C. 611 note) is amended by striking "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended" and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".

(i) REFERENCES TO AGENT OF A FOREIGN PRINCIPAL.—The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended is amended—

(1) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" each place it appears and inserting "representative of a foreign principal";

(2) by striking "agents of foreign principals" each place it appears and inserting "representatives of foreign principals";

(3) by striking "agent of such principal" each place it appears and inserting "representative of such principal"; and

(4) by striking "such agent" each place it appears and inserting "such representative".

(j) REFERENCES TO POLITICAL PROPAGANDA.—

(1) The paragraph preceding section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended is amended by striking "propaganda" and inserting "political".

(2) The Foreign Interests Representation Act (other than the paragraph amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection) is amended by striking "propaganda" each place it appears and inserting "promotional or informational materials".

(k) REFERENCES TO THE ACT.—

(1) Section 207(f)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended," and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".

(2) Section 219 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended," and inserting "representative of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Interests Representation Act"; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" and inserting "representative of a foreign principal";

(ii) by striking "such agent" and inserting "such representative"; and

(iii) by striking "Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended" and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".

(3) Section 5210(4) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4809(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking "agent of a foreign principal" and inserting "representative of a foreign principal"; and

(B) by striking "subsection (d) of the first section of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611)" and inserting "section 1(d) of the Foreign Interests Representation Act (22 U.S.C. 611(d)),".

(4) Section 34(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 34(a)) is amended by striking "Act of June 8, 1934 (ch. 327, 52 Stat. 631), as amended" and inserting "Foreign Interests Representation Act".

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, November 16, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the 15 minutes in opposition. I yield 7½ minutes of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to yield blocks of time to other Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] each will be recognized for 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

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

As I discussed, every year foreign interests spend hundreds of millions of dollars to influence our Government. They employ topnotch representatives. Many times they are former staff members of key committees, counsel to Ways and Means. Sometimes they are Members who chaired the most powerful committees in the Congress.

That evidently is a way of life, and the bill attempted to deal with that by banning for a lifetime U.S. Trade Representatives and Deputy Trade Representatives. We felt that did not go far enough.

But the bottom line is there are several General Accounting Office reports, and they basically say that only one out of every three, maybe only one out of every four agents who represent foreign interests take the time to register. The Traficant amendment deals with the registration of these agents dealing with foreign interests, and, in fact, penalties to stop such abuse.

Since that 1990 report was released by the General Accounting Office, the GAO wrote, neither the Justice Department nor Congress has adequately rectified this breach of security.

I submitted a bill dealing with the issue. The bottom line is with the end of the cold war, our whole dynamic on foreign interest lobbying has switched from sinister underground spy networks to trade and global competition. Many individuals and law firms who represent interests in these areas are exempt from registration under the act.

Now the bill deals with that, but not enough. The Traficant amendment would make them come in and submit in writing the reasons why they should qualify for an exemption.

In addition to that, the bill basically, and the focus, is changed from foreign agent representation act to foreign interest representation act, and that is where it should be.

Any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering commercial, industrial or financial operations of a foreign interest would no longer be exempt. In addition, representatives of foreign interests will now be required to notify the Attorney General. Moreover, any person relying on an exemption under the act must notify the Justice Department of their intention to do so.

The amendment also establishes a test to determine what constitutes foreign control. Entities that are more than 50 percent foreign owned would be presumed to be foreign controlled, and be required to register. Entities with a 20 to 50 percent foreign ownership would also be considered foreign controlled.

But the timeliness of foreign agent registration now becomes an issue. Of the 28 registration statements reviewed in the GAO report, 70 percent had not even registered on time, for those who had registered.

Now one out of four is registering, and 70 percent of the one out of four is registering late. No one is really looking into them. We are talking about lobbying. We are worried about everybody lobbying Congress. I am talking about foreign interests that lobby the Congress of the United States. I could hear the talk. I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK]. "Yes, it's right, TRAFICANT, you're right, but not now." Beam me up here.

The penalties that are under law right now are so great the Justice Department shies away. The Traficant amendment puts reasonable penalties on. From a $2,000 civil fine up to $1 million with repeated abuse or significant facts.

The Justice Department would be given the authority to subpoena individuals for testimony and their records. The bottom line here is, even though I am preaching to the wind, we are now worried about Bosnia, with a $40 billion trade deficit with China.

Who represents China? We do not know. I guarantee you that. A $70-plus billion trade deficit with Japan. Whom all of those are, we do not know. We have gone from a $2 billion surplus with Mexico to a $20 billion deficit projected this year. Who represents the Government of Mexico? Who represents interests in Mexico?

□ 1045

Mr. Chairman, Canada, $16 billion surplus. Who represents all those interests? Here we are with North American free trade, Congress; we have a $36 billion deficit in our own hemisphere. We have chased our workers out of the country, chased our factories out, and we do not even require the people who represent those interests to register.

The Senate, the Senate said, "If you add this on, it is gone, boy." Let me

tell you what, any Senate that would reject this commonsense amendment is a Senate that the American people can do without.

I do not know how much time I have left, Mr. Chairman, but I want to retain some of my time to hear these illustrious rebuttals.

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

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

I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Ohio on this issue. I have offered to work with the gentleman from Ohio on his concerns.

I believe that the bill that is before the House addresses the concerns that the gentleman has in a very substantive way. I believe that the bill takes a big step forward in improving the information that will be available concerning foreign agents as well as persons representing foreign business interests.

As I have said before on the floor, I believe that this whole issue of the representation of foreign interests is something that we need to look into with greater detail. I am committed to doing that in a comprehensive way early next year in the Subcommittee on the Constitution.

I am concerned that, in some ways, the gentleman's amendment would actually weaken what we have in the bill. I think that that is a point that needs to be made and understood by the Members.

But I want to work with the gentleman from Ohio. I would urge the gentleman from Ohio to withdraw his amendment so that we can move forward with this important legislation, put this legislation on the President's desk, and break the 40-year gridlock. I understand what the gentleman has said, and I respect his perspective on this.

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

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Would the gentleman articulate where the Traficant amendment weakens his bill?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I will, Mr. Chairman. For instance, H.R. 2564, the bill before the House now, eliminates the domestic subsidiary exemption which is currently in the law for foreign corporations. Your amendment would restore that exemption. Now, I think that is a weakening of the bill.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Notification would allow it. We have to know the reasons, sir. Let us be honest about that. Right now that exemption goes without notice.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I urge the Members of the House to focus on the issue here. We debated this at great length yesterday or earlier and at some length yesterday. The point here is that we have a bill dealing with lobby disclosure reform. This is an issue that has been tied up in the House and the Senate for more than 40 years. We have seen 40 years of gridlock.

We have a historic opportunity today to send a bill to the President to sign that will ensure that the public has access to information concerning lobbying activities here in Washington. I think it is time we do that.

There is bipartisan consensus that that is what we should do. There is bipartisan support for this bill that passed the Senate 98 to zero.

I do not claim that this is a perfect bill. But I do know that if history repeats itself, we will not get anything done on this issue, and I think the American people want something done and they are tired of excuses. They are tired of delay. They are tired of games that are played, and it is time that we ended that.

So I would urge opposition to the amendment, the well-intended amendment, offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], a major sponsor of this legislation on our side.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] that what you are asking for in this amendment is, in my opinion, the right thing, as were several of the amendments asked for last night, and I think I can speak with more credibility perhaps than many of the Members of the House about this because of the fact that over the last years I have introduced and on occasion passed legislation to require disclosure of foreign ownership, sponsored and voted for legislation to force disclosure of the lobbying connections between our former Cabinet members and their clients after they leave and to prohibit them from being able to lobby for or advise foreign nationals or foreign companies. I agree with you.

It is not the amendment that you have here today that is the problem. It is the fact that any amendment in this setting is a problem.

As you know, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] are going to introduce legislation which I intend to cosponsor that will take these amendments and put them into law. We will get to vote on this again.

The Senate has not said that if you put the Traficant amendment on we will kill this bill or if you put the Istook amendment on we will kill this bill; they have not said they are going to kill the bill at all.

What we know, though, is if this bill goes to conference, as opposed to being passed and going to the President, it is going to be tied up and killed as it has been every time it has been attempted for 40 years.

Here we have a historic opportunity to pass this bill and see it signed into law and watch a major bipartisan accomplishment improve this process. Any amendment offered today, no matter how good it is, standing alone, is going to endanger this process.

For that reason I ask Members to vote "no" and then to cosponsor the Canady-Frank bill that will come after it.

I want to say the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] has played this straight from the beginning. He played it straight last year when we were in the majority, and I was chairman of the Committee of jurisdiction, and he has played it straight this year as subcommittee chairman. I accept his commitment to do just what he said; that is, to have hearings and move this bill out of here that contains many of the things we would like to see done.

For the time being, please vote "no" on the amendment today so we can pass the bill.

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

Let me say the gentleman from Ohio has brought this to our attention before. I agree with most of his amendment.

This is a complex issue, and as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, there is one point the gentleman from Ohio acknowledges, and I appreciate it, that the legislation here would strengthen regulation of foreign agents. He makes the point that we can strengthen it further. We agree with him.

But there are two points that are relevant. First, and I think what happened was he quite sensibly drafted his amendment to the existing law. This bill, as it came to us, changed the existing law. So, while his amendment does, in fact, strengthen the regulation of foreign interests in most instances, there is one instance, because of the kind of problem that happens with drafting, where he drafted to the original law and then the bill about came in after that, and there is one provision here, domestic subsidiaries of foreign interests, which now have an exemption in the law, and the bill, as presented, would abolish that exemption. Domestic subsidiaries would have no exemption. What they have now is a too generous exemption.

The gentleman from Ohio understandably tightens up the exemption. What he could not have known when he was drafting his bill was this legislation would do away with the exemption altogether. So, through no fault of anyone's, in fact, in this one case his bill

weakens the scheme. In general, it strengthens it. His amendment, in general, strengthens it. In this one instance, it weakens it because it modifies an exemption we abolished altogether.

I would note I mentioned yesterday we have, and I am holding a bill here that includes as cosponsors myself, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], I hope the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] on the other side, and others. Not the chairman of the subcommittee, because he quite understandably wants to preserve his ability to look at the whole thing. But he promised us yesterday—and I have worked with him for years and he is a man who has kept every promise he has ever made to other Members—there would be a hearing and markup of legislation that would focus specifically on tightening foreign agents' registration.

Here is our problem. As my friend from Texas said, it is not anyone in the Senate has said if you change it we will kill the bill. It is worse than that. If we had such a public threat, then the gentleman would be correct, the gentleman from Ohio, and political pressure could be brought against them. But as the gentleman from Ohio understands as well as anyone here, this bill has a lot of enemies who do not want to admit they are its enemies. If we were dealing with someone who stood up and said, amend it and I will kill it, we could deal with that.

This bill is not likely to be shot head on. It is likely to be nibbled at from all sides. It will disappear. There will be quicksand here. There will be a bend in the road. We have a crowded legislative calendar.

It took a lot of energy to get this bill up even today. If it has to go to conference with everything else going on, with Bosnia, with the budget, with all the other major items, there is a strong likelihood of it being held up.

The problem is not if you go to conference and someone stands up and says, "I hate this bill," but people who want to kill it say, "I like this bill better than you do. I want to do it this way. I want to do it that way." We have no way to resolve it.

So we believe, and we appreciate the gentleman acknowledging this, we have a bill that improves the scheme of regulation of foreign interests. We agree it does not go far enough. Our hope is that we would get this bill passed, which we can do. If we get by this amendment without it being adopted, this bill goes to the President's desk, in my opinion, and we then immediately thereafter begin to tighten it. We tighten it in ways where I think we have a consensus.

The only change we would want to make in the gentleman's bill, I want to make, would be one I think he would agree with, we would want to continue to wipe out that exemption rather than to restore it.

With that, I hope the gentleman from Ohio would understand we say this in a cooperative spirit and want to get this bill to the President's desk.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Under the bill, section 8, lobbying contact, under exceptions, B, the term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or foreign political party and disclosed. I have heard all of this talk about how it is so much stronger.

Let us talk about what your bill does not do here, folks. Your bill does not empower the opportunity of the Justice Department to subpoena foreign agents to appear, testify, or produce records at administrative hearings concerning their violation of registration. Your bill does not impose administrative fines for minor violations against those who, after being directly informed of their obligation to report, still fail to do so. So, as a result, the General Accounting Office says this is meaningless. The Department of Justice is not going to go after these gnats with an MX missile.

Now, if there is some delineation and clarification of exemption, I would submit I would have to see in writing where the strength of your language is that much stronger. But, given that, given that, when is it that there are minor matters that deal in these issues that cannot be rectified in the conference with the U.S. Senate? Have we started to become subservient to the House of Lords or what?

Let me say, I do not have that much time. You guys are going to defeat the amendment. I want to say this to you: We have allowed foreign interests to run around this country lobbying our Government, and if not this bill today, then, damn it, when? That is what this bill is about. You are telling me you are going to bring another bill back. It is going to go to the other body. They are going to like it then, and the President is going to sign it.

What I am hearing today is: If it is great legislation, it has no shot; if it is mediocre, send it over, boys.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

•I am disappointed in my friend. We are trying to work this out. You want to posture and wave your arms, fine.

You asked me where is your bill weaker. We, in our bill here, page 26, line 13, letter D, striking subsection (q), subsection (q) of the law is an exemption granted to domestic subsidiaries of foreign agents. We abolish that exemption. Your bill merely amends it.

Yes, your bill tightens this in some ways. But here is the specific case, page 26, line 13.

Second, we are not being subservient to the Senate. We are recognizing what you yourself understand. There are enemies of this bill who, if it goes back into the parliamentary thicket, will make it less likely it emerges.

□ 1100

That is why we want to get this thing done, and then move beyond that. But I will say at this point, there is a very specific area, page 26, line 13, where we strike an exemption for domestic subsidiaries of foreign interests, a pretty significant one, and you leave it in there and modify it. That is the difference.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, under my amendment, and listen to the language, "Any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering the commercial or financial operations of a foreign interest would no longer be exempt. In addition, representatives of foreign interests will now be required to notify the Attorney General" if they would even seek any technicality to have such an exemption.

The only thing that I do is, I ban it too, but I make sure that at least those have an intention of trying to get around the registration have to show their hand here. I think that that speaks well of it. If there could be any more clarifying language, I would be glad to accept it.

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

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

The gentleman had just said, first of all, he abolishes the exemption; but, second, he makes you tell the Attorney General if you are going to get it. That is like saying, "I didn't take the bicycle, and it was fixed when I gave it back to you, but it was broken when I took it."

The fact is that the gentleman, inadvertently perhaps, restores an exemption that this bill repeals, and saying that the Attorney General has to tell us does not change the facts. That is why this would benefit from being able to be worked on, as we will do in January or February.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

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

Mr. Chairman, we are so close. We are about this close from passing real lobby reform legislation, the length of the pen that the President of the United States can use to sign this into law. We have done it in a very contentious Congress, on a bipartisan basis, with people who said "Yes, let us have a gift

ban, and a strong gift ban," and who now, after almost 50 years, five decades, are this close, the length of a pen, to signing this into law and to make it the law of the land that we are reforming this Congress and regulating the lobby.

Yes, I am very concerned about the lack of registration of foreign agents. There are some that are not registered. But for every one of them, there are dozens or hundreds of people that are domestic agents that are not registered under our laws today. I am concerned about the loss of jobs to other countries, but I am also concerned about the loss of the public interest from this Capitol building. Let us do what is right today: Defeat these amendments, place this on the President's desk, sign it into law this year, and then move on to reform our campaign finance laws, on a bipartisan basis also.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from western Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH], replacing the big shoes of Tom Ridge, and he has done a fine job.

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and for his handsome comments.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment, I think, provides fundamental reform of the registration of foreign agents. I think it is timely and necessary, given that this aspect of the law has not been modified for many decades and is demanding of reform. It is an obscenity right now that most representatives of foreign interests do not register. They are not in the public domain. The public is not protected from them and is not provided with the information that they need about the level of foreign interest representation.

Mr. Chairman, let me say, there is no controversy here. The managers of this bill have conceded, despite some technical arguments, that generally this amendment would strengthen this bill. That clearly is not in question here. I think the managers of this bill have made one real argument against this amendment, that somehow it impedes the progress of the legislation. However, I would repeat my earlier argument on previous amendments, like the English-Traficant amendment that was defeated last night by a very narrow margin, that we need to do our business.

It has been conceded here that this bill, this underlying bill, should be stronger. I would submit that we will feed public cynicism if we do not go forward and produce, here and now, the strongest possible bill, and have the discipline to follow through and get a conference passed by both houses. I do not think we can jump start this by simply passing the Senate version which, as has been conceded, does not go far enough in some particulars.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been one of the few issues that has been bipartisan in the extraordinary leadership of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], Republican and Democrat coming together for the first time in 49 years to pass meaningful lobby disclosure.

The Senate wants the bill of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] to pass. They want this bill to be sent back to the Senate. Some do not like the Simpson amendment in it; some do not like for the first time the fact that Senators will have to disclose their blind trusts, the full amount. They want it to come back to them so in conference they can take out the parts they do not want. Others want to send the President a bill that he will veto, to embarrass the President.

Mr. Chairman, we have the opportunity to have for the first time since 1946 meaningful lobby disclosure pass this Congress and be signed by the President. When they passed meaningful lobby disclosure in 1946 it was gutted by the Supreme Court in 1954. We have a meaningless law right now on the books. It is the reason that only 6,000 people register as lobbyists, when it is estimated that 60,000 to 80,000 people actually lobby Congress and lobby the executive branch. We have an opportunity to have these individuals lobby, and to disclose that they lobby, to disclose who pays them, to learn how much they are paid and to learn what they do.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] has a good concept. I believe that will pass. I believe that we can bring out a bill on its own, combined with a few others that have come forward in the course of this debate, but I urge my colleagues to recognize we are so close. We have the opportunity to defeat this amendment, maybe defeat one more, and then send it to the President and have it become law.

I would just conclude by congratulating the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY] and congratulating the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], and to tell them that it is refreshing to participate, and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] and others, to participate in a bipartisan effort to get true lobby disclosure.

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

Mr. Chairman, No. 1, I do not want any of my comments taken to in any way cast any shadow of competency and/or address to duty on behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], one of the most intelligent Members of this body, who has shepherded a lot of these bills in the past, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], his effort, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], both of them extremely well qualified and do an excellent job. They have worked with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] and we probably have the best brain trust involved in the bill. When you talk about the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], we talk about one of our more solid Members who understands the Constitution and can interpret law.

Saying that, Mr. Chairman, I agree with everything the gentleman said. I have some concerns with loopholes in your language. In section 3 under definitions, the definition of lobbying contact calls for, in subsection B, under subsection 8, the term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political entity.

Mr. Chairman, there is some real technical language in here that people can run with. Everybody says no, that does not apply, the other section applies. A court of law is a funny place. The only thing I would like to say is this: that the Traficant amendment gives reasonable fines for reasonable offenses. It provides a date certain when individual agents representing foreign agents must register, and they have no more than a 30-day grace period, January 30–July 30.

The point I am making is, I listen to these arguments but here is what troubles me. We all agree that this is strengthening. If there is one question on the exemption language which, quite frankly, I believe the intent of my legislation prohibits any exemptions for commercial trade issues and, in fact, further makes notice that anybody who misreads that section must notify the Attorney General that they think they may have an exemption, make sure there is a process, before they could even consider having an exemption. My bill specifically in fact denies any exemption. I will read it: "Any person who engages in political activities for the purpose of furthering commercial or financial operations of foreign interests would no longer be exempt."

Yes, the trouble that we have is most people do not know the law. There is no notification, which the Traficant bill provides. There is no reasonableness in the fines. As a result, there is no enforcement. There are no subpoena powers. It is like saying we are going to enforce the law, but we cannot subpoena your records.

I have been here for a number of years and, quite frankly, I am absolutely sickened by foreign interests who rip us off. Let me say this: We might be concerned about the Senate's blind trust today, but I am concerned about foreign interests' blindsiding of

the American economy. I think that is a hell of a lot more.

However, I am going to do this. I am asking the chairman, because I have a commitment by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK], will he include the Traficant language with that one minor clarification, in another piece of legislation, and does that have a shot to come out of this Congress?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, as I have told the gentleman before, I want to work with the gentleman on this issue. We are going to consider the specific language that he has proposed here today, any changes he wants to make on it, any other suggestions he has on this general subject. I want to move forward with as strong a piece of legislation on this subject on this legislation as we possibly can.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I would ask the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, is that a yes?

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Yes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I can guarantee to the gentleman, knowing the way this place functions, that we will have a new bill come out, his language will be in it in some form, and if he does not like that form, we will have a vote on the floor on his language, because we need a vote on this and other issues, and I can guarantee he can have a vote on this floor and I will be supporting it.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out, there are a number of others of us who would like to speak in favor of such effort.

Mr. TRAFICANT. With that, Mr. Chairman, I think we have at least made our case. The blind trusts of the Senate are important, but there is the blindsiding of our economy by individuals trying to operate and get around it. I agree, the gentleman's intentions are honorable.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment, which in text and in substance will be included in further legislation, from what I have heard, now be withdrawn and there be no labor of a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that today, the House of Representatives is considering H.R. 2564, legislation that will make long-overdue lobbying reforms. By approving this measure, the House will make real changes in the lobbying process, and take an important step toward restoring the American people's faith in their government.

Too often in the past, Congress has failed to effectively address the problems plaguing the lobbying process. Last year, for example, the House worked in a bipartisan manner to approve meaningful lobbying reform legislation, only to see the maneuvers of a few Republicans in the Senate block its enactment.

Throughout this year, Democrats have called upon the Republican majority to move forward with similarly meaningful lobbying reform legislation. By bringing H.R. 2564 to the floor, the Republicans have at last heard and answered this call. This bill would require professional lobbyists to identify their clients and disclose how much they are paid for their efforts. It would also guarantee the American people full access to this information.

Earlier this month, the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, recognized the importance of real lobbying reform and unanimously approved H.R. 2564. This impressive, bipartisan support offers great promise for today's debate on the measure.

Two weeks ago, the House demonstrated its commitment to reform by approving tough, new gift rules. Today, the House can take another step on the path toward needed reform and restored public faith in Government. I urge my colleagues to choose this path by passing real lobbying reform. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2564.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2564, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. This historic legislation imposes new disclosure requirements for lobbyists who contact legislative and executive branch officials and their staffs.

Lobbying reform legislation is long overdue. In fact, Congress has failed to agree to comprehensive legislation on this issue for 49 years. I have served in this body for almost 3 years and I am relieved to finally have the opportunity to vote for genuine lobbying reform.

Today, when the House adopts a rule to ban lobbyists from giving, and Members from receiving, unnecessary gifts, such as meals and vacations, it will be amending the 1946 Federal Regulation and Lobbying Act.

The 1946 act is seen as having broad deficiencies: among other weaknesses, it does not cover executive branch lobbying, grassroots lobbying, or the lobbying of congressional staff. These deficiencies have diminished the public's trust in Congress and its actions.

This issue should concern all Americans, because it indicates where the sympathies of their own Representatives lie, with them and their neighbors or with special interest groups based in Washington.

Polls clearly show that citizens continue to believe that special interests control the outcome of legislative debate. It is time for the House of Representatives and all of its Members to answer to the public's demand for lobbying reform.

The Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 reforms the way special interest groups and lobbyists unduly influence legislation on Capitol Hill. The legislation holds lobbyists responsible and if they break the law, they will be punished with tens of thousands of dollars in fines. I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 2564.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2564, the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. Unfortunately, current lobbying disclosure requirements are riddled with loopholes, which may lead public officials to enact policies that benefit special interests, rather than the public good. Building on Republican efforts to end business as usual in Washington, H.R. 2564 would impose strict registration and disclosure requirements for lobbyists who contact legislative and executive branch officials or their staffs. The bill would impose civil penalties on lobbyists who fail to file or who report false information, prohibit former U.S. trade officials from representing foreign entities, and expand financial disclosure requirements for Members of Congress.

In order to ensure that individuals who petition their congressional and Government representatives are not unfairly burdened with disclosure laws, H.R. 2564 defines a lobbyist as any individual who is employed or retained for compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a 6-month period.

There is strong bipartisan support for this legislation. In fact, the Senate passed an identical version of this legislation—S. 1060—on July 25, 1995, by a vote of 98 to 0.

Justifiable concerns were raised that if the Senate-version of this legislation were amended, the bill would become mired in a House-Senate conference, and the possibility of enacting any significant lobbying reform legislation would be substantially reduced. Therefore, although I find merit in many of the amendments which are being offered during floor consideration of H.R. 2564, I am voting against all changes to the underlying bill to avoid sending the legislation into a protracted House-Senate conference. This scenario would result in delay and disagreement between the two Chambers, which has in fact undermined previous attempts at lobbying reform.

Mr. Chairman, improvements in our outdated lobbying registration and disclosure requirements are long overdue. By promptly passing H.R. 2564 without amendment, we can send this important measure to the President's desk for signature into law. I am hopeful that the House will consider separate legislation relating to the issues raised through the amendment process in the coming months.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to approve this legislation in the same form as passed by the Senate. H.R. 2564 is an important reform bill which is worthy of strong bipartisan support.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support this legislation. It is a bill worth passing and one which should be enacted without further delay.

If passed by the House without amendment, the bill would be cleared for the President's signature. If amended however, the legislation must be returned to the Senate for further consideration. This delay will effectively kill lobby reform legislation for the rest of the 104th Congress.

This bill expands the registration requirements for lobbyists and requires more disclosure regarding lobbying activities. Specifically, the bill requires those who lobby congressional staff, senior executive branch officials, and Members of Congress to register as lobbyists.

In addition, lobbyists must identify their clients, the general issues on which they lobby, and how much they are paid for their efforts.

While we must ensure that the constitutional right of the people to petition their government is protected, we must also make certain that paid lobbying activities are adequately disclosed. This bill protects both of these principles and deserves our support.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2564 without amendment and pass these much-needed lobbying reforms.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALLARD) having assumed the chair, Mr. KOLBE, 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. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 269, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 828]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mfume
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Cox
Crane
de la Garza
Fattah
Flake
Hefner
Riggs
Roth
Towns
Tucker
Waters

□ 1134

Mrs. LINCOLN and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 828, I was necessarily detained due to official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 828, I was unavoidably detained on other legislative business and was not able to cast my vote within the allotted time. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2564, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 269, I call up the Senate bill (S. 1060) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of the Senate bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) responsible representative Government requires public awareness of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence the public decisionmaking process in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government;

(2) existing lobbying disclosure statutes have been ineffective because of unclear statutory language, weak administrative and enforcement provisions, and an absence of clear guidance as to who is required to register and what they are required to disclose; and

(3) the effective public disclosure of the identity and extent of the efforts of paid lobbyists to influence Federal officials in the conduct of Government actions will increase public confidence in the integrity of Government.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) CLIENT.—The term "client" means any person or entity that employs or retains another person for financial or other compensation to conduct lobbying activities on behalf of that person or entity. A person or entity whose employees act as lobbyists on its own behalf is both a client and an employer of such employees. In the case of a coalition or association that employs or retains other persons to conduct lobbying activities, the client is the coalition or association and not its individual members.

(3) COVERED EXECUTIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered executive branch official" means—

(A) the President;

(B) the Vice President;

(C) any officer or employee, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of such an officer or employee, in the Executive Office of the President;

(D) any officer or employee serving in a position in level I, II, III, IV, or V of the Executive Schedule, as designated by statute or Executive order;

(E) any member of the uniformed services whose pay grade is at or above O–7 under section 201 of title 37, United States Code; and

(F) any officer or employee serving in a position of a confidential, policy-determining, policy-making, or policy-advocating character described in section 7511(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(4) COVERED LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OFFICIAL.—The term "covered legislative branch official" means—

(A) a Member of Congress;

(B) an elected officer of either House of Congress;

(C) any employee of, or any other individual functioning in the capacity of an employee of—

(i) a Member of Congress;

(ii) a committee of either House of Congress;

(iii) the leadership staff of the House of Representatives or the leadership staff of the Senate;

(iv) a joint committee of Congress; and

(v) a working group or caucus organized to provide legislative services or other assistance to Members of Congress; and

(D) any other legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 109(13) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(5) EMPLOYEE.—The term "employee" means any individual who is an officer, employee, partner, director, or proprietor of a person or entity, but does not include—

(A) independent contractors; or

(B) volunteers who receive no financial or other compensation from the person or entity for their services.

(6) FOREIGN ENTITY.—The term "foreign entity" means a foreign principal (as defined in section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611(b)).

(7) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—The term "lobbying activities" means lobbying contacts and efforts in support of such contacts, including preparation and planning activities, research and other background work that is intended, at the time it is performed, for use in contacts, and coordination with the lobbying activities of others.

(8) LOBBYING CONTACT.—

(A) DEFINITION.—The term "lobbying contact" means any oral or written communication (including an electronic communication) to a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official that is made on behalf of a client with regard to—

(i) the formulation, modification, or adoption of Federal legislation (including legislative proposals);

(ii) the formulation, modification, or adoption of a Federal rule, regulation, Executive order, or any other program, policy, or position of the United States Government;

(iii) the administration or execution of a Federal program or policy (including the negotiation, award, or administration of a Federal contract, grant, loan, permit, or license); or

(iv) the nomination or confirmation of a person for a position subject to confirmation by the Senate.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term "lobbying contact" does not include a communication that is—

(i) made by a public official acting in the public official's official capacity;

(ii) made by a representative of a media organization if the purpose of the communication is gathering and disseminating news and information to the public;

(iii) made in a speech, article, publication or other material that is distributed and made available to the public, or through radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication;

(iv) made on behalf of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party and disclosed under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.);

(v) a request for a meeting, a request for the status of an action, or any other similar administrative request, if the request does not include an attempt to influence a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official;

(vi) made in the course of participation in an advisory committee subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act;

(vii) testimony given before a committee, subcommittee, or task force of the Congress, or submitted for inclusion in the public record of a hearing conducted by such committee, subcommittee, or task force;

(viii) information provided in writing in response to an oral or written request by a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official for specific information;

(ix) required by subpoena, civil investigative demand, or otherwise compelled by statute, regulation, or other action of the Congress or an agency;

(x) made in response to a notice in the Federal Register, Commerce Business Daily, or other similar publication soliciting communications from the public and directed to the agency official specifically designated in the notice to receive such communications;

(xi) not possible to report without disclosing information, the unauthorized disclosure of which is prohibited by law;

(xii) made to an official in an agency with regard to—

(I) a judicial proceeding or a criminal or civil law enforcement inquiry, investigation, or proceeding; or

(II) a filing or proceeding that the Government is specifically required by statute or regulation to maintain or conduct on a confidential basis,

if that agency is charged with responsibility for such proceeding, inquiry, investigation, or filing;

(xiii) made in compliance with written agency procedures regarding an adjudication conducted by the agency under section 554 of title 5, United States Code, or substantially similar provisions;

(xiv) a written comment filed in the course of a public proceeding or any other communication that is made on the record in a public proceeding;

(xv) a petition for agency action made in writing and required to be a matter of public record pursuant to established agency procedures;

(xvi) made on behalf of an individual with regard to that individual's benefits, employment, or other personal matters involving only that individual, except that this clause does not apply to any communication with—

(I) a covered executive branch official, or

(II) a covered legislative branch official (other than the individual's elected Members of Congress or employees who work under such Members' direct supervision),

with respect to the formulation, modification, or adoption of private legislation for the relief of that individual;

(xvii) a disclosure by an individual that is protected under the amendments made by the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, under the Inspector General Act of 1978, or under another provision of law;

(xviii) made by—

(I) a church, its integrated auxiliary, or a convention or association of churches that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph 2(A)(i) of section 6033(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or

(II) a religious order that is exempt from filing a Federal income tax return under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) of such section 6033(a); and

(xix) between—

(I) officials of a self-regulatory organization (as defined in section 3(a)(26) of the Securities Exchange Act) that is registered with or established by the Securities and Exchange Commission as required by that Act or a similar organization that is designated by or registered with the Commodities Future Trading Commission as provided under the Commodity Exchange Act; and

(II) the Securities and Exchange Commission or the Commodities Future Trading Commission, respectively;

relating to the regulatory responsibilities of such organization under that Act.

(9) LOBBYING FIRM.—The term "lobbying firm" means a person or entity that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists on behalf of a client other than that person or entity. The term also includes a self-employed individual who is a lobbyist.

(10) LOBBYIST.—The term "lobbyist" means any individual who is employed or retained

by a client for financial or other compensation for services that include more than one lobbying contact, other than an individual whose lobbying activities constitute less than 20 percent of the time engaged in the services provided by such individual to that client over a six month period.

(11) MEDIA ORGANIZATION.—The term "media organization" means a person or entity engaged in disseminating information to the general public through a newspaper, magazine, other publication, radio, television, cable television, or other medium of mass communication.

(12) MEMBER OF CONGRESS.—The term "Member of Congress" means a Senator or a Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(13) ORGANIZATION.—The term "organization" means a person or entity other than an individual.

(14) PERSON OR ENTITY.—The term "person or entity" means any individual, corporation, company, foundation, association, labor organization, firm, partnership, society, joint stock company, group of organizations, or State or local government.

(15) PUBLIC OFFICIAL.—The term "public official" means any elected official, appointed official, or employee of—

(A) a Federal, State, or local unit of government in the United States other than—

(i) a college or university;

(ii) a government-sponsored enterprise (as defined in section 3(8) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974);

(iii) a public utility that provides gas, electricity, water, or communications;

(iv) a guaranty agency (as defined in section 435(j) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(j))), including any affiliate of such an agency; or

(v) an agency of any State functioning as a student loan secondary market pursuant to section 435(d)(1)(F) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(d)(1)(F));

(B) a Government corporation (as defined in section 9101 of title 31, United States Code);

(C) an organization of State or local elected or appointed officials other than officials of an entity described in clause (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), or (v) of subparagraph (A);

(D) an Indian tribe (as defined in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e));

(E) a national or State political party or any organizational unit thereof; or

(F) a national, regional, or local unit of any foreign government.

(16) STATE.—The term "State" means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States.

SEC. 4. REGISTRATION OF LOBBYISTS.

(a) REGISTRATION.—

(1) GENERAL RULE.—No later than 45 days after a lobbyist first makes a lobbying contact or is employed or retained to make a lobbying contact, whichever is earlier, such lobbyist (or, as provided under paragraph (2), the organization employing such lobbyist), shall register with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

(2) EMPLOYER FILING.—Any organization that has 1 or more employees who are lobbyists shall file a single registration under this section on behalf of such employees for each client on whose behalf the employees act as lobbyists.

(3) EXEMPTION.—

(A) GENERAL RULE.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), a person or entity whose—

(i) total income for matters related to lobbying activities on behalf of a particular client (in the case of a lobbying firm) does not exceed and is not expected to exceed $5,000; or

(ii) total expenses in connection with lobbying activities (in the case of an organization whose employees engage in lobbying activities on its own behalf) do not exceed or are not expected to exceed $20,000,

(as estimated under section 5) in the semiannual period described in section 5(a) during which the registration would be made is not required to register under subsection (a) with respect to such client.

(B) ADJUSTMENT.—The dollar amounts in subparagraph (A) shall be adjusted—

(i) on January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) since the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) on January 1 of each fourth year occurring after January 1, 1997, to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index (as determined by the Secretary of Labor) during the preceding 4-year period,

rounded to the nearest $500.

(b) CONTENTS OF REGISTRATION.—Each registration under this section shall contain—

(1) the name, address, business telephone number, and principal place of business of the registrant, and a general description of its business or activities;

(2) the name, address, and principal place of business of the registrant's client, and a general description of its business or activities (if different from paragraph (1));

(3) the name, address, and principal place of business of any organization, other than the client, that—

(A) contributes more than $10,000 toward the lobbying activities of the registrant in a semiannual period described in section 5(a); and

(B) in whole or in major part plans, supervises, or controls such lobbying activities.

(4) the name, address, principal place of business, amount of any contribution of more than $10,000 to the lobbying activities of the registrant, and approximate percentage of equitable ownership in the client (if any) of any foreign entity that—

(A) holds at least 20 percent equitable ownership in the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3);

(B) directly or indirectly, in whole or in major part, plans, supervises, controls, directs, finances, or subsidizes the activities of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3); or

(C) is an affiliate of the client or any organization identified under paragraph (3) and has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity;

(5) a statement of—

(A) the general issue areas in which the registrant expects to engage in lobbying activities on behalf of the client; and

(B) to the extent practicable, specific issues that have (as of the date of the registration) already been addressed or are likely to be addressed in lobbying activities; and

(6) the name of each employee of the registrant who has acted or whom the registrant expects to act as a lobbyist on behalf of the client and, if any such employee has served as a covered executive branch official or a covered legislative branch official in the 2 years before the date on which such employee first acted (after the date of enactment of this Act) as a lobbyist on behalf of the client, the position in which such employee served.

(c) GUIDELINES FOR REGISTRATION.—

(1) MULTIPLE CLIENTS.—In the case of a registrant making lobbying contacts on behalf of more than 1 client, a separate registration under this section shall be filed for each such client.

(2) MULTIPLE CONTACTS.—A registrant who makes more than 1 lobbying contact for the same client shall file a single registration covering all such lobbying contacts.

(d) TERMINATION OF REGISTRATION.—A registrant who after registration—

(1) is no longer employed or retained by a client to conduct lobbying activities, and

(2) does not anticipate any additional lobbying activities for such client,

may so notify the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives and terminate its registration.

SEC. 5. REPORTS BY REGISTERED LOBBYISTS.

(a) SEMIANNUAL REPORT.—No later than 45 days after the end of the semiannual period beginning on the first day of each January and the first day of July of each year in which a registrant is registered under section 4, each registrant shall file a report with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives on its lobbying activities during such semiannual period. A separate report shall be filed for each client of the registrant.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—Each semiannual report filed under subsection (a) shall contain—

(1) the name of the registrant, the name of the client, and any changes or updates to the information provided in the initial registration;

(2) for each general issue area in which the registrant engaged in lobbying activities on behalf of the client during the semiannual filing period—

(A) a list of the specific issues upon which a lobbyist employed by the registrant engaged in lobbying activities, including, to the maximum extent practicable, a list of bill numbers and references to specific executive branch actions;

(B) a statement of the Houses of Congress and the Federal agencies contacted by lobbyists employed by the registrant on behalf of the client;

(C) a list of the employees of the registrant who acted as lobbyists on behalf of the client; and

(D) a description of the interest, if any, of any foreign entity identified under section 4(b)(4) in the specific issues listed under subparagraph (A).

(3) in the case of a lobbying firm, a good faith estimate of the total amount of all income from the client (including any payments to the registrant by any other person for lobbying activities on behalf of the client) during the semiannual period, other than income for matters that are unrelated to lobbying activities; and

(4) in the case of a registrant engaged in lobbying activities on its own behalf, a good faith estimate of the total expenses that the registrant and its employees incurred in connection with lobbying activities during the semiannual filing period.

(c) ESTIMATES OF INCOME OR EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section, estimates of income or expenses shall be made as follows:

(1) Estimates of amounts in excess of $10,000 shall be rounded to the nearest $20,000.

(2) In the event income or expenses do not exceed $10,000, the registrant shall include a statement that income or expenses totaled less than $10,000 for the reporting period.

(3) A registrant that reports lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may satisfy the requirement to report income or expenses by filing with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives a copy of the form filed in accordance with section 6033(b)(8).

SEC. 6. DISCLOSURE AND ENFORCEMENT.

The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall—

(1) provide guidance and assistance on the registration and reporting requirements of this Act and develop common standards, rules, and procedures for compliance with this Act;

(2) review, and, where necessary, verify and inquire to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of registration and reports;

(3) develop filing, coding, and cross-indexing systems to carry out the purpose of this Act, including—

(A) a publicly available list of all registered lobbyists, lobbying firms, and their clients; and

(B) computerized systems designed to minimize the burden of filing and maximize public access to materials filed under this Act;

(4) make available for public inspection and copying at reasonable times the registrations and reports filed under this Act;

(5) retain registrations for a period of at least 6 years after they are terminated and reports for a period of at least 6 years after they are filed;

(6) compile and summarize, with respect to each semiannual period, the information contained in registrations and reports filed with respect to such period in a clear and complete manner;

(7) notify any lobbyist or lobbying firm in writing that may be in noncompliance with this Act; and

(8) notify the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia that a lobbyist or lobbying firm may be in noncompliance with this Act, if the registrant has been notified in writing and has failed to provide an appropriate response within 60 days after notice was given under paragraph (6).

SEC. 7. PENALTIES.

Whoever knowingly fails to—

(1) remedy a defective filing within 60 days after notice of such a defect by the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives; or

(2) comply with any other provision of this Act; shall, upon proof of such knowing violation by a preponderance of the evidence, be subject to a civil fine of not more than $50,000, depending on the extent and gravity of the violation.

SEC. 8. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit or interfere with—

(1) the right to petition the government for the redress of grievances;

(2) the right to express a personal opinion; or

(3) the right of association,

protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

(b) PROHIBITION OF ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit, or to authorize any court to prohibit, lobbying activities or lobbying contacts by any person or entity, regardless of whether such person or entity is in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

(c) AUDIT AND INVESTIGATIONS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to grant general audit or investigative authority to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT.

The Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 (22 U.S.C. 611 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1—

(A) by striking subsection (j);

(B) in subsection (o) by striking "the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence" and inserting "any activity that the person engaging in believes will, or that the person intends to, in any way influence";

(C) in subsection (p) by striking the semicolon and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking subsection (q);

(2) in section 3(g) (22 U.S.C. 613(g)), by striking "established agency proceedings, whether formal or informal." and inserting "judicial proceedings, criminal or civil law enforcement inquiries, investigations, or proceedings, or agency proceedings required by statute or regulation to be conducted on the record.";

(3) in section 3 (22 U.S.C. 613) by adding at the end the following:

"(h) Any agent of a person described in section 1(b)(2) or an entity described in section 1(b)(3) if the agent is required to register and does register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the agent's representation of such person or entity.";

(4) in section 4(a) (22 U.S.C. 614(a))—

(A) by striking "political propaganda" and inserting "informational materials"; and

(B) by striking "and a statement, duly signed by or on behalf of such an agent, setting forth full information as to the places, times, and extent of such transmittal";

(5) in section 4(b) (22 U.S.C. 614(b))—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "political propaganda" and inserting "informational materials"; and

(B) by striking "(i) in the form of prints, or" and all that follows through the end of the subsection and inserting "without placing in such informational materials a conspicuous statement that the materials are distributed by the agent on behalf of the foreign principal, and that additional information is on file with the Department of Justice, Washington, District of Columbia. The Attorney General may by rule define what constitutes a conspicuous statement for the purposes of this subsection.";

(6) in section 4(c) (22 U.S.C. 614(c)), by striking "political propaganda" and inserting "informational materials";

(7) in section 6 (22 U.S.C. 616)—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking "and all statements concerning the distribution of political propaganda";

(B) in subsection (b) by striking ", and one copy of every item of political propaganda"; and

(C) in subsection (c) by striking "copies of political propaganda,";

(8) in section 8 (22 U.S.C. 618)—

(A) in subsection (a)(2) by striking "or in any statement under section 4(a) hereof concerning the distribution of political propaganda"; and

(B) by striking subsection (d); and

(9) in section 11 (22 U.S.C. 621) by striking ", including the nature, sources, and content of political propaganda disseminated or distributed".

SEC. 10. AMENDMENTS TO THE BYRD AMENDMENT.

(a) REVISED CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1352(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2) by striking subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) and inserting the following:

"(A) the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person with respect to that Federal contract, grant, loan, or cooperative agreement; and

"(B) a certification that the person making the declaration has not made, and will not make, any payment prohibited by subsection (a).";

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking all that follows "loan shall contain" and inserting "the name of any registrant under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 who has made lobbying contacts on behalf of the person in connection with that loan insurance or guarantee."; and

(3) by striking paragraph (6) and redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (6).

(b) REMOVAL OF OBSOLETE REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Section 1352 of title 31, United States Code, is further amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d); and

(2) by redesignating subsections (e), (f), (g), and (h) as subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

SEC. 11. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LOBBYING PROVISIONS.

(a) REPEAL OF THE FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT.—The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (2 U.S.C. 261 et seq.) is repealed.

(b) REPEAL OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO HOUSING LOBBYIST ACTIVITIES.—

(1) Section 13 of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Act (42 U.S.C. 3537b) is repealed.

(2) Section 536(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490p(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 12. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO OTHER STATUTES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO COMPETITIVENESS POLICY COUNCIL ACT.—Section 5206(e) of the Competitiveness Policy Council Act (15 U.S.C. 4804(e)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as the terms 'lobbyist' and 'foreign entity' are defined under section 3 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent for a foreign principal".

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 219(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting "or a lobbyist required to register under the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 in connection with the representation of a foreign entity, as defined in section 3(7) of that Act" after "an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938"; and

(2) by striking out ", as amended,".

(c) AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN SERVICE ACT OF 1980.—Section 602(c) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 4002(c)) is amended by inserting "or a lobbyist for a foreign entity (as defined in section 3(7) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995)" after "an agent of a foreign principal (as defined by section 1(b) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938)".

SEC. 13. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 14. IDENTIFICATION OF CLIENTS AND COVERED OFFICIALS.

(a) ORAL LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity that makes an oral lobbying contact with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall, on the request of the official at the time of the lobbying contact—

(1) state whether the person or entity is registered under this Act and identify the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact is made; and

(2) state whether such client is a foreign entity and identify any foreign entity required to be disclosed under section 4(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(b) WRITTEN LOBBYING CONTACTS.—Any person or entity registered under this Act that makes a written lobbying contact (including an electronic communication) with a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official shall—

(1) if the client on whose behalf the lobbying contact was made is a foreign entity, identify such client, state that the client is considered a foreign entity under this Act, and state whether the person making the lobbying contact is registered on behalf of that client under section 4; and

(2) identify any other foreign entity identified pursuant to section 4(b)(4) that has a direct interest in the outcome of the lobbying activity.

(c) IDENTIFICATION AS COVERED OFFICIAL.—Upon request by a person or entity making a lobbying contact, the individual who is contacted or the office employing that individual shall indicate whether or not the individual is a covered legislative branch official or a covered executive branch official.

SEC. 15. ESTIMATES BASED ON TAX REPORTING SYSTEM.

(a) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 6033(b) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is required to report and does report lobbying expenditures pursuant to section 6033(b)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would be required to be disclosed under such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 4(a)(3), 5(a)(2), and 5(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 3(8) of this Act, consider as lobbying activities only those activities that are influencing legislation as defined in section 4911(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(b) ENTITIES COVERED BY SECTION 162(e) OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986.—A registrant that is subject to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 may—

(1) make a good faith estimate (by category of dollar value) of applicable amounts that would not be deductible pursuant to such section for the appropriate semiannual period to meet the requirements of sections 4(a)(3), 5(a)(2), and 5(b)(4); and

(2) in lieu of using the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 3(8) of this Act, consider as lobbying activities only those activities, the costs of which are not deductible pursuant to section 162(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) DISCLOSURE OF ESTIMATE.—Any registrant that elects to make estimates required by this Act under the procedures authorized by subsection (a) or (b) for reporting or threshold purposes shall—

(1) inform the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives that the registrant has elected to make its estimates under such procedures; and

(2) make all such estimates, in a given calendar year, under such procedures.

(d) STUDY.—Not later than March 31, 1997, the Comptroller General of the United States shall review reporting by registrants under subsections (a) and (b) and report to the Congress—

(1) the differences between the definition of "lobbying activities" in section 3(8) and the definitions of "lobbying expenditures", "influencing legislation", and related terms in sections 162(e) and 4911 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as each are implemented by regulations;

(2) the impact that any such differences may have on filing and reporting under this Act pursuant to this subsection; and

(3) any changes to this Act or to the appropriate sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that the Comptroller General may recommend to harmonize the definitions.

SEC. 16. REPEAL OF THE RAMSPECK ACT.

(a) REPEAL.—Subsection (c) of section 3304 of title 5, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) REDESIGNATION.—Subsection (d) of section 3304 of title 5, United States Code, is redesignated as subsection (c).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal and amendment made by this section shall take effect 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 17. EXCEPTED SERVICE AND OTHER EXPERIENCE CONSIDERATIONS FOR COMPETITIVE SERVICE APPOINTMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3304 of title 5, United States Code (as amended by section 2 of this Act) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The Office of Personnel Management shall promulgate regulations on the manner and extent that experience of an individual in a position other than the competitive service, such as the excepted service (as defined under section 2103) in the legislative or judicial branch, or in any private or nonprofit enterprise, may be considered in making appointments to a position in the competitive service (as defined under section 2102). In promulgating such regulations OPM shall not grant any preference based on the fact of service in the legislative or judicial branch. The regulations shall be consistent with the principles of equitable competition and merit based appointments.".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, except the Office of Personnel Management shall—

(1) conduct a study on excepted service considerations for competitive service appointments relating to such amendment; and

(2) take all necessary actions for the regulations described under such amendment to take effect as final regulations on the effective date of this section.

SEC. 18. EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

An organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which engages in lobbying activities shall not be eligible for the receipt of Federal funds constituting an award, grant, contract, loan, or any other form.

SEC. 19. AMENDMENT TO THE FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT (P.L. 75-583).

Strike section 11 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 11. REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.—The Attorney General shall every six months report to the Congress concerning administration of this Act, including registrations filed pursuant to the Act, and the nature, sources and content of political propaganda disseminated and distributed.".

SEC. 20. DISCLOSURE OF THE VALUE OF ASSETS UNDER THE ETHICS IN GOVERNMENT ACT OF 1978.

(a) INCOME.—Section 102(a)(1)(B) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) in clause (vii) by striking "or"; and

(2) by striking clause (viii) and inserting the following:

"(viii) greater than $1,000,000 but not more than $5,000,000, or

"(ix) greater than $5,000,000.".

(b) ASSETS AND LIABILITIES.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (F) by striking "and"; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

"(G) greater than $1,000,000 but not more than $5,000,000;

"(H) greater than $5,000,000 but not more than $25,000,000;

"(I) greater than $25,000,000 but not more than $50,000,000; and

"(J) greater than $50,000,000.".

(c) EXCEPTION.—Section 102(e)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended by adding after subparagraph (E) the following:

"(F) For purposes of this section, categories with amounts or values greater than $1,000,000 set forth in sections 102(a)(1)(B) and 102(d)(1) shall apply to the income, assets, or liabilities of spouses and dependent children only if the income, assets, or liabilities are held jointly with the reporting individual. All other income, assets, or liabilities of the spouse or dependent children required to be reported under this section in an amount or value greater than $1,000,000 shall be categorized only as an amount or value greater than $1,000,000.".

SEC. 21. BAN ON TRADE REPRESENTATIVE REPRESENTING OR ADVISING FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) REPRESENTING AFTER SERVICE.—Section 207(f)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) inserting "or Deputy United States Trade Representative" after "is the United States Trade Representative"; and

(2) striking "within 3 years" and inserting "at any time".

(b) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT AS UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE AND DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE.—Section 141(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2171(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(3) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENTS.—A person who has directly represented, aided, or advised a foreign entity (as defined by section 207(f)(3) of title 18, United States Code) in any trade negotiation, or trade dispute, with the United States may not be appointed as United States Trade Representative or as a Deputy United States Trade Representative.".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to an individual appointed as United States Trade Representative or as a Deputy United States Trade Representative on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 22. FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST IN QUALIFIED BLIND TRUST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(a) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(8) The category of the total cash value of any interest of the reporting individual in a

qualified blind trust, unless the trust instrument was executed prior to July 24, 1995 and precludes the beneficiary from receiving information on the total cash value of any interest in the qualified blind trust.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 is amended by striking "and (5) and inserting "(5), and (8)".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to reports filed under title I of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 for calendar year 1996 and thereafter.

SEC. 23. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT LOBBYING EXPENSES SHOULD REMAIN NONDEDUCTIBLE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that ordinary Americans generally are not allowed to deduct the costs of communicating with their elected representatives.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that lobbying expenses should not be tax deductible.

SEC. 24. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this section, this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on January 1, 1996.

(b) The repeals and amendments made under sections 13, 14, 15, and 16 shall take effect as provided under subsection (a), except that such repeals and amendments—

(1) shall not affect any proceeding or suit commenced before the effective date under subsection (a), and in all such proceedings or suits, proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been enacted; and

(2) shall not affect the requirements of Federal agencies to compile, publish, and retain information filed or received before the effective date of such repeals and amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 269, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 2564) was laid on the table.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF S. 1060, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 116) directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Florida to explain the purpose of his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution directs the enrolling clerk to correct solely technical errors in the Senate bill, especially with respect to some erroneous cross references. It makes no substantive changes in the bill. The concurrent resolution is necessary so that the bill that will be sent to the President will be technically correct.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 116

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill S. 1060, to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Senate shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 6(8), strike "6" and insert "7".

(2) In section 9(7), insert "and" after the semicolon, in section 9(8), strike "; and" and insert a period, and strike paragraph (9) of section 9.

(3) In section 12(c), strike "7" and insert "6".

(4) In section 15(a)(2), strike "8" and insert "7".

(5) In section 15(b)(1), strike ", 5(a)(2)," and in section 15(b)(2), strike "8" and insert "7".

(6) In section 24(b), strike "13, 14, 15, and 16" and insert "9, 10, 11, and 12".

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2099, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 280, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 2099) making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of November 17, 1995, at page H13249).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report on H.R. 2099 as well as the Senate amendments reported in disagreement, and that I may include charts, tables and other extraneous materials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have before us H.R. 2099, which is a very, very complex bill dealing with diverse agencies such as veterans, housing, EPA, NASA, and a variety of other independent agencies and commissions.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to start my comments by expressing my deep appreciation for my colleagues within the subcommittee who have worked so hard to bring this package together in a successful fashion. Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that this work would not have been able to be done successfully without the assistance of very fine staff, headed by my chief of staff within the committee, Mr. Frank Cushing, and his colleagues.

I would also like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that within my personal staff a great deal of assistance was provided for me, I would like to extend my appreciation particularly today to David LesStrang, Jeff Shockey, and one of my key staff people who will be leaving us shortly, Mr. Doc Syers.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a combination of pleasure and pain that I bring this bill to the floor today, and I would suggest first that the pleasure is there because I am very proud of the fact that this subcommittee has led the way in putting Uncle Sam on a diet. This bill represents $10.1 billion as a down payment toward balancing the budget by 2002.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, up until now we have been talking about moving toward balancing the budget. This, however, is where the rubber meets the road. It is one thing to talk. It is another thing to make the very, very tough decisions.

Let me suggest that the pain that I mentioned earlier involves that very fact. Unfortunately, the spirit of bipartisanship among the committee members that has long been a hallmark of the Committee on Appropriations has suffered as a result of our taking a different turn in the road regarding this country's spending habits. Even as we continue to travel on that road to balance the budget, I pledge to do all that

I can, Mr. Speaker, to bring this subcommittee back to that bipartisan spirit that we have lost this year.

This conference report reflects a willingness to make the very tough decisions and to meet the spending targets necessary to balance the budget in 7 years. As I have suggested, out of 13 appropriations subcommittees, the VA-HUD bill makes the single largest contribution toward balancing the budget. It does not wait until year 5 or year 7 or year 10. We are making the tough decisions today. No longer will we tolerate paying lip service to the goal of deficit reduction.

This conference report of $61.3 billion in new discretionary spending represents a reduction in budget authority of 13.1 percent, and it is about $9.25 billion below the administration's requested spending level for fiscal year 1996.

To say the least, the decisions that led to these reductions were certainly not easy ones to make. The work of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies has changed dramatically from last year. No longer do we simply compare the agency account on the basis of what they received last year, then add on a certain amount for inflation and maybe tack on some more there to establish a new base level.

□ 1145

We have now completed a bottom-up review of all of our agencies. This is all part of a process of justifying each program's existence and examining how taxpayer dollars are being used. I intend to continue this approach next year so that every program within every agency under our jurisdiction receives the kind of necessary scrutiny to find appropriate savings.

The subcommittee began working on this bill on January 24 when we held the first of over 20 separate hearings. When our bill passed the House in late July we showed a reduction from the 1995 enacted level of $9.7 billion, while the Senate showed a reduction of $8.4 billion in budget authority.

As I noted, the conferees essentially split the difference for a net reduction of over $9 billion.

However, during the process we were also able to take advantage of an additional 1 year's legislative savings, a provision at HUD, thus giving us an additional $1 billion, with which to better fund housing programs.

Let me at this time take a moment to share some of the positive actions recently taken by the House-Senate conference meeting. We provided an increase of $400 million over the 1995 level for VA medical care and were able to do away with the so-called incompetent veterans' legislative savings provision that was of concern to many. We provided some $24.4 billion for HUD programs. While this is a reduction from the budget request, it actually represents a program level of $1 billion over the earlier House-passed bill.

Most importantly, this increase would achieve for 1996 without adversely impacting our outlay problems in 1997 and beyond.

In the bill we terminated four Federal agencies for savings of $705 million, including the Office of Consumer Affairs, the Chemical Safety and Hazards Investigation Board, Community Development Financial Institutions, and the Corporation for National Community Service.

We fully funded the space station and space shuttle programs, even though NASA took its fair share of downsizing like every other department and agency under this subcommittee's jurisdiction.

We provided over $1.1 billion to continue the Superfund Program at EPA and over $2.3 billion for wastewater, drinking water, and various categorical grants to the States so they can adequately meet Federal environmental mandates.

We also created a performance partnership program between the EPA and the States so that these funds can be used where the States believe they are most needed.

Finally, we have not included any of the EPA legislative provisions as passed by the House and only four passed by the Senate. Of those, three were included in last year's bill signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, please allow me to digress for just a moment with respect to the HUD programs. As I mentioned, we were able to do a little more this year than we first thought. However, each successive year will get more and more difficult with respect to HUD outlays as payment for some of the budget authority approved in past years finally comes due.

The choices we make this year will go beyond fiscal year 1996. Indeed, they set the foundation for the years ahead. One specific area of special note in this regard is the renewal of section 8 subsidy contracts. Over the next 2 years, the cost of renewing section 8 expiring contracts will increase from $4.35 billion in 1996 to $14.4 billion by 1998. This will occur despite the fact that we have passed legislation which actually lowers HUD spending levels from past years.

The challenge facing the subcommittee in the coming years will be difficult, but we have made great progress this year, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to find reasonable solutions to complex issues like this section 8 issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD a table illustrating the aforementioned section 8 problem.

SECTION 8—RENEWAL OF EXPIRING CONTRACTS

[Dollars in thousands]

	Units	1996 Budget authority	Units	1997 Budget authority	Units	1998 Budget authority
Certificates	241,206	$2,993,597	213,590	$2,709,631	579,193	$7,517,923
Vouchers	58,798	729,739	100,389	1,273,548	242,256	3,095,473
LMSA	120,587	475,354	126,591	1,637,370	227,794	2,835,182
Property disposition	4,464	35,194	12,738	103,439	17,351	156,649
Moderate rehabilitation	8,016	99,486	18,232	231,294	30,409	394,709
New construction/substantial rehabilitation	1,957	17,492	15,667	144,233	45,208	436,083
Total	435,028	4,350,862	487,207	6,099,515	1,142,211	14,436,019

Note.—Totals may not add due to rounding. Budget authority in 1997 and 1998 reflects LMSA contract renewals with one-year terms calculated from assumptions contained in HUD's 1996 estimates.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I would like to make an additional observation with regard to HUD. My experience in working with HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros and NASA Administrator Dan Golden illustrate how valuable partnerships can be when faced with tough spending decisions. Both have reached out and been helpful in outlining their specific priorities.

I had hoped such a partnership would be possible in working with President Clinton's chief of staff Leon Panetta to fashion a bill President Clinton would support. To date it appears we are far from any final agreement.

It is important to note to my colleagues for the record that the administration fully expects to veto this bill. At a meeting almost 2 weeks ago, Mr. Panetta informed Chairman BOND, Senator MIKULSKI, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. STOKES, and me that this bill would be vetoed regardless of what we did to address the President's priorities. If this is correct, then the true losers will be the millions of Americans who counted on the many programs that would be continued and properly funded under this agreement.

I might mention, Mr. Speaker, at this point that for those of you among my colleagues who care about veterans' medical care programs, who care about housing programs, who are concerned about EPA, it should be noted

that the only money those programs will receive in the coming year will be as a result of this conference report successfully being signed into law. To do otherwise will leave them with a base of funding considerably less than available in this bill.

So I would suggest my colleagues on both sides of the aisle make note of that. This is your chance to provide funding that is needed for veterans' programs and housing and the like.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report strikes a careful balance in caring for our veterans, housing people in need, protecting the environment, ensuring America's future role in space, and meeting many other critical needs. This is a good, tough, fair bill, and it deserves the bipartisan support of this body. I strongly urge adoption of the conference report and urge your support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this House for whom I have greater respect or higher regard than the chairman of our subcommittee, JERRY LEWIS of California. He brings before the House a tough bill and I am aware of the long hours and how much personal time and sacrifice he has committed to this effort. I also want to recognize all of the subcommittee staff for their tireless work on this bill, along with my own staff persons.

I regret having to rise in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2099, the Fiscal Year 1996 Appropriations Act for the Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies. My opposition to this legislation is predicated upon the fact that the lives of millions of Americans will be devastated if this measure is passed in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed during this Congress, a new leadership with an ambitious plan to implement its Contract With America. While my Republican colleagues laud their discipline in terms of advancing the contract, I worry that they have shown a blindspot to the high cost in human suffering and damage to this country's precious resources that this legislation will extract. This is certainly the case with the conference report on H.R. 2099.

Having previously served as chairman of the VA-HUD Subcommittee, I am acutely aware of the complexities of the subcommittee's bill. I am also aware of the problems with the Federal deficit and the call for Government reform which have heightened the problems of providing funding for essential needs, many of which are under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. I believe, however, that there is considerable opportunity to try to meet these basic and pressing priorities upon which millions of Americans depend—even in this budget climate.

When this bill first came before the House in July, I argued then against drastic funding cuts and harmful legislative provisions in housing, the environmental, and veterans programs. I think my colleagues on this side of the aisle can take tremendous credit for having heightened awareness about these negative actions to the extent that the conference report before us has made some important positive steps to correcting some of these concerns. Unfortunately, not enough has been done and therefore I must still oppose this measure.

In fact, the President agrees with my position and has already indicated that he will veto this bill if it is presented to him in its present form. In his statement on H.R. 2099, the President stated and I quote:

> The bill provides insufficient funds to support the important activities covered by this bill. It would threaten public health and the environment, and programs that are helping communities help themselves, close the door on college from thousands of young people, and leave veterans seeking medical care with fewer treatment options. This bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear.

Let me take a moment to explain to you why this bill is so unacceptable to the President and those of us who care about the people dependent upon the programs in this bill.

For veterans programs, this bill is still almost $1 billion below the President's request. You know how misguided this bill must be when programs serving those brave men and women who sacrificed and protected our national interest are not adequately funded. Further, there are unprecedented retaliatory limitations placed on the Secretary of Veterans Affairs because he spoke out strongly against the cuts in these programs for these veterans. According to the majority they are sending him a message. The message clearly is that they don't tolerate free speech.

Housing programs, which already suffered under the $6.3 billion cut to HUD in the 1995 rescissions bill earlier this year, face another $4 billion in reductions in fiscal year 1996. This constitutes a wholesale assault on those individuals and critical programs that provide safety net and human service programs through Federal housing. Hardest hit are those programs that provide affordable and decent housing for the elderly and poor, like section 8 incremental rental assistance and public housing.

Now, my colleagues on the other side will claim that these actions are fair; that HUD is mismanaged and an unwieldy bureaucracy that has gotten out of control. Well, I don't think that our elderly, our families with children, and our poor would agree that these cuts are fair. I am certain that threatening them with homelessness and hopelessness is not a price worth paying to satisfy the Republican Contract With America.

But my Republican colleagues did not stop here. Added to these reductions are nearly 20 pages of extensive legislative changes—legislation that clearly falls within the jurisdiction of the authorizing committee. Like many other provisions the majority party has adopted this year, this legislation showed up in the chairman's mark of the bill. While certain provisions have been deleted, just as many others have been added and are now in the conference report before us. These damaging changes come at a time when affordable housing is at a record short supply.

Mr. Speaker, as if there are not enough problems, not enough reasons for the President to veto this piece of legislation, there remains the undisguised attack on the environment that this bill represents. As all of us remember, this bill as passed by the House included an assortment of antienvironment riders that the Republican leadership insisted the bill carry. To no one's surprise, Members from both sides of the aisle joined in saying that these extreme legislative changes should have no place in this bill. And so most, but not all, have been removed.

Does this make this bill an environmentally sound measure? Does this mean that the majority leadership's assault against the environment is over? Does this mean that my friends from across the aisle who fought so hard with me on my various motions to strip the rider may now vote—with a clear conscience—for this bill? The answer is a resounding no.

This bill makes a huge, unpredented cut in EPA's operating budget. This cut of more than 20 percent is intended to and will devastate the Agency's ability to protect public health and the environment.

And let us be clear here. These cuts go far beyond what is necessary to balance the budget. That is the smoke screen. If the Republicans really favored protecting the environment, they would find a way to ensure that EPA receives adequate funding even under a balanced budget plan. Instead they have targeted a huge, disproportionate, arbitrary reduction, that belies any claim that Republicans are interested in protecting the environment.

Furthermore, contained within the details of the big cut are other attacks to the environment.

At a time when Americans continually indicate their support for increased environmental enforcement, this measure targets EPA's environmental enforcement activities for extra cuts. Last year, EPA investigated over 500 cases of criminal misconduct, including cases involving loss of life, tainted food, and falsified laboratory data.

Last year EPA brought over 2,200 administrative and civil cases resulting in reductions in hundreds of thousands of pounds of pollutants and over $740 million in remediation efforts to clean up damage caused by violations of the environmental laws. What number of civil and administrative actions can we expect this fiscal year?

Right now the Center for Disease Control has told vulnerable Americans—the elderly, cancer and AIDS patients and others—to boil tap water due to the danger from microorganisms in much of the Nation's drinking water. The Republicans respond by cutting safe drinking water funds in half from the President's request. Not money for regulations, mind you, but money that would be used by local communities to build and improve their water purification equipment.

The Republicans also cut hazardous site cleanups by 25 percent and sewage treatment funds by 30 percent. With these actions, the bill undermines the capacity of EPA and States to clean up toxic sites and keep raw sewage out of our streams, lakes, and oceans.

And let us not forget about the riders. While most have been eliminated from the bill language itself, the conference report still bluntly pressures EPA into making exceptions and exemptions for natural gas processors, oil refineries, pulp and paper facilities, and cement kilns that burn hazardous waste. The special interests will not be disappointed by this bill.

One rider, that is still in, cuts EPA out of wetlands permitting so that the permitting can proceed without the environmental experts allowed a voice.

The conference on H.R. 2099 also terminates the Corporation for National and Community Service [Americorps], the Community Development Financial Institutions Program, the Council on Environmental Quality, and the Office of Consumer Affairs. These programs and agencies are of highest priority to the administration.

I do not think that this is a close vote for anyone who believes in meeting our obligations to our Nation's veterans, providing affordable and decent housing for all Americans, protecting the environment, and rewarding community service. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my friend, the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, might help clarify the intent of the conferees with regard to the language contained in the Senate report accompanying the fiscal year 1996 VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield, I will be happy to do so.

Mr. METCALF. As the gentleman knows, the Senate report addressed a particular site on the national priorities list, the Tulalip landfill in Marysville, WA. The Senate language requires EPA to complete the comprehensive baseline risk assessment at the site and to then conduct an alternative dispute resolution procedure in order to achieve a remedial act plan based on sound science all parties agree on.

Mr. Speaker, that direction to the agency represents the views of the majority of those Members from the Washington State delegation. The site involves over 300 large and small businesses in my home State. It is critical to all of them that EPA follow this direction at the site.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Ms. DUNN of Washington. I thank the gentleman and rise in strong support of the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF] that the EPA be required to complete a comprehensive baseline risk assessment at the Tulalip landfill in Washington State.

Many of us from Washington State represent constituents who have been severely impacted by EPA's handling of this site. The Senate report language was very clear in its direction the agency, and the chairman's support of this directive is appreciated.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will yield further, let me, by way of responding to both of my colleagues from Washington, say that I want to assure you both that the presence of that particular language in the final conference report in no way diminishes the intent of the conferees that the Senate language serves as the clear and final direction to the EPA at the Tulalip site during the fiscal year.

My recollection is that both Washington State members of the Committee on Appropriations, one from each side of the aisle, have strongly supported this language, and it is certainly my intention to see that the agency conducts a comprehensive baseline risk assessment and responds to your request. So I appreciate my colleague raising the question.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman.

□ 1200

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous bill. I rise in strong opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2099. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

I hope all Americans know what is in this bill, because it reveals the real essence of the Republican vision for this country.

In a budget where sacrifices had to be made to protect tax breaks for the wealthy and Republican pet projects, something had to give. Here is what gave.

One group that is being forced to give is our Nation's veterans, their widows, and their children. This bill reduces funds for VA construction and improvement projects by 62 percent. It cuts $400 million from the Administration's requests for veterans' health care.

What does this mean? By the year 2000, cuts mandated by this Republican budget plan will require 41 veterans' hospitals to close their doors. More than 1 million veterans will be denied health care. The Republican plan will force the elimination of about 60,000 health care positions and the cancellation of 40 construction projects for the VA.

More shockingly—and one of the really spiteful things that I have seen done by the Republicans in this Congress, and that is an extraordinary event—because Secretary Jesse Brown dares to speak his mind about this bill and Republican budget priorities, the majority has added to the conference report provisions aimed at stripping huge sums and personnel out of his office. As a matter of fact, they totally eliminated his travel budget. The question then is how will he travel about the country to look at VA facilities, VA projects, and to talk to the veterans? So much for free speech and so much for the veterans in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is going to also cut 20 percent off of EPA's budget. It is going to see to it that cleanup of Superfund sites and the dirty waters of this Nation will be set back enormously. So much for the environment.

This is also the worst attack on housing since the Hoover administration. Housing programs face $4 billion in reductions. These cuts are on top of more than $6 billion cut in last summer's rescission bill. Wrongheaded provisions are also included to undercut enforcement of fair housing and antiredlining requirements.

I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] for purposes of a colloquy.

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

Mr. Speaker, I seek the time just to engage our chairman, the gentleman

from California [Mr. LEWIS], in a colloquy. I would like to reserve a serious reservation that I have with respect to the statement of the manager's language regarding amendment No. 58. Section 223(D) of the administrative provisions was intended to address HUD's pattern of regulation regarding property insurance. My problem is simply this: The language does not precisely reflect the compromise that was reached with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] and others. I want to address that.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], his concern is appropriately addressed. I share his reservation. The House bill, which contained a spending limitation in the bill language, was rather clear. Unfortunately, I think the final manager's language goes beyond what the gentleman attempted to develop, and he is the author of the provision. It was carefully worked out with the staff on the other side.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. Can I get the chairman's assurance that the offending language will be removed if this bill is vetoed and if negotiations on H.R. 2099 are resumed for any other reason?

Mr. LEWIS of California. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I can assume the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that if we have another opportunity to go back at this language by way of a separate bill, or a bill to follow one that is vetoed, the gentleman's voice will be very clearly heard.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this mean-spirited and draconian HUD–VA appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. This will victimize people who are helpless—they have neither money nor power, which are commodities that seem to get attention these days. H.R. 2099 slashes one fifth of the budget for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It starves all efforts to expand, preserve, and rehabilitate all kinds of public, assisted, and affordable housing. And through the legislation that is included in this appropriations report, housing policy has shifted and changed course dramatically.

But bad as it is, this conference report is much better than the bill that left the House in July.

Let me tell my colleagues what will happen if this conference report becomes law. If we pass this bill, we virtually ensure that affordable housing will continue to decrease and deteriorate; we will lose our $90 billion investment in public housing; and hundreds of thousands more families will become or remain homeless.

Public housing residents in the more than 3,400 local housing authorities throughout the Nation are at risk of seeing their everyday maintenance requests go unanswered for lack of operating funds, which are set at only $2.8 billion, some $400 million below this year's HUD funding request.

Inevitably, housing that is good will fall into ruin, and the eyesores of deteriorated and dilapidated housing in many of our urban centers will remain vacant and crumbling, further destroying neighborhoods.

Because nearly one-third of the modernization funds and 50 percent of the urban revitalization grants for severely distressed public housing projects will be lost if this conference report passes.

Under this bill there will be no new public housing funded and no incremental or new section 8 certificates available for the first time in 20 years. There will be only certificates for replacement housing—even though there are more than 5.6 million families today who pay more than 50 percent of their incomes for rent, or who live in substandard housing. The number of families who need help grows each year by more than ten times the number that would be assisted under this bill. During this fiscal year 88,400 units of affordable housing were financed through the various Federal housing programs but—next year there will be fewer than 15,000 units.

The conference report leaves two of the core programs untouched—HOME and CDBG. That's good; however, don't be surprised when the mayors and the Governors are here begging for more money. Why? Because, the deep, deep cuts in public housing and section 8, and the increases in the cost of that housing inevitably will mean trouble for our cities and States—more deteriorated housing and more homelessness—more people with nowhere safe and sound to live.

What this conference report does, make no mistake, is place the burden on cities and States, while the Federal Government takes a walk and abrogates its responsibilities.

I have watched these programs work for poor and working families, for the elderly and for the disabled throughout my public career. One of my jobs in my home city of San Antonio before I came to Congress was with the San Antonio Housing Authority. Public housing worked; and despite the problems in some places, public housing in most areas is safe, decent, and sound. But this bill by the Republican majority will devastate the lives of thousands of families currently residing in public and assisted housing and those who wait, sometimes for years, for such housing.

The Republicans talk about their historic balanced budget bill. They talk about their willingness to make hard decisions about discretionary spending to control spending. Despite what our colleagues on the majority contend, these are not hard decisions, they are merely heartless attacks on those too poor and too inconsequential to count on the scales of political calculations. The insistence and desire to provide foolhardy tax breaks for the wealthy at the expense of America's poor and working families drives this bill just as it drives the whole budget process. That is the thrust of this massive and mean assault on our most vulnerable citizens.

I urge a "no" vote on this conference report, which merely victimizes further the victims of poverty.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the committee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report of H.R. 2099 shows a real commitment to our future and our citizens. While it takes a major step toward eliminating our Nation's deficit, it does so while providing medical care to our veterans, housing for the poor, and preserving the challenges to be explored in space. One might call it a balancing act—but it is a skill that Chairman LEWIS and his excellent staff have refined. I commend them on their fine work. I would also like to give thanks and a wish of good luck to Doc Syers of the chairman's staff, who will be leaving the Hill to boldly go where no man has gone before. Doc has been a great friend over the years and we will miss him.

Returning to the matter at hand, our veterans represent one of our Nation's finest resources. This conference report appropriates $37.7 billion for the Department of Veterans Affairs, of which $16.5 billion is included for medical care. After listening to the concerns of many veterans groups, the subcommittee determined the controversial incompetent veterans language should be deleted. Our commitment to our veterans is unwavering and I believe this bill is proof of this fact.

The conference report also provides $19.3 billion for housing programs to help our poor, our homeless, and to give homebuyers a chance to reach the American dream of owning their own home.

In this time of fiscal restraint, the conference report takes strong action in eliminating programs which are ineffective or duplicative, such as the AmeriCorps Program and the Health and Human Services Office of Consumer Affairs.

When faced with the tough challenges of a decreasing budget, the subcommittee made effective decisions. This is a conference report in which we can all be proud and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this essential legislation. A yea vote is a vote in favor of our veterans and our commitment to our Nation's future.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to the conference report. Although admittedly an improvement from the draconian version originally passed by this body a few months ago, this bill still is a glaring indication of wrong-headed priorities.

In addition to slashing funding for housing and veterans programs, this appropriations bill severely curtails the Government's historic role in ensuring the most basic guarantees of clean air and clean water. It cuts the Environmental Protection Agency by 21 percent, including a 19-percent cut in the program that cleans up hazardous waste sites. It also cuts hundreds of millions of dollars from wastewater treatment grants that provide critical assistance to local communities in keeping drinking water safe and beaches swimmable. In the area I represent, these funds are critical to helping to clean up Long Island Sound.

This legislation is premised on the false assumption that a strong economy and a clean environment are natural enemies. The authors of this bill try to polarize the debate as a choice between jobs and environmental stewardship.

Well, my colleagues, do not be fooled. A strong environment and a strong economy go hand in hand.

My constituents and I know from our experience with Long Island Sound that pollution-based prosperity is shortsighted and costs more—financially and otherwise—in the end.

There is no denying that these environmental rollbacks will cripple the EPA's ability to protect the quality of our air and water.

Let us not turn back the clock on environmental protection. Defeat the conference report.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman LEWIS, Congressman STOKES, and the subcommittee staff for all of their hard work in producing this compromise agreement.

This conference report contains funding for many vital programs for our Nation's veterans, protects and preserves our environment, helps house the needy and disabled, and moves scientific research and discovery forward.

As Chairman LEWIS has said it has been a difficult task balancing these needs against the critical need to balance our Federal budget. I believe that it has been done responsibly.

In total, this report provides $80.6 billion for these important programs. That number is $9.6 billion less than last year and $894 million more than the House-passed bill. This action shows that we have truly compromised in order to produce a sound piece of legislation.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we were able to increase the Superfund program by $163 million for a total of $1.16 billion. In addition, this agreement removes the December 31 "drop dead" date for the Superfund program. By removing this provision, we will be allowing this important program to operate while the authorization committee acts on reforming the Superfund law.

Representing a State with more Superfund sites than any other, I want to thank Chairman LEWIS for these actions and for realizing the importance of keeping work at all current Superfund sites moving forward. This funding increase brings the total number very close to what the program received last year.

This conference agreement also removes the controversial 17 EPA riders that were included in the House-passed bill. I am particularly happy that the clean water riders were removed. As I have always said, these riders should not have been included in this bill. We should give the authorization committees a chance to fine-tune the Clean Water Act, instead of prematurely halting many of the programs that have been working under this Act.

While I do not agree with all the reductions in this conference agreement, I do believe that it is time to stop throwing good money after bad and start focusing our limited resources toward programs that work.

Three such programs are at HUD, section 202, Senior Housing, and 811, Disabled Housing, and HOPWA, Housing Opportunity for People With AIDS. These programs have a proven track record and have worked. While the House-passed bill consolidated these three programs under one account, the conference agreement keeps these accounts separate allowing each of them to run independent of one another. This is something I supported and worked in conference to achieve. I would have liked to provide more funding, however, the committee agreed to freeze all these accounts at the current level.

As regards scientific research and development, I am pleased that this agreement recognizes that our Nation's future depends on properly educating all Americans so that we can continue to be number one in developing and producing various technologies. New Jersey is already the home to the brightest and best in both the public and private sector. This report dedicates itself to renewing our Nation's commitment to science by providing new resources, both fiscal and physical.

This report also funds the Department of Veterans Affairs. Nearly half of our allocation supports these activities and the committee increased medical care above the current year by $337 million. This should be adequate funding to keep all our veterans who rely on the VA for medical care fully supported.

I would also like to comment on the behavior of VA Secretary Brown who has politicized this budget process. Under the guise of so-called "free speech" he has needlessly alarmed veterans throughout the Nation. As a veteran myself, I am insulted by his actions.

Mr. Speaker, we have drafted a sound agreement and I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, before the Thanksgiving holiday, we came to an agreement on a framework to work toward a balanced budget. Within this framework, we agreed to a set of priorities to guide our actions. We agreed to preserve Medicare, strengthen our educational system, and protect the environment for our children and our future.

Well, today we have the opportunity to stand up for one of the priorities we outlined over a week ago. It is time to stop this Congress from rolling back existing environmental protections. In the VA-HUD appropriations bill before us now, most of the infamous regulatory riders have disappeared, but the EPA has still been put on a starvation diet.

This bill radically cuts the EPA's budget, from the $7.2 billion appropriated last year, down to only $5.7 billion, a reduction of $1.5 billion, or 21 percent. The EPA enforcement budget is specifically targeted for an even larger 25 percent cut. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, taking the environmental cops off the beat by slashing their budget is just another way to gut strong environmental laws.

The GOP cuts slash $270 million from the Superfund program. The EPA Administrator, Carol Browner, has testified that this will delay cleanups of toxic waste sites at hundreds of communities around our Nation.

And at the same time this Congress is cutting the budget for environmental protection, we just sent the Defense Department $7 billion the Pentagon did not even ask for.

Mr. Speaker, this all comes down to a question of priorities. Should we be giving tax cuts to the wealthy and buying more B-1 bombers, which we do not need? Or, should we be ensuring that our children have clean air and clean water and that toxic waste sites in our communities get cleaned up?

We cannot say 1 day that we believe the preservation of our environment is a national priority, and then 10 days later turn around and agree to radical cuts in environmental enforcement and cleanup programs. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to vote against this proposal.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill, and I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and

the staff for all their hard work. Without the chairman and, obviously, the staff, we would not be here today.

Mr. Speaker, the VA-HUD bill has never been an attractive piece of legislation. Never. It contains funding for a wide variety of programs that represent different and often conflicting priorities. What we have before us is the product of this task, and it is a good one. The bill does not simply spread the pain throughout all of the programs in its jurisdiction, it makes the tough choices which are necessary, but it also preserves funding for those programs which work well.

There are some who will complain that the spending cuts in our bill are just simply too deep.

□ 1215

Mr. Speaker, let me make one point. We spend over $5 billion for environmental protection and over $20 billion for affordable housing in this bill. Just a few days ago, as my colleagues know, during the Government shutdown only 4 percent of EPA's 18,000 employees were considered essential and, I repeat, only 1 percent of HUD's employees were considered essential. So it seems to me that it would be much easier to say that perhaps these cuts are not deep enough; they should be deeper.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member of this body, given the chance, would draft a different VA-HUD bill. I would like to make a few changes myself. But to use an often-heard quote, we cannot allow the perfect to be the enemy of the good.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. What is wrong with this bill is what is wrong with the priorities. There is no consideration or deliberation, much less public awareness, of votes on these topics. Wholesale policy changes are made without consideration, Mr. Speaker, all of this, of course, under the mantra of a balanced budget.

The impact of the GOP spending cuts priorities for the poor, the environment, the homeless, the veterans. It is not fair, and it is not right. The fact is that it is bad policy. A Congress that creates and bloats the human deficit, the environmental deficit, but claims to balance the budget is out of balance; out of balance with the common sense and values of the people we represent.

Mr. Speaker, the shortest distance between legislation and law is to get the President to sign this. I suggest we defeat this conference report, send it back to conference committee, and get on with the job of making compromises and reflecting the values of the people that we represent that stand for a sound environmental policy, sound policies and fairness to the poor and the programs that are important to them. I suggest we send this back to conference and a "no" vote on this measure.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference agreement on H.R. 2099, the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. This conference agreement has positive modifications from the radical bill passed by the majority party of the House earlier this year, but it remains wholly out of step with people, priorities and shared sacrifice which should characterize reductions in spending necessary to achieve a sound fiscal result.

On the whole, the agreement cuts housing programs by 21 percent, guts homeless programs by almost 30 percent, reduces Environmental Protection Agency spending by 21 percent, eliminates a number of community programs, and subsumes many into larger block grants thereby diluting the funds and in the end, atrophying the programs. These cuts are represented as being necessary for deficit reduction, but what is proposed in this measure is a fundamental retreat from proper Federal responsibilities and support. The conference agreement cuts housing on the ground by $4 billion from the administration request, but manages once again to provide over $2.1 billion for the latest version of the questionable space station. This VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies conference agreement continues to balance the budget on the backs of those least able to support cuts: the poor, the homeless, and our seniors. Our congressional priority should be to help those unable to help themselves but this measure reneges.

As I mentioned, the conference agreement cuts homeless funds, both at HUD and the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The statement of managers indicates that the funds should be used as localities see fit under the rubric of options available under the McKinney Act programs. I cannot agree that any one HUD homeless assistance program should receive any priority over another such program as the statement of managers suggests. If demand were any indicator, the supportive housing program would be the likely model program, not the shelter plus care program emphasized in this agreement. The record should further reflect the reality that in shifting these reduced funds—a shell and pea game—in no way alters the loss and adverse impact on the homeless. In fact, it only compounds and complicates the use of the programs.

I am also concerned about the great number of authorizations rewriting policy in this appropriations conference agreement. The Banking Committee today continues to cede its authority and role to the Budget and Appropriations Committees and in the process jeopardizes the integrity of important housing and community development programs.

Frankly, the committee process in this Congress is in a shambles. The new Republican majority has adopted an authoritarian posture. Through the budget and appropriation scheme the GOP leadership has dictated without consideration, much less public awareness and votes on the topics, wholesale policy changes under the guise of fiscal crisis and the mantra of balancing the budget. They—the majority Gingrich Republicans—rationalize and gloss over the fundamental impact of the GOP spending priorities that cut programs for the poor, the environment, the homeless, and the veterans in this measure for example. This isn't fair and it isn't right. We can and should balance the budget but how we do it is the key to our role as policy makers. A Congress that creates and bloats the human deficit and the environmental deficit but claims to balance the budget is out of balance with the common sense and values of the American people we represent.

What it all comes down to is that despite the changes in this HUD-VA appropriations legislation from the House-passed version and at least two round trips to the House and Senate conference table, the priorities and the funding levels guarantee that we will see more people denied housing opportunities in public and assisted housing, fewer people receiving homeless assistance in order to get back on their feet, veterans excluded from needed service, and more chances for polluters to desecrate our precious air and water. All this by virtue of this deficient appropriations measure.

Mr. Speaker, I do not oppose every aspect of this measure. However, because the cuts and sacrifices are not balanced, I must strongly oppose this conference agreement. I urge my colleagues to heed the President's concerns with regards to this measure and vote against this report. By defeating the conference report today and addressing the serious deficiencies in a House/Senate conference report we can attain the shortest distance from legislation to law. We do not have to experience a certain veto that will force us to start all over again.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on VA-HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations engage me in a brief colloquy?

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will yield I would be happy to.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me first say that I very much appreciate the support of my good friend, Chairman LEWIS, over the past several months regarding plans to construct a new consolidated facility for the EPA and the Research Triangle Part in North Carolina.

As the chairman knows, the EPA is currently scattered in 11 separate buildings which are privately owned and in bad shape. The chairman made this freshman Member aware that previous Congresses have not dealt with this problem.

After studying the matter and after touring these existing facilities, I learned that recent studies show that renovating the existing buildings and signing new leases would cost $400 million. For only $232 million, a brandnew, consolidated facility can be built, making this the most realistic, cost-effective plan available to further the important mission of the EPA.

I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has pledged his support to find the additional funds necessary in the next fiscal year to make this new facility a reality, and I want to thank the gentleman for that support.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEINEMAN] for bringing to our attention in such an effective manner the importance of this research facility, and the committee does very much want to be of assistance.

As I indicated in the earlier colloquy, the Research Triangle Park facility is one of the three major infrastructure projects requested for the EPA. Funding was not available for the current fiscal year, but I have pledged my support to the gentleman to do my very best to find funds necessary for the project in the next fiscal year.

It is my understanding that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure is currently updating the authorization for this project, and I look forward to addressing this in the years ahead.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report.

Once again, we are witnessing an all out assault on the quality of our Nation's water, air and land. The Republican Party is trying to accomplish through funding cuts what they failed to do through an open debate on environmental policy.

Time and again this year, and the last several years, Democrats and Republicans have come together in a spirit of bipartisanship to protect the environment. This conference report will cut enforcement of environmental laws, cut funding for safe drinking water, cut funding for wastewater treatment, and cut hazardous waste cleanup.

Slashing EPA's budget by more than 20 percent, will cripple the EPA's ability to ensure that our water is safe to drink, our food is safe to eat, and our air is safe to breathe.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BORSKI].

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, this conference report will roll back 25 years of environmental protection and it should be defeated.

This bill slashes the funding for the Clean Water Act. It slashes the funding for Superfund. It slashes the funding for EPA to even conduct an effective management and enforcement program.

EPA, will be barred from any role whatsoever in decisions on development of our Nation's most valuable wetlands.

It is absolutely incredible that we can give the Pentagon $7 billion more than the President of the United States wanted but, unbelievably, we can't find the money for the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the laws that protect our water and our air.

Mr. Speaker, in the Philadelphia region, there have been and will be cancellations of numerous Superfund inspections, leaving potentially dangerous toxic waste undiscovered at sites that threaten the community.

The conference report means no new Superfund priority cleanups, whether or not there is a toxic threat to drinking water.

Mr. Speaker, the American public does not want less environmental protection. They want more protection of their water and their air.

This bill does not give them that protection. It should be defeated and sent back to conference.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of reasons to vote against this bill, but the truth of the matter is, whether we are concerned about the fouling of our air and our water and our streams or whether or not we are concerned about the cuts in the veterans' health care budget, what is the most egregious in this budget is what we have done to the housing of our Nation's poor and our Nation's senior citizens.

We see cuts in this budget that will decimate our housing programs. We see politicians constantly marching before public housing projects and condemning them for the condition that they are in, and yet what this housing budget does is gut the very provisions that are necessary to improve those housing projects. At the same time, we turn around and cut the homeless budget of our country by 40 percent. So what we are going to do is we are going to gut our public housing, we are going to come in and hurt our assisted housing projects, and once our senior citizens and our poor are not able to live in those projects, we then are going to turn them to the streets where we then gut the homeless budget of this country. It is a crying shame, and we ought to do better than this.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just might mention, in responding to the gentleman's comments, that, indeed, the assisted housing, for example, in this country has increased in terms of budget by 50 percent in the last 4 years. All one has to do is look across the country at boarded-up buildings in housing projects everywhere to know that it is time for us to rethink where we have been in terms of those programs. Clearly, this side is very concerned about those future programs in terms of their effectiveness, and it is time for us to take some new direction.

I said in my opening remarks the Secretary Cisneros has publicly said on many occasions it is time to rethink where we are going on housing. Money is one way to do it; but, indeed, it is important to make sure that the House recognizes that it has a positive role to play in terms of the change as well.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the bill primarily because of the impact on the environment. No other agency faces the type of cuts in this House that the EPA does in this conference report.

It has already been mentioned that EPA funding is cut by approximately 20 percent, with enforcement being the hardest hit in terms of cuts, almost 25 percent. We all read in the New York Times last week that the EPA has had to cut back on inspections and enforcement already. This will only make it worse.

In addition, more than half of the original 17 antienvironmental riders have been included either directly or through report language in this conference report. Since agencies often have to follow the dictates of the appropriators, this shift to report language in my opinion does not mean that the damage to the environment will be any less. So I ask once again that we oppose this bill and that it go back to conference to improve in particular the funding for the EPA.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, two-and-a-half weeks ago we celebrated Veterans Day, and we told the veterans of America how much we respect them and how grateful we are for the sacrifices that they have made for this Nation. Well, two-and-a-half weeks have come and gone and how quickly we have forgotten.

This bill cuts $43 million from the VA programs, a larger cut than the House version, but that is just the beginning. The Republicans' 7-year budget, which begins with a funding bill we are discussing today, cuts entitlements for veterans by $6.7 billion over 7 years. Under the Republican budget, many veterans would pay more for their prescription drugs. In some cases, the cost that veterans pay for prescription drugs would double, and the cuts do not stop there.

The Republican budget demands that, in addition to the $6.7 billion veterans' cuts, all discretionary spending, including veterans' programs, be reduced by 20 percent over the 7-year combined period.

Let us defeat this bad bill. It is unfair to our veterans.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ].

Mr. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this draconian conference report. This conference report is nothing more than a cruel attack on our children, the elderly and the poor. These cuts are not about arbitrary numbers of the elimination of port barrel projects. They are about human beings. Behind every dollar of this reduction, there is human tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, by gutting the MCKINNEY program, hundreds of thousands of Americans will be forced to live in the streets. As we begin the coming winter months, the action taken on the floor today will constitute a death sentence for many.

These cuts mean less security services and the elimination of critical social services. For the 500,000 public housing residents in the New York City area, this reduction translates into deteriorating buildings, greater insecurity and fewer opportunities for economic advancement. This is shameful. It is not enough that Republicans have slashed education, cut Medicare, and eliminated job training programs. Now they are planning to throw poor people out on the street. Enough is enough.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a more-than bill. This is more than what we had before, but what is that? I certainly applaud the assurance that has been given to the space program, but where are we in research and development dollars, far less than needed. Then when we begin to look at the Department of Housing and Urban Development we see that this bill cuts 17 percent, the Environmental Protection Agency is almost gutted with cuts of 21 percent, and our Federal Emergency Management Agency is cut 17 percent. What will occur if disasters occur in our States.

Then we look at the Community Development Bank initiatives which were designed to revitalize economically distressed areas that program is being absolutely eliminated. The housing assistance under section 8 which helps house poor Americans is being cut. Homeownership grants, wherein we in this Congress have stood on the House floor and said we want Americans to own homes, is being cut by 48 percent.

□ 1230

Public housing modernization programs are being but by 32 percent. Then the one-for-one replacement program to restore public housing is being cut. Also when we talk about negotiations in my city regarding a final solution to APV, located in the 18th Congressional District in Houston, intrusions to prevent us from considering historic preservation issues and the repeal of the Frost-Leland amendment which does not take into account the need for a local master plan for public housing being completed, are not helpful. This is not a good bill. This is an intrusive bill in some areas and it takes away the money from the people who need it most. More-than is simply not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, I include my complete statement on the conference report for the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opinion regarding the conference report on the VA–HUD appropriations bill. I applaud the conferees for appropriating $13.8 billion for NASA. This funding is more than the amount contained in the House bill. The Space Agency will receive full funding for the space station. Funding for other programs such as human space flight, mission support and science, aeronautics and technology is slightly below current level.

While there are still challenges that remain with respect to the space program, I believe that NASA will continue to provide leadership to the rest of the world.

The Department of Veterans' Affairs also receives funding that is only slightly below the current level, with the major spending reductions relating to the construction of VA facilities. Our veterans have made numerous sacrifices on behalf of our country and we must ensure that the needs of veterans remain a top priority.

Some of the provisions of the bill, however, trouble me, particularly funding for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency. The bill reduces spending for the Department of Housing and Urban Development by 17 percent and for the Environmental Protection Agency by 21 percent. The Federal Emergency Management Agency's funding has been cut by 17 percent.

Furthermore, the conference report eliminates funding for the AmeriCorps Program, which is providing numerous opportunities for young people to contribute to their communities. The Community Development Bank initiative is also eliminated. The Community Development Banking Program was designed to revitalize economically distressed areas by providing grants, loans, and technical assistance to financial institutions and community development organizations in such areas.

With respect to housing, the conference report eliminates funding for section 8 rental assistance contracts and hope homeownership grants. Low-income assisted housing programs are cut by 48 percent, public housing modernization programs by 32 percent, section 202 elderly housing by 39 percent, section 811 disabled housing by 40 percent and homeless programs by 27 percent.

I do not believe that it is necessary to make these drastic cuts in spending. We have now learned that the economic projections provided by the Congressional Budget Office on the level of the budget deficit need to be revised.

Other housing reforms include the suspension of the one-for-one replacement rule, which requires local public housing authorities to replace each public housing unit it demolishes with a replacement unit. Affordable housing should be a major priority for our country.

In connection with the issue of public housing, I am concerned that the conference report contains language that states:

> That historic preservation is an admirable goal, but that it is not good policy to require the preservation of buildings unsuitable for modern family life at the expense of low-income families in need of affordable housing.

I believe that it is necessary that we clarify the issue of the importance of historic preservation to the cultural heritage of our country. Historic preservation guidelines contained in current law and regulations have not delayed the process of rehabilitating facilities such as Allen Parkway Village in Houston. Let me also add that many officials in my hometown of Houston also recognize the role of historic preservation in providing affordable housing to the citizens of Houston.

I also believe it was unnecessary to include language in the conference report, at this time, that repealed the Frost-Leland provision, which prohibited Federal funds from being used to demolish Allen Parkway Village in Houston. This repeal is untimely because all interested parties in the effort to rehabilitate and build new housing at the Allen Parkway Village facility met yesterday to reach an agreement to move the process forward and to create a master plan. I recognize, however, that it is important that municipalities have the ability to make the best use of taxpayers funds by being able to seek reimbursement from the Federal Government when some of the structures within a housing facility must be demolished. At the appropriate time with the establishment of an inclusive master plan to restore

housing for needy and working families such a repeal should be implemented.

The provisions of the bill that relate to the Environmental Protection Agency greatly concern me since the bill reduces overall funding for the Superfund Program by 13 percent. There are several communities in my congressional district that have experienced problems with toxic waste areas such as Pleasantville and Kennedy Heights. This is not the time to reduce funding for the Superfund Program.

I am concerned about the reduction in funding for State loan funds relating to upgrading facilities to provide safe drinking water and infrastructure repair such as possibly Houston's own wastewater project. And spending cuts for programs that enforce other environmental and public health standards.

The VA–HUD appropriations bill is a comprehensive bill and a controversial bill. As we debate the various provisions contained in this bill, I hope that my colleagues will carefully consider the policy assumptions that were involved in drafting the bill and the potential impact of such policies on millions of Americans.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very effective colleague from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the kind gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this conference bill and urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this.

I was particularly pleased that the conference was able to fully fund the shuttle and the space station at near the request level of the President, and I am particularly pleased that the conference restored $100 million that the Senate had cut from the shuttle program.

It allows NASA's vital field research centers to remain open so that they can continue to perform the important research work, and I am particularly pleased that there is $25 million for a VA medical clinic in my district. The veterans in my district have been waiting 12 years for a medical facility. This will allow these veterans to begin to receive good quality medical care that they have long deserved and they have long been waiting for.

I would again urge all my colleagues to put aside their partisan differences and vote in favor of this bill. It is a good bill. It is good for veterans. It is good for NASA. I would encourage its support.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT]

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should be properly entitled the Unilateral Disarmament Act of 1995 because what it is all about is unilaterally disarming our capability to provide for clean air and clean water. It just returns to the old Gingrich-ite philosophy of the environment, "Polluters know best."

Well, we do not think they know best, and we think it is essential that this Nation have the capability to provide for clean air and clean water.

This is a bill for unilateral disarmament. It says to those who would police the polluters that they will not have the resources to get the job done. This is the same group that tried to tie up and bind and shackle with 17 different binders the right to protect against the environment, and even some elements of their own party rebelled against it and said it would not stand. So now they have come back and they have tried every way they can to cut the power of our law enforcement officers to protect and preserve our environment. It needs to be rejected.

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

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

Mr. President, you should veto this bill. It kills a program that evokes the spirit of a national service program, the AmeriCorps.

There are many other bad aspects of this bill but eliminating AmericCorps is penny-foolish. It is a program that benefits the very heart of our communities.

In my district in California, we have AmeriCorps workers involved in the Boys and Girls Clubs, in Big Brothers and Sisters, in the Food Bank of Monterey.

We have 20 AmeriCorps volunteers involved in the Senior Companion Program. I happened to swear in as a former Peace Corps volunteer new AmeriCorps workers. The pledge of office is something this Congress ought to learn. The pledge of office to be AmeriCorps is to get the job done. The job that they are doing is essential to make our communities get back on their feet both socially and economically.

I suggest that to eliminate that program is not a very wise thing to do. Mr. President, if this House cannot reject the bill, then veto it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is an awful bill and I hope it is defeated. Let us look at what it does. It cuts housing programs by 21 percent. It cuts environmental protection by 21 percent, the Superfund by 19 percent, homeless programs by 27 percent.

The Republicans give our veterans an amendment against burning the American flag, but what do they do to veterans' needs? They cut construction or improvement at VA facilities by 62 percent and slash all kinds of other help to our veterans. It is nothing but a sham and a shell game that is being perpetrated on our veterans. The AmeriCorps Program, the community development bank initiative and dozens of housing programs are eliminated. All of the original 17 EPA riders which the House instructed to drop were removed from the bill.

We are talking about America's future here. What we are doing is we are slashing all these good programs to pay for a tax cut for the rich. It is really a disgrace.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for purposes of a colloquy.

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

I appreciate the work the chairman has done to ensure that the bill and the managers' language reflect the House concerns about environmental riders. As the chairman knows, I am still a bit uncomfortable with the managers' language. I just want to ask the gentleman to make clear that report language does not have the force of law. So am I correct in saying that the managers' language is not binding and should not be interpreted by the courts as having the force of law?

Mr. LEWIS. If the gentleman will yield, bill language has the force of law, managers' language does not, especially when recognizing the way the agency the gentleman is concerned about relates to the Congress.

Mr. BOEHLERT. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress and later joined the Committee on Appropriations as a very young Member of Congress, in fact the youngest Member of Congress at that time, I was asked why I had tried so hard to get on the Committee on Appropriations rather than some of the other committees around here. I said at that time that the reason I did that is because I thought that, more than anything else that Congress does, our budgets define what it is that we value.

I think this bill tells a very sad story about what this Congress apparently values because, as the previous speaker on our side of the aisle indicated, this bill makes huge reductions in housing, it makes huge reductions in our ability to enforce environmental cleanup legislation. In that sense I think it will leave this country much poorer, both in terms of the housing stock available to low-income people in this society and most especially poorer in terms of the quality of the air, the quality of the water, and the quality of the living environment that our kids and our grandkids will be living.

This bill is going to be vetoed and it should be vetoed because it is, I think,

an abdication of our responsibilities to be stewards of the environment and to be stewards of the entire ecosystem.

I also think it abdicates in many ways the responsibilities that we have to our veterans. It cuts $900 million from the VA request.

It eliminates, it is true it eliminates 17 anti-environment riders which were earlier attached to this bill and then later stripped out by a motion on the House floor, and that is good. But as the previous colloquy indicated, many of those riders have found their way back into the statement of managers.

While those riders in the statement of managers do not have the force of law, they certainly do place a considerable burden on the agency, in that they require the agency to try to take into account the opinion of the committee when they drafted that statement on the part of the managers. When we are dealing with an agency such as EPA, which has tended to follow guidance provided in statements of the manager in years past unless they are forbidden to do so by law, I think that what it really does is put the Congress on record in support of a good many anti-environmental positions which I do not believe the Congress wants to do, given its vote on those riders just a few weeks ago.

Let me also note with respect to veterans that despite the fact that this bill had about $1.5 billion more to work with in reality than the bill had when it left the House, that despite that fact, veterans' medical care is funded $213 million below the amount originally contained in the House bill. I think that is wrong.

Let me state that again. Despite the fact that the committee and $1.5 billion more to work with than the House bill, veterans got $213 million less than they would have gotten in the House bill for veterans' medical care.

I congratulate the committee for dropping its plan to reduce benefits for what are known as incompetent veterans. That was also mentioned by one of our friends on the Republicans side of the aisle earlier. I congratulate the committee. As Members know, we offered an amendment on this side of the aisle to try to require that that provision be eliminated. It was not accepted on the floor. I am happy it was accepted now.

But nonetheless, I do not think that we can justify cutting veterans' medical benefits by $213 million. My motion to recommit will eliminate that reduction and would restore that $213 million. I would urge that Members vote "yes" on the motion to recommit and then "no" on the bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this conference report with some resesuations. We need to pass this bill to move the process forward. Although I have the greatest respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, Chairman LEWIS, and I agree with him more often than not, I hoped the result of the House-Senate conference on H.R. 2099 would be better.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, I have worked hard to make sure this legislation established appropriate funding levels for programs and policies and did not create new programs without the direction of authorizing committees.

I remain convinced that the original House funding levels for housing programs supporting vulnerable populations should be maintained. Section 202, which provides housing support for elderly families, and section 811, which assists disabled families, are programs we should strongly support. We need to do better.

Section 202 represents hope for many of our seniors seeking a decent home. These are our parents and grandparents, people whose lives were spent contributing to their community and who deserve our support now.

Section 811 allows families trying to raise children with disabilities or disabled adults looking for supportive housing to get the assistance they need and the support they deserve. Again, this is the type of program this House must protect.

Mr. Speaker, there are improvements in the conference agreement. The authorization committees are aware of the problems the appropriators face. In fact, we donated over a billion dollars from a change to the FHA assignment program inserted by the House Banking Committee to assist the Appropriations committees in their work. We realized the difficult pressures on the Appropriations Committee, and therefore we allowed them to claim a portion of the savings from our reconciliation package to benefit housing programs, to ensure that low-income families would not face higher rents, so that public housing authorities would not face new reductions in their operating subsidies without giving time for new reforms and deregulations to take effect.

Obviously, we must include some provisions to alleviate difficult budget pressures. These provisions are good policy choices as well. Removing disincentives that prevent low-income tenants from going to work is a great step forward for this Congress and I applaud Chairman LEWIS for working with me to correct this for fiscal year 1996. But I would stress that the real work of drafting policy reforms is not to be found here in an Appropriations bill, rather it is the subject of the hard work of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity is currently engaged in.

I intend to work with my very distinguished colleague and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON, as well as with my friend, Mr. LEWIS, to ensure that the House position on these areas that remain in conflict are maintained when the bill comes back to this House.

I would ask my colleagues who vote to support this legislation today to withhold their support of any future bill unless changes are made to shift priorities back to deserving low-income families and to eliminate unnecessary legislative provisions.

□ 1245

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I want to strongly support the motion to recommit which has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

I think it is important that we recommit this bill, and, therefore, I urge my Members and our colleagues to support it

Mr. Speaker, it is unusual for a bill to be so bad that none of the Democratic conferees on the House side would sign the conference report. It is a bill which the President has told the conferees is so bad that he will veto it in its current form.

The conference agreement eliminates funding for the President's AmeriCorps service program, the community development bank initiative, the FDIC affordable housing program. It also eliminates several other housing programs.

I can understand why the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity has just said to the House that he is voting for it with some very severe reservations in light of the cuts in these programs. I can understand why he made that statement.

It also cuts the office of consumer affairs.

There are provisions in the bill which will act to raise rents for families living in public housing, in section 8 housing.

In a letter received from the Administration, the President expresses concern about the $162 million reduction in funds that were requested to go directly to the States and needy cities for clean water and drinking water needs. He cites the more than 50 percent cut for the Council for Environmental Quality. He also cites the failure of the bill to provide funding for economic development initiatives.

Finally, in his letter or communication to us, the President says, and I quote, "Clearly this bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear." He urges the Congress to send him an appropriations bill for these important priorities that truly serve the American people.

This bill, in its present form, does not adequately serve the American

people. The President is going to veto it.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, this is a very, very important vote.

I would mention one more time to the House that any funding that is made available to very important programs—such as those serving veterans, those serving housing, those programs that involve the EPA, a variety of other agencies—any funds that go in the coming fiscal year to those programs will be voted for up or down on this vote. So if you are for supporting veterans, then you should be voting "aye" on this measure.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, the most important challenge that we have during this Congress, the people have said very clearly that we must move toward balancing the budget. The President has signed on. The House has committed by way of its budget actions we will move toward balancing our budget at least in a 7-year period.

Beyond the rhetoric of balancing the budget, this is a time to begin voting. This bill, of all appropriations bills, makes the single largest reduction in a pattern of ever-increasing Federal spending. Because of that, I suggest my colleagues take a hard look at saving $9.2 billion below the President's request.

This bill is an important bill because it does make a difference if you believe in balancing the budget.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to Conference Report 104–353 for the VA–HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996.

According to a November 9, 1995, article in the Honolulu Star Bulletin:

> The Honolulu median price among existing houses and apartments changing hands, $350,000, was one-third higher than the next-highest city, San Francisco, where the median was $263,300, according to a report today by the National Association of Realtors.

H.R. 2099, appropriates a mere $19.3 billion for the Department of Housing and Urban Development. This is less than either the House or Senate-passed versions of the bill. It is a $5.3 billion reduction from the fiscal year 1995 appropriation and it is $6.2 billion, or 24.3 percent, less than the administration budget request.

H.R. 2099 would permit the Secretary to manage and dispose of multifamily properties owned by HUD and multifamily mortgages held by HUD without regard to any other provision of law. Provisions established to protect the needy will be ignored.

Assistance for homeless programs would be cut by $297,000, dropping funding in this area from $1.1 billion in fiscal year 1995 to $823 million in fiscal year 1996.

Finally, opportunities for tenant-sponsored organizations, nonprofit organizations, and others, to purchase the buildings they reside in, would be eliminated. H.R. 2099 sunsets preservation programs after October 1, 1996. The Emergency Low Income Preservation Act of 1987 and the Low Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990 would be eliminated by this time next year. These programs help tenant-sponsored organizations, nonprofit organizations, and many others acquire buildings for their low-income residents.

These cuts are not slowing growth, but deliberate and undeniable reductions in program funding.

In addition to all of these cuts in the VA–HUD appropriations bill, the budget reconciliation bill contains further reductions and will eliminate the low-income housing tax credit which encourages investment in housing for low-income families.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on this conference report.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill camouflaged by the military uniforms of our former service men and women. Not only will this bill hurt veterans, the environment, and tenants in low-income housing, but it eliminates funding for AmeriCorps, the national service program.

In my district, there are tens of thousands of veterans and military retirees who rely on medical assistance and quality medical facilities. Unfortunately, the cuts in this bill will threaten the quality care they depend on. For example, it cuts nearly $400 million in medical care from the administration's request and eliminates educational help for those who agree to work at VA facilities.

Many veterans and military retirees are willing to make a sacrifice in the effort to end the deficit, but we should not target them unfairly—and, unfortunately, this bill does just that.

This bill will also hurt the environment by cutting the EPA's funding by over $1.5 billion from this year's budget. In my coastal district, less money will be given to help local communities keep the Monterey Bay clean and healthy. This bill will also hurt the public by preventing EPA from expanding its list of the toxic chemical releases that companies must make public. Finally, this bill hurts our young people.

As we approach a new millennium, we need to renew the spirit of our Founding Fathers. A program that evokes that spirit is the national service program, AmeriCorps. It is a volunteer program that works—it should not be arbitrarily cut. It is an investment in our future—according to IBM for every dollar AmeriCorps invests, the community will realize a return of $1.60 to $2.60 or more in direct benefits. AmeriCorps workers are involved in every aspect of our communities, teaching in schools, feeding the homeless, and counseling troubled youth.

In my district in California, we have AmeriCorps workers involved with the Boys and Girls Club, Big Brothers and Sisters, and the Food Bank of Monterey. We have 20 AmeriCorps members involved in the Senior Companion Program which has low-income seniors assisting other seniors, allowing them to lead independent lives.

Several weeks ago I had the privilege of swearing in two AmeriCorps volunteers in Hollister. They will be working on developing a new youth center and administering the city's housing rehabilitation program. Unfortunately, this bill terminates funding for AmeriCorps.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I know the benefits of volunteer service. No one can quantify the benefits an AmeriCorps worker gives to his or her community. Unfortunately, the communities of Hollister and Monterey will notice the loss of this valuable volunteer service benefit.

This is yet again another example of Republican budget-cutting that is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on HUD–VA.

This bill contains some of our Nation's most important priorities, and I was pleased that the conference agreement protects space research. Nevertheless, the overall cuts which were sustained by the EPA and Superfund are unacceptable. Preserving our environment is too important to be traded off for other priorities. Therefore, I oppose this bill.

I commend the conferees for providing funding to NASA to continue important work on space science and move the space station forward. I especially want to thank the conferees for providing $1.26 billion for mission to Planet Earth. The research this sponsors will greatly enhance weather forecasting, and allow us to protect lives and property by giving better advance warning before severe weather such as hurricanes. I am pleased that today, this bill reaffirms the importance of the work that is done at the Goddard Space Center.

Nevertheless, the funding cuts for EPA in this bill are an unacceptable attack on our environment.

Funding for Superfund cleanup has been cut by 19 percent. This leaves no flexibility to take care of sites which will be identified as problems in the upcoming year. The Fifth District of Maryland has five areas which are currently being considered for Sueprfund cleanup assistance. All five contain pollution which threatens the health and well-being of Fifth District residents. It is unfair to limit clean up progress to currently identified sites. This bill will exclude many dangerous areas from getting clean up help

I am also concerned about the impact of EPA cuts on our ongoing efforts to clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Under this conference report, EPA funding would be cut more than one-fifth. This means that available funding will be directed to dealing with crises. Long-term restoration efforts will bear the brunt of the cuts. For example, we recently discovered that as much as 30 percent of the nitrogen pollution in the bay is due to airborne, not waterborne, contamination. The cuts in this bill will force the EPA to stop much of this type of research. Likewise, our ongoing programs to reintroduce rockfish and other species to the bay may also be put on hold.

I am pleased that the Chesapeake Bay program has been funded under this bill. However, as any fisherman will tell you, our efforts to restore the bay and its oyster population are dependent upon the quality of the water that flows into the bay. The ultimate success of our efforts to restore the economic and environmental vitality of the bay depend on cleaning up the Patuxent, Anacostia, and Potomac Rivers. These are precisely the sorts of

long-term projects which are most likely to be delayed as scarce funding turns to short-term emergency responses and crisis management.

These cuts show the folly of attempting to cut taxes while balancing the budget. I believe we must balance the Federal budget, for the sake of our children and grandchildren. But I do not believe that spending $245 billion to give tax breaks to our wealthiest Americans is a wise use of taxpayer funds. These cuts are not to balance the budget—they are paying for the tax cut. How will our grandchildren judge us if we fail to preserve our Nation's environmental and economic viability? Will giving a tax cut be an adequate defense? I believe not, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2099, the fiscal year 1996 VA–HUD appropriations bill. While the measure before us is slightly better than the one passed by the House, it has a long way to go before it is acceptable. I am particularly concerned about the 26 percent cut in housing programs, the 27 percent cut in homeless programs, and the 21 percent cut in the programs of the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA].

I would like to thank the chairman of the committee and the conferees for continuing to fund the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS [HOPWA] program as a separate program. The $171 million provide for HOPWA, the same level as the post-rescission funding in fiscal year 1995, will help communities across the Nation as they develop local solutions to problems confronting people with HIV/AIDS. Because new communities qualify for HOPWA funds this year, the level of funding to communities already receiving HOPWA grants will be reduced. This problem could have been resolved by providing a higher level of funding. However, I am pleased that HOPWA is being maintained as a separate program and will, therefore, not have to compete with housing for the disabled and the elderly.

I would also like to commend the conferees for their efforts to address the continuing threat to the affordable housing stock posed by prepayment. This conference report provides $624 million for a modified preservation/prepayment program. Although I am concerned that the funds are insufficient to meet the needs, I am pleased that the conferees recognized that there is a serious problem and are interested in developing a solution to it.

Despite these provisions, I oppose this bill because it reneges on our Federal commitment to help this Nation's families. Strong families make our communities strong and strong communities make our Nation strong. For families to be strong, they must have access to the basics—employment, education, healthcare, and housing. This bill dramatically decreases the ability of local communities to provide access to decent, safe, and affordable housing for America's families.

The costs to our society of homelessness are significant and they are long-term. At the simplest level, the costs are financial. It costs more to return homeless people to the mainstream of society than it costs to prevent them from becoming homeless in the first place. But, the costs to society of homelessness go far beyond financial ones.

Children growing up homeless in the streets today will carry the scars of their childhood experiences and the memories of society's indifference to them into their adulthood. We are being willfully blind if we refuse to see that society's indifference today will cost us tomorrow.

The conference report to H.R. 2099, like so many of the pieces of the agenda of this Republican-controlled Congress, targets its hardest hits at the most vulnerable. In the case of housing, those hit the hardest are the poorest residents in public and assisted housing and poor working families, too many of whom live on the streets. The median income of households receiving Federal housing assistance is $8,000. These households simply have no additional resources with which to pay for increases in housing costs.

Currently, more than 5.6 million very-low-income households in this country pay half or more of their incomes for rent or live in substandard housing. Between 1989 and 1993, this group grew by 600,000 households—a growth rate which will be dwarfed by the one ahead of us if this bill becomes law. More than 8 percent of our Nation's children—our future—live in these households.

In this Nation, we already have at least 4.7 million fewer affordable rental units than we need, and more than 1.5 million households are on waiting lists for public or assisted housing. This number will increase dramatically and quickly if this bill becomes law. Under the funding levels contained in this bill, no additional families will receive Federal housing assistance, and for those families who have been on waiting lists, sometimes for years, their hopes for decent housing grow even dimmer.

These cuts would be bad enough if they were being done on their own. They are not. Coupled with the dismantling of the Federal safety net and draconian cuts in Federal programs contained in other legislation passed by Congress—including cuts in welfare, food stamps, the Earned Income Tax Credit, Medicaid, education and job training—the cuts in housing and homelessness programs in this bill add up to disaster. These cuts create insurmountable odds for America's struggling working lower income families and increased demand for local community assistance, with no hope of Federal assistance. The needs do not go away because Congress has taken the money away. In many cases, the needs will grow. This bill is cruel and cold-hearted. It does not reflect American values.

I also oppose the provisions in this conference report which would cut the funding levels for the Environmental Protection Agency by 21 percent.

These provisions not only severely limit the agency's ability to protect our lands, air, and water; but they also continue the full-scale assault on the environment that began on the first day of the 104th Congress.

Poll after poll has indicated that the American people favor strong environmental laws. We should not be willing to sacrifice the health and safety of our children. For the families, children, and citizens of America, I urge my colleagues to oppose this conference report.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise some strong concerns I have with language contained in the conference report on H.R. 2099 concerning the ongoing efforts in the Department of Housing and Urban Development to move toward Federal regulation of so-called redlining within the property insurance industry, an area of regulation traditionally left to the States.

The VA–HUD bill approved by the House earlier this year contained language requested by me, Representative KNOLLENBERG, and a number of other Members from throughout the country which would have reestablished the States' right to regulate the insurance industry and address rules dealing with any redlining problems in their respective States, and prohibited HUD from spending fiscal year 1996 dollars on promulgating redlining regulations and funding projects by activist groups. I commend and thank Chairman LEWIS for working to include this language in the House bill.

HUD has no statutory authority to be involved in this area, and under the McCarran/Ferguson Act regulation of insurance is properly handled by the States. The States are exercising that authority to address redlining problems where they exist, and there is absolutely no reason for HUD to get involved.

The House of Representatives clearly endorsed this view when it voted 266 to 157 against an amendment to strike this section from the bill. The Senate bill did not contain similar language when it went to conference.

I am deeply distressed that the conference committee not only deleted this section, but replaced it with report language which takes a position directly opposite of the House-approved language prohibiting redlining regulation. In particular, the language calls for congressional committees to take action "so that a clear statutory basis of regulation can be provided, and effective antidiscrimination regulation of insurance activities enforced" with respect to redlining. This is a position with which I vehemently disagree and which is diametrically opposed to the position taken earlier by the House.

I have every confidence that if this bill is vetoed by the President, as is expected, this matter will be addressed again by the Appropriations Committees. I thank Chairman LEWIS for his support and look forward to working with him in the future to include the previously adopted language to prohibit HUD for regulating property insurers in any future version of this legislation.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the VA–HUD appropriations conference report.

This bill makes dangerous and unnecessary cuts in programs protecting the health and welfare of our Nation.

It decimates important environmental protection programs by cutting EPA funding by 21 percent—the largest targeted cut for any single Federal agency.

It also slashes public housing programs by 21 percent and homeless programs by 27 percent, at a time when public housing needs are rising, not falling.

The impact of these cuts will be felt in urban and rural areas throughout the Nation. For example, in Los Angeles County alone, reductions in the incremental section 8 housing program will deny rental assistance to 40,000 individuals and families currently on the county's waiting list.

I urge my colleagues to reject the flawed funding priorities reflected in this bill by defeating the conference report.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are playing an increasingly dangerous game with public health and the environment.

Every poll shows that Americans oppose the weakening of environmental standards. In fact, an ABC/Washington Post poll showed that 70 percent of respondents felt that the Federal Government has not done enough to protect the environment. If you ask questions about the protection of communities and employees from hazardous industries and substances, the public support is even higher.

And yet the Republican leaders of this Congress, beginning with the blatant efforts to repeal much of the Clean Water Act as part of the Contract With America, have unleashed an unprecedented assault on the safety of America's communities. That assault has been promoted, drafted, and financed by the very industries and special interests that are benefiting from the Republican revolution.

This conference report is a startling example of this capitulation by the Republican Congress to the special interests who have long challenged the authority of public entities to regulate the safety of the workplaces, the safety of their products, and the safety of their operations. Provisions in this report hamstring the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the laws that keep our water clean, our air safe, and our communities free from toxic dangers.

This conference report bars EPA from protecting wetlands, limits EPA's authority to list new hazardous waste sites, and bars the issuance of new standards to protect the public from drinking water contaminated by radon.

As a representative of a heavily industrial district where constituents have often been subjected to health hazards both on the job and in the community, this legislation contains unacceptable waivers from basic laws intended to protect the public from serious threats to health and safety. Instructions buried in the legislative history of this conference report direct EPA to: Exempt the oil and gas industry from requirements to develop accident prevention plans; excuse the oil and gas industry from reducing toxic air pollution from refineries; and infringe on the public's right to know by limiting the kinds of information about air and water pollution that industries must report for the Toxic Release Inventory.

The Seventh District of California—like much of the San Francisco Bay area—has had a long and unhappy history with industries that have leaked, spilled, spewed, emitted, discharged, and released up to 40,000 tons of hazardous materials, with serious results on our community. Indeed, our region has been affected by dozens of releases of hazardous chemicals and other substances into our water, our air, and our lands.

The San Joaquin River, which discharges into the fragile Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, dumps the following loads every year into that estuary: arsenic, 12 metric tons; chromium, 66 tons; lead, 51 to 55 tons; and nickel, 51 tons.

In 1993, the General Chemical Co. of Richmond, CA, released a huge amount of oleum into the air, forcing 24,000 people to seek medical attention. General Chemical was charged with numerous violations of civil and criminal law, including failure to maintain equipment, failing to provide adequate employees training, failure to provide employees with protective equipment, and negligently emitting an air contaminant.

The General Chemical crisis illustrates the accuracy of the principle: prevention pays. General Chemical was required to pay $1.18 million in fines to the Government agencies and recently agreed to a $180 million settlement with thousands of its victims. For a small amount of that money, General Chemical could have had in place the safety policies and technology that would have prevented the release, and the subsequent damage and costs, in the first place.

There are those who believe that industry will act to minimize risks to its employees, the community, and the environment without the compulsion of safety regulations. They are sadly naive. Time and again, in my community and around this country and indeed the world, we have learned the lesson that removing safety regulations invariably leads to short cuts and practices that endanger thousands of lives. Those who seek, in this legislation, to pare back the important work of the Environmental Protection Agency, or elsewhere attack the Occupational Safety and Health Administration or the Mine Safety and Health Administration, would do well to consider this record.

The Shell refinery in Martinez, CA, like other local refineries, discharged large amounts of selenium into local waterways, with potentially serious results on waterfowl and other marsh wildlife. Shell, like Unocal and Exxon, failed to meet a 1993 deadline to reduce selenium discharges. Some also charge the refineries with the release of dioxins that have been linked with cancer and other serious health problems.

Earlier this year, a pipeline leak at the Dow Chemical plant in Pittsburg, CA, released dissolved chlorine hydrochloric acid and carbon tetrachloride, affecting nearby residents. The examples go on an on: Unocal of Rodeo dumped 200 tons of toxic chemicals onto surrounding communities over a 16-day period. Although plant managers were aware of the leak and workers informed their supervisors, the leak was permitted to continue for 16 days before the damaged unit was finally shut down, leaving hundreds of people with longstanding illnesses.

There are a lot of people in this House who obviously do not believe our communities, our constituents, or our employees need or deserve the protection of their Government from the contamination and poisonings associated with industrial actions. I do not know if they are misinformed, naive, or swayed by the special interests who are behind the weakening of the EPA and behind this legislation. But the effect is the same.

Laws written to protect our citizens and our communities are being trampled by special interest money and influence and, quite literally, people are going to die as a result of this capitulation to corporate interests.

I recognize everyone in this House can point to some example of another of bureaucratic overstepping, and we need good faith efforts to minimize that kind of obstructionism and redtape. But protecting our constituents from the well-documented cases of industrial contamination and poisoning by undercutting the EPA is irresponsible and condemnable. We should vote against this legislation and stand up for the men and women who work in our factories, live in our communities, and look to their Government to provide them with a basic amount of protection and security.

I urge the House to reject the conference report.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the honor to host in my district one of the finest public servants who has ever served the combat veterans of this Nation—the Honorable Jesse Brown.

Secretary Brown did not just talk to the veterans at the VFW hall in Davison, MI—he took the time to carefully listen to the concerns of each veteran who attended the town hall meeting. He talked individually to literally dozens of the veterans that day.

But now some Members of Congress want to muzzle Secretary Brown because he has become a real advocate for the veterans and their needs.

In yet another attempt to stifle opposition to their agenda, these Members of Congress want to severely cut funding for the veterans Secretary's office as a means of sending Jesse Brown a message.

These cuts in the Secretary's personal office are in addition to the harsh cuts already contained in the appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, such behavior should be beneath the dignity of this House.

I urge Members to join me in opposition to this attack on the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs—and oppose this appropriations bill.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, I support passage of the VA–HUD conference report to H.R. 2099. I want to thank Chairman Lewis and the conferees for their diligence on this bill, and their willingness to work with me and members of the Oklahoma delegation, to incorporate report language compelling the EPA to properly notify corporations or persons as a potentially responsible party [PRP] for facilities on the Superfund's national priorities list.

I know that the House Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees are currently in the process of reauthorizing and reforming the Superfund Program which is in critical need of improvement. However, for some unfortunate parties, Superfund reform may be a case of too little—too late.

Presently, there are policies which the EPA should be implementing that would save a great deal of time, money, and legal maneuvering in the context of reform and good government. Superfund's overreaching, illogical, and unfair liability snarls have deflected the program from its intended function: to protect human health and the environment in a realistic cost-effective manner. Despite the expenditure of at least $25 billion in Federal and private funds over the past 15 years, cleanup construction has been completed at only 291 out of nearly 1,300 sites—a whopping 12 percent success rate.

I wholeheartedly concur with the conference report language which states,

> Potentially responsible parties [PRP's] have a reasonable expectation to be notified by the EPA in a timely manner and within a

time frame that permits participation in remedy selection and execution. In particular, it is inequitable and unconscionable for the agency to identify a PRP without the means to effectively participate in remedy selection and execution and then, after the remedy has been substantially completed, to attempt to identify other parties to pay for remedial activity.

Additionally, the report language makes clear that the EPA should review all of its activities to determine the extent to which such situations have occurred and, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, make every effort to remedy such actions in a nonconfrontational, nonlitigious manner.

I strongly encourage EPA Administrator Browner to abide by the spirit of this language and not take any premature actions which may lead to innocent corporations or persons expending unnecessary legal costs for a problem they did not have any association with and/or did not create.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, as a staunch defender of both veterans and the balanced budget, I want to set the record straight on how veterans are being treated under the GOP's 7-year plan.

Under the conference agreement for VA/HUD appropriations, VA Medical Care is increased by $400 million over last year's level. Medical Research is increased by $5 million over last year's level and the Minor Construction Program is increased by $37 million over last year's level. Through responsible deficit reduction measures, we seek to preserve the dignity of veterans and the standard of living for future generations.

The VA/HUD Appropriations Act is very generous to veterans' programs. In fact, the VA/HUD act reflects cuts in nearly every other agency program or account except VA's Medical Care Account. This increase comes at a time of a declining population and declining utilization of VA hospitals. It might interest you to know that on any given day between 23 percent and 50 percent of all beds in VA hospitals lie vacant. The money used to staff, and heat empty beds could be better used in the actual delivery of services to veterans.

According to GAO, if the VA were to analyze the President's budget using the same assumptions the Department used when it analyzed the budget approved by the Congress, the VA would find that veterans are better off under the congressional budget than under the President's own plan. When the Secretary of Veterans Affairs was asked if veterans would suffer more under the Clinton administration's plan he said, "that's absolutely right."

The Republican plan will preserve and fund VA health care at a level that ensures the quality that veterans have come to expect. But it also tasks the system to become more efficient and deliver care in a more cost-effective manner. VA spends more than $5,000 per patient per year. This is $1,800 more than Medicare and a whopping $3,800 more than the private sector. Looking at these numbers, there must be ways for the VA to become more efficient.

Health care is changing rapidly and VA must be part of that change.

We need to question the need for more buildings and instead look for ways to provide more care. VA has historically been an institutionally based system that now is forced to support an aging network of 173 hospitals, 376 outpatient clinics, 133 nursing homes, and 39 domicilaries. We need to seriously examine what, where, and if VA needs to build in order to better serve veterans. The approach taken by this conference bill is a step in the right direction by asking the VA to assemble a long-term plan for its infrastructure and construction needs. The VA, must begin to plan strategically like the private sector, taking into consideration such factors as an increasingly constrained budgetary environment, a declining veteran population, shifting demographics, and the rapidly changing health care market. Today, when 9 out of 10 veterans have access to private health insurance, and 10 percent of current VA users are leaving the VA system to use Medicare, we seriously have to question the need for more facilities. The major construction level of $136 million and the minor construction level of $190 million reverse the historical trend of anchoring the VA in bricks and mortar. Today's health care is becoming less and less institutional. The VA must be part of that trend. It must have the flexibility to go to the veterans instead of requiring the veteran to travel long distances to procure health care in often aging and obsolete facilities.

I believe that veterans and taxpayers will be better served by a VA that is more efficient and provides more accountability to those who provide the basis of its support. This bill is pro-veteran. It shows that Republicans are committed to putting veterans first.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on the VA–HUD appropriations bill. President Clinton has announced his intention to veto this bill because it funds veterans programs at $900 million less than what he requested in his budget.

Right now, nearly 2 million veterans live in Florida, nearly 60,000 in my district alone. More veterans live in Florida than in any other State except one. And 100 veterans move to Florida every day. These men and women are growing older and need medical care.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a slap in the face to Florida's veterans. The President requested $154 million for the Brevard County Hospital which would serve Florida's veterans in and around my district. But the Republicans in Congress took away that money. That hospital so desperately needed by veterans will not be built.

Where do sick veterans in Florida go for hospital care? For the last few years, hundreds of Florida veterans who have developed psychological problems are shipped out of State. That is right. They get shipped off to Mississippi and Alabama for their care. Two beautiful States, indeed, but far away from their loved ones in Florida. I think this is wrong. To me, there is nothing more compelling than the need to care for veterans who suffer the effects of fighting our wars. That is why Florida needs the Brevard County Hospital.

According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, with this bill, almost all renovation and construction of veteran's health facilities will terminate. A funding freeze would lead to a sharp reduction in the number of employees who counsel veterans and decide claims for benefits. The VA's award-winning medical and prosthetic research program would be cut in every year under the freeze.

Mr. Speaker, balancing the budget is a top priority. And I am committed to doing just that. The President is also committed to a balanced budget. But in balancing the budget, a shared sacrifice is necessary. And I share the President's view that we must not balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's most fragile citizens—seniors, veterans, poor women, children, and the disabled.

Our Nation's veterans earned their benefits through service and sacrifice. It should be America's highest priority to honor our commitment with our veterans. I believe it is wrong to abandon our veterans who have gone in harm's way to serve our country. We need to take care of our U.S. servicemen and women—when they are fighting our wars, and when, as veterans, they need health care. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. EMERSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. That is safe to say, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 2099 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on Senate amendment numbered 4.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 208, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 829]

YEAS—216

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Bentsen
Ackerman	Barcia	Berman
Andrews	Barrett (WI)	Bevill
Baesler	Becerra	Bishop

Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant (TX)
Burr
Cardin
Castle
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Foglietta
Ford
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson-Lee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lincoln
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Stokes
Studds
Stupak
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Traficant
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NAYS—208

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Beilenson
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Geren
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heineman
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Livingston
Longley
Lucas
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Morella
Myers
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stump
Talent
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—8

Fattah
Flake
Hefner
Roth
Seastrand
Towns
Tucker
Volkmer

□ 1311

Messrs. LINDER, SALMON, FOLEY, LEWIS of Kentucky, RIGGS, and BILBRAY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. KENNELLY, Messrs. ROEMER, BARCIA, FUNDERBURK, HAYES, GOODLATTE, FOX of Pennsylvania, MURTHA, MANZULLO, GOODLING, HILLEARY, and STOCKMAN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 829, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today because of inclement weather and airport delays, I was delayed on two votes.

For H.R. 2564, I would have voted "yes"; and for H.R. 2099 I would have voted "yes."

□ 1315

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], to explain the schedule this afternoon and for tomorrow. If we are going on Amtrak tomorrow, I would ask the gentleman, why can we not do it today? It is 1 o'clock in the afternoon and we have a good part of the day left.

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

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this last vote is the last vote of the day. The Committee on Rules will be meeting at 2:30 or later this afternoon to write a rule on the Amtrak legislation that we intend to bring up tomorrow. We do not anticipate any vote on Friday or Monday.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if I can reclaim my time, I ask unanimous consent that we bring the Amtrak bill up today. There would not be any objection on this side of the aisle. We would be happy to take it up today. We do not need a rule, unless the gentleman plans to close the rule. We do not need a rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The Chair is unable to recognize the gentleman for that unanimous-consent request.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman to yield for the purposes of inquiring of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished whip on the majority side, are we going to bring up the securities reform legislation?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Michigan will continue to yield, we intend to bring up that piece of legislation sometime next week.

Mr. DINGELL. Next week, not tomorrow or Thursday, Friday?

Mr. DELAY. Sometime next week.

Mr. DINGELL. Would it come up Monday or Tuesday of next week?

Mr. DELAY. We have not set the schedule for next week, but it would be sometime next week.

Mr. DINGELL. I thank the gentleman.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RECOMMITTING THE VA-HUD APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT WILL ALLOW FOR THE GREATER PROTECTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see that the VA-HUD appropriations conference report, which, of course, includes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency, was recommitted to conference today, primarily because of two provisions related to the Environmental Protection Agency. One is that the amount of money that is appropriated to the EPA is probably one of the lowest amounts for any agency, and specifically with regard to enforcement, there is a 25-percent cut in terms of the EPA's enforcement.

Already we know that the EPA has cut back significantly on inspections and on enforcement because of the level of funding that they have received pursuant to the continuing resolution. In other words, as we proceed in trying to put together an appropriations bill for the EPA, less money can be spent on a monthly basis since October 1, because we have not had an appropriations bill signed into law.

Mr. Speaker, the point I was trying to make is that this conference report, which fortunately was sent back to conference today, cuts back on EPA's enforcement ability by about 25 percent. Since we are already into fiscal year 1996 and we are operating on a continuing resolution which significantly cuts back the amount of money available to the EPA, already inspections and other enforcement actions have been reduced at the Environmental Protection Agency. This 25-percent cut in enforcement will simply magnify that problem.

What it means essentially is that, although we have good environmental laws on the books, they cannot be enforced. Polluters will go free, and there will not be the ability for the EPA to go in and even know exactly what is going on, whether someone, for example, is violating their discharge permit into waters.

In addition to the problem with enforcement, this House has several times, at least on two occasions now, voted to take out riders that were in the EPA appropriations bill which I characterize as anti-environment, because they prohibit the agency from actually enforcing certain actions pursuant to the current law. Yet, we know that of the 17 House riders that were in the EPA appropriations bill, two of them remain in the conference report, and at least half of them have been placed into what we call report language. They are not actually in the law, but they are placed in the conference report, and normally Federal agencies have some sort of requirement to try to go along with what the report, what the conference report language says.

Specifically, there are two provisions, two of the riders that are still in the bill and I hope will be taken out when this bill goes back to conference. One of the two would essentially say that the EPA has no ability to enforce wetlands protection. Right now the EPA has the authority under certain circumstances to permit the filing in of wetlands where the agency feels there has been substantial or will be substantial detriment to the environment. That has been taken out; that rider is still in the bill, but that prohibits the agency from providing any kind of wetlands protection.

The other rider that still is in the bill is one that would prohibit the designation of new Superfund sites. Again, if we are supposed to use a scientific basis, which we traditionally have, for deciding whether or not a hazardous waste site would be put on the national priority list for Superfund status, then there is no reason why an appropriations bill, or a conference report in this case, should specifically say that no new Superfund site can be designated.

In addition, through, Mr. Speaker, there are at least another eight or nine riders that are put into what we call report language. These are essentially loopholes that are created to provide special treatment; for example, utilities and other industries seeking to prevent the EPA from expanding its disclosure program under the Community Right To Know Act, refineries facing compliance with air toxic emission standards, cement kilns that burn hazardous waste, air permitting programs for the State of Virginia, bioengineering plants, State audit shields for polluters, natural gas processors. In each case there is conference language requesting the EPA to create loopholes or other special treatment in these various categories.

Essentially, Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly that since agencies are supposed to follow the dictates of the appropriators, this shift to report language, taking the riders out of the statute but putting in the report language, really means that a lot of the damage will still be done to the environment. I hope that the conferees, when this bill goes back to committee, will make some additional changes so we have more money for environmental protection.

THE OCCUPATION OF BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend some time this afternoon and talk to us about the occupation of Bosnia. The President has already decided that we are going to be sending troops into Bosnia, approximately the number of 20,000, under the alleged peacekeeping mission. However, I think as we see the events of Bosnia unfold, we are starting to realize that there are many questions unanswered, in that the direction of those questions and the partial answers that we are receiving is saying that this is not a peacekeeping effort, and that this is a peacemaking effort which will probably result in an occupation unless we take some drastic changes of direction now.

Mr. Speaker, this is a big concern, I think, to every American. If it is not on their thoughts today, it should be. It will be tomorrow. I think it is a well-known fact now in the media and in Congress that the President is going to send troops to Bosnia. He has the constitutional authority to send those troops. He has thought this out. It has been planned in the Pentagon. There will be troops before the end of the year in Bosnia.

It is very frustrating for a Member of Congress, because we are unable to stop this action. We have repeatedly voted to stop from sending troops to Bosnia, yet every effort on the part of the Congress has been met with disdain, with the turning from our advice, and the President has not yet come to us with the arguments, with the right ideas, with the right plan in order to gain not only the support of Congress, but the support of the American public.

Some of the questions that are arising out of this tragic mistake that we are about to make are, No. 1, the President says there will be casualties. There are risks involved. I think this Member of Congress and others would like to know what is the acceptable level of casualties in Bosnia. Is it 1,300 troops per day? Is it the loss of 250 young men and women each day we are over there? Is that acceptable?

I can tell you what is acceptable in Kansas, in the Fourth District of Kansas. It is zero. No casualties. But that is not what we have heard. There will be casualties, but we do not know how many.

□ 1330

Another thing is that we were told that it is going to be 20,000 troops, but now we are finding out that it may be 30,000, maybe 35,000. There will be some held in float. There will be some stationed nearby. According to the War College, it takes seven troops to support one combat troop. So if it is 20,000, that means it is 140,000 with support personnel. If it is 30,000, it goes up to 210,000. Pretty soon, we are talking about a quarter of a million people, and they are in there for the alleged duration, which is supposed to be 12 months.

Will there be a rotation? If there is a rotation, where will the training take place? Does that mean that there is now a half a million troops involved? If so, what would happen if North Korea should cross the border and what would happen if Saddam Hussein again crosses another border? What would happen if a conflict occurs in Yugoslavia or some other place like Macedonia?

This country is not funded in the Department of Defense to handle a two-scenario conflict. Regardless of what the leadership in the administration has said, it is simply not there. Members of the Pentagon know that.

If this is an occupation, which it appears to be leaning towards, 20,000 is not enough. Probably 200,000 is more like what it will take, just ground troops. What is the mission here?

Another question is, what is the geographical area that we will be required to defend? Is it near the hottest area? Near the Serbs? Mr. Speaker, we have already had air strikes on the Serbs. There are some 40,000 to 60,000 rogue Serbs who do not agree with the peace agreement, and we will be near there. Our troops are planned to land at Tuzla, which is just about a mile from the Serb current locations. A mortar round can travel a mile.

Other questions are, is the duration of 12 months enough? We have had a century's old conflict and we think we can solve it in 12 months? What firepower will we have there? What is the funding level? It started out at $1 billion. It is now up to $3 billion. Would it not be more economical in terms of human lives to offer to rebuild the entire country with this $3 billion instead of spending it on troops, putting them in harm's way and accepting some level of casualties?

There are many more questions. One is the question of leadership. Will America not be a leader if we back away from this? There are many ways to lead, through NATO and through other ways. We can lead through air power, through intelligence, through strategy, through logistical support. We have many ways that we can lead. But to send troops into harm's way without the support of the American public, without the support of the America people, the Congress, the answer is no, Mr. President.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION BILL LIMITS OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst, during these next couple of days, of making a recommitment to the American people that we are now serious about a budget reconciliation process that takes away the stridency and the gross imbalance that the present bill has offered.

I voted against the Budget Reconciliation Act that has been proposed by the majority in this House. This is not to say that the consequences of not balancing a budget is not of great concern.

I have been to my district. I have discussed the issue with a myriad of constituents: working Americans, also individuals who are looking to become independent, transitioning themselves maybe from public housing, from being recipients of welfare. But as they look to become independent and as working families are looking to become stronger, the Budget Reconciliation Act says to them that we will not join you in partnership.

This bill drastically cuts housing opportunities for affordable housing. This bill drastically cuts opportunities for poor working families to receive an earned income tax credit. What we may be saying sounds like a continuous recording sound, droning on and on. But what it actually does is impacts the lives of working and living Americans. It jeopardizes the fragile relationship of survival, whether they survive today or whether they do not survive tomorrow.

We find that when we cast aspersions and criticisms on those who receive welfare, this Budget Reconciliation Act, along with the proposed welfare reform plan, cuts child care, cuts job training, and disregards the opportunity for encouraging businesses and others to employ now present welfare recipients by providing a tax incentive to hire such persons. We find in the Budget Reconciliation Act that the job program that helped youth be employed during the summer the last number of years is simply nothing but a baby-sitting job or a baby-sitting activity. How egregiously wrong that perspective is.

In my district, in the city of Houston, we will lose some 6,000 summer jobs. Across this Nation, we will lose millions of dollars that have helped young people be directed away from activities that would cause criminal results to more constructive activities that have exposed them to career activities.

There have been accusations, for example, that the monies have been misused. I am not sure of the extensiveness of any hearings that have suggested that cities that have been, and quasi-public agencies that have been in partnership with the business communities throughout this Nation have not effectively utilized youth summer program money.

We have been able to hire 6,000 youths in my community. All of them have managed to be exposed to unique experiences. Whether it was with NASA and the space station, whether it was with city government, or whether it was with one of our major energy companies in the community, they have learned independence, self-sufficiency, self-esteem.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I had a young person who worked in my office when I was a local elected official who did real work, by the way, this young intern, who, when she got the offer to be an intern under the summer jobs program, called with excitement but yet sadness and said, I cannot accept, because I do not have the proper clothes and I would be embarrassed to show up. I said to that young person, if you have to wear a paper bag, come to this office to know what you can do, how you can be challenged and what the opportunities are for you in the future.

The Budget Reconciliation Act must give to the American people hope. It must give to them a direction. It must give to them focus. What we have now is an ill-spirited and misdirected opportunity.

So I would ask, as the process continues, that we begin to look at where this country wants to go in the 21st century. Do we want to turn back the clock on environment with respect to clear water, clean air, and would you believe, food safety inspections? How outrageous when we have come so far that now we would deny citizens the adequacy of food safety inspections.

We have a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to fairly strike a chord of reason in the Budget Reconciliation Act process. I will participate. I ask my colleagues to participate.

BALANCED BUDGET REQUIRES ELIMINATING AND TRIMMING PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House today on the budget and on the process of balancing the budget.

I have listened to a number of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle today and in the weeks past on the budget, and I really think that maybe an honest step would be for them to say that we do not want to balance the budget, just get it over with. Because what we are hearing is, well, not here and not there, and do not do this, and do not do that.

Federal jobs programs, for example. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have 163 different Federal jobs training programs. Is it possible that some of those could be trimmed back, some could be consolidated, and perhaps, oh, do not say it too loudly around Washington, but maybe some could be eliminated? Is that not what the American people actually want?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

99-059 O—97 Vol. 141 (Pt. 24) 26

Mr. KINGSTON. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his perspective.

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned several job training programs. I would only raise an inquiry for what I hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to do and what I would hope that we could do together, and that is to turn this country around to a level of self-sufficiency. Part of that comes from our youth. If I can just separate out your comments to focus on the summer jobs programs that have been effective in our communities, because, in fact, they have been a partnership between the public and the private sector.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one of the things that is very important to remember is that the AmeriCorps Program, which the gentlewoman has been discussing, for example, is $26,000 per child. Well, I would say to my colleague, we can produce a heck of a lot of great opportunities for kids at that rate.

The problem, as the gentlewoman knows, is that if we want to do something for kids, we have to reduce the deficit. We cannot pass them our bankrupt legacy, the $200 billion debt that we have year after year, the $4.9 trillion that is eating away at these things.

Now, the gentlewoman and I know that when we were kids, an old trick used to be to go to the corner drugstore and charge a Coca Cola or an ice cream to your dad's account down there. Well, at the end of the month your father would find out, well, you charged something to me, and I am going to make you pay that back.

Well, now what is happening is we parents are going down and we are charging things for our kids to pay, but these are 4- and 5- and 6-year-old children who for years and years are going to be paying.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? I thank the gentleman for his thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I will be very quick on this point. If we have analyzed the $26,000 on AmeriCorps, we have not yet juxtaposed or compared that against the investment or resources that they provide to the community which balances off, because they are giving labor for free, in essence, and the summer jobs exposes children to opportunity.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is important, but out of 163 job training programs I would challenge the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] to say, let us cut these. We are in agreement that maybe we need 100 job training programs, or maybe we need 2, or maybe we need 50. Where I think the Democrat Party is being somewhat disingenuous is you all are saying, let us cut the budget and let us balance it, but not here, not now, not in my area.

These are good programs. I would say to my colleague that, in each case, many of them are good programs, yet we are still in debt. So why do we not try to take the good ones that are good and consolidate them together and reduce it and, most importantly, cut out the Washington bureaucrats who are the middle people who are sucking up so much of the money that should go?

I want to make one more point. Mr. Speaker, it is already November, almost December. We keep hearing, balance the budget, but not here, not now. We want to work in a bipartisan fashion. To my knowledge, the only serious plan that has come from you all has been on the Blue Tick Hounds or the Hound Dog Democrats or whatever you call them, and I know that the gentleman from Mississippi has been a part of that. That is a great counterpunch to the debate, and I applaud it. But it is still a minority group within the Democrat Party.

We do not have a serious Democrat proposal to balance the budget yet. So as long as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to say, not here, not now; I would say, get in the arena with us. I mean, it is difficult to balance the budget. If it was not, we would have had one in the last 25 years.

Let me yield to the gentleman from Mississippi. If we can get more time, I will continue this debate, because the lady from Texas has been a very positive person in this debate process.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think there is more that we can do, the gentleman from Georgia, and I appreciate it. I think we have tried to meet on different issues. I wish that the budget now before us was not so strident.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

REQUEST TO EXTEND SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I have a unanimous-consent request. I would like to extend the gentleman's time by 3 minutes so that he could yield to me so that I could have the opportunity to answer the question that he asked of me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to recognize that unanimous-consent request. The gentleman is limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, how many additional people are there on the list, sir?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Approximately 15.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with going back and forth between Democrat and Republican, is it not true that a Democrat can ask for unanimous consent for 5 minutes to speak out of order and then the gentleman from Mississippi can get 5 minutes if no one objects?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

□ 1345

A BALANCED BUDGET?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry before we go on.

I understand what is at stake here. But is the ruling of the Chair about continuing because, if we start this process, that means those who have signed up will have to wait a longer time? Is that the reason for proceeding this way?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize Members for extensions of 5-minute special orders.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I understand. I thank the Chair.

I have the time, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to my friend from Georgia, and I do consider him my friend, that what the coalition and what I hope every Member of this body is asking for is honesty in budgeting.

I did some checking yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office, and even the Republican budget for 1996 would run up a $296 billion annual operating deficit; $118 billion of that would be taken from trust funds.

I have continually heard that bill being referred to on the floor of the House of Representatives as the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Sir, that is not a balanced budget. I think the gentleman knows that, and I know that, I think the people of America ought to know that.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, following up on Mr. TAYLOR's comment, as you know, yesterday I started what I said would be a series of discussions as to what constitutes a balanced budget in the context of the Speaker's admonition to us that we use honest numbers.

I invited the Speaker to come down and discuss that if he wants. He is not here today. I do not know whether he will be here tomorrow. I am going to be here right through the 15th. He may be

in negotiations right now, I do not know, about this so-called balanced budget. But every time we see on television or hear on radio or read in the newspaper the Speaker talking about a balanced budget in 7 years and using honest numbers, I submit to you and I submit to him and would be very happy to have a discourse with him that this is illusionary. This is entirely illusory in nature. These numbers do not reflect an honest balanced budget.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] indicated, every single budget proposed from the years 1996 through 2002 has a massive deficit attached to it in the Republican plan. Every single one of those budgets is going into the Social Security trust fund. It is stated right in the budget documents of the Republican proposals, and I do not object at any time to someone coming forward with the idea of saying let us get to a balanced budget as I indicated yesterday.

In time to come, I will come on this floor and propose the kind of alternatives that some of us are putting together and are willing to get behind that which will achieve that in an honest way. This is dishonest in the sense that you are putting forward, or we are having put forward to us by the majority the idea that somehow they have exclusive claim to a balanced budget.

I will indicate that this year alone, and I may be off $1 or $2 billion, a couple of billion dollars depending on what the final figures come out to be, but the proposal is that they take $63 billion from a so-called surplus in the Social Security system.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will yield briefly because I have got a long way to go and you folks are on the floor every single day with this line and you have hundreds of people saying the same things, and we are just a couple of us here right now. But I will yield for the moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would say this to my friend from Hawaii whom I know to be a learned and honest gentleman. This is an 18-inch ruler, and what is unbelievable to me that over here 18 inches may be different, if we were talking money on the other side of the aisle, and I agree with what you and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] are saying, let us use the same ruler when we debate this so that balance really is balance. No deficit really means no deficit.

So I would say to you in the spirit of let us get to the bottom of it, I am with you 100 percent on what your assertion is. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. To enter into a dialog with you on this, then, is it your position that the budget as put forward by the majority at the present time is not going to balance the budget if at the end of 2002 we have almost $1 trillion owing to the Social Security trust fund?

Mr. KINGSTON. If we are making by a ruler that is the same ruler that we measure all plans on and that is the case, then we need to look at it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If you could be so kind, would you try and answer my question. Is it the Republican budget position that in the year 2002 when you have ostensibly balanced the budget that you will owe the Social Security trust fund $636 billion plus interest, approximately $1 trillion will be owing to the trust fund?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this. Last night was the first night that I listened to what you are saying and it raised something that I want to go back and do my homework on. But I can assure you that I would be happy to answer that question afterwards and continue a dialog in an honest manner.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, do I have time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ten seconds.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I very much appreciate the honesty of the gentleman from Georgia. I will indicate to him and to the rest of the House that if they go back and do their homework as he suggests, they will find that in the year 2002 we will owe almost $1 trillion to the Social Security trust fund, and in the time to come, Mr. Speaker, over the next couple of weeks I am sure we can explore this issue at greater depth. I thank the Speaker very much and the gentleman from Georgia.

BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up briefly, I was going to be talking on Bosnia but to follow up briefly on what the gentleman said before, anybody that comes up with a plan that does more to balance the budget than what the Republican plan has done this year is fine with me. But I am hearing conflicting signals.

The first thing I am hearing is that the Republican budget does not go far enough to balance the budget. And then we turn around the next day and hear how savagely the Republican budget cuts everything. The fact of the matter is that is a falsehood.

Student aid goes up 49 percent under the Republican plan, goes from $24 billion to $36 billion. But now we are hearing a new line. Now the line is that the Republican budget does not go far enough. If the gentleman from Hawaii would like to get into the debate and figure out a way to balance the budget plus handle it, $1 trillion dollars, 7 years from now, if you say we are $1 trillion short, I welcome him. Again, I want to talk about Bosnia. But I will just say this with a footnote.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Will the gentleman kindly yield a moment.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let me just finish this. Any plan you come up with if it goes even further than the Republican plan in making the savings that we are doing is going to have to add about $750 billion to what your President and your party is willing to do.

I yield to the gentleman before going into Bosnia.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. That is very kind because I will focus on Bosnia. I realize what you are saying. Obviously if this moves forward we have to find more money to deal it. That is one of the problems with Bosnia.

My point is that there are alternatives. I will not take the gentleman's time tonight. It includes capital budgeting, and I do not consider it Republican or Democrat in that context. I am considering it in the context of America, the way the rest of American Government and business and families run their budgeting.

We separate capital budgeting from operating expenses and I think we can get to a balanced budget. We do not have to put a timetable right now but I would be happy to discuss with the gentleman and my good friend from Georgia ways that we can deal with honest numbers. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Hawaii. Certainly it has nothing to do with the Republican or Democratic Party. It has to do with being honest with budget figures. Obviously the Republicans in the early 1980's engaged in rosy scenarios just as Democrats have in the past.

But moving on to Bosnia, I know the gentleman from Hawaii certainly has some opinions on this which I look forward to hearing, also, I have just got to tell you. I hear so many people calling my offices, and I have answered a lot of the calls myself, and I have talked to other Members across the country.

The fact of the matter is, and I do not care what a CNN poll says, the overwhelming number of Americans today do not want United States men and women to put their lives on the line for a 500- or 600-year-old civil war in Bosnia. The fact of the matter is that we as a country appear to have learned a lot from the mistakes we made in Vietnam.

In fact, the Pentagon put forward a doctrine that would prevent us from getting involved in future conflicts that would lead into Vietnam-style quagmires. It was called the Weinberger doctrine. It came out in the mid 1980's, and it seemed to make a lot of

sense. The first requirement was that before the President sent one young American to die in a war across the sea, he clearly stated a vital American interest that was at stake.

I have sat on the Committee on National Security for the past few months. I have heard testimony from the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, General Shalikashvili, and they have failed to come forward, and not them personally. They are representatives of the administration. The administration has failed to set forth a clear, vital American interest that is worth the spilling of blood of young American men and women to end a civil war that has been going on for 500 or 600 years, to end a civil war that is much more complex than even the conflict we got involved with with Somalia.

Remember the need to go to Somalia because it was the right thing to do? We had to stop the hunger, we had to stop the clans from fighting each other.

The fact of the matter is, we went to Somalia, we spent $3 billion, it cost us over 20 American lives, and today the warlords continue to fight each other. We did not make a difference in Somalia, and Somalia is nothing compared with what we go to when we start talking about sending troops to Bosnia. It makes absolutely no sense.

The President spoke a few nights ago and tried to define a vital interest, but unfortunately his vital interest had to do with securing a Bosnian peace treaty. The fact of the matter is that right now that Serbs in Sarajevo said they will fight to the death. I have got to tell my colleagues, until we clearly define a vital American interest that is worth the death of Americans, I respectfully have to reject the President's reasoning to send young Americans to Bosnia to die.

BALANCED BUDGET DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Members on both sides of the aisle feel very passionately about their positions in the budget debate, and we should feel passionately about this issue because in fact what we are debating is the future of our country. The debate is about far more than numbers. It really, in essence, is about the values and the priorities of the American people.

Democrats are concerned about the level of cuts that this budget makes in Medicare, in education, and in environmental protection. We believe that the cuts that are currently there, the cuts in this budget, go too far and too fast and will hurt too many people.

We are also very concerned about the tax package that is contained in this budget. Because of that tax package, we think that it is wrong to impose higher taxes on those who can least afford it while lowering the taxes on those who can in fact most afford it. That seems to have the priorities of this Nation out of whack.

We are not alone in thinking that the budget has its priorities upside down. If you take a look at what the American people are talking about, and there are recent surveys that have discussed this issue, the surveys indicate that 60 percent of the public today would like to see the President veto this budget as it currently stands.

I think that there are a number of us here who concur that that is what the President should do if Republicans refuse to lessen the blow on our seniors, our students, and on our environment.

Congress should not force its priorities on the American people. It is time to start to listen to them, to compromise on a balanced budget that protects the priorities of the American people. No one disagrees about getting our fiscal house in order, about achieving a balanced budget. There is a right way to do it and a wrong way to do it.

What we want to try to do is to protect those principles and those priorities that the American public has asked us, in fact, to protect. That means protecting educational opportunity, environmental protections, and it means protecting Medicare.

As it currently stands, the Republican budget, and this number has not budged in all these months, cuts $270 billion from Medicare to help to finance a tax cut for the wealthiest Americans. Over 50 percent of the tax cuts go to the richest 1 or 2 percent of the people in this country.

□ 1400

The cuts go too far too fast and will devastate a health care system that is serving 37 million seniors.

It is not only the seniors who are going to be hurt, and it is not just Democrats who are warning about the impact of the deep and the dangerous Medicare cuts. The most recent issue of Money magazine, there is an article. It tells families, actually, in the article, to hold on to their wallets because health care costs are going to go up if this budget passes. In fact, because of the cuts in Medicare payments to hospitals under this plan, administrators say that they will have to raise health care costs for the rest of the population in order to have to make up the difference.

According to a recent article in the New York Times, the Medicare cuts will shift more than $11 billion in costs onto small businesses and American workers. That is because if people wind up having additional people wind up with not having insurance, once more, as our current situation indicates to us, that those people who are without insurance, if they do get health care, and they will, that those costs do not just fall into an abyss, into a vacuum. Those costs get picked up by all those who, in fact, are currently paying health care costs. We will just add to the number of those who are uninsured, and those additional costs will have to be borne by those who are currently picking up health care costs today.

That is a burden on individuals, and it is a burden on our businesses today and our workers that they simply cannot afford.

The GOP Medicare proposal is fundamentally flawed by controlling spending, but, by not controlling costs, it ensures seniors will be forced to pay more out of pocket while health care costs continue to rise. That would mean a giant step backward for America's seniors. That is not the way to balance the budget. That is not the American way.

CLAIMS VERSUS TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, the last few months the congressional Democrats have tried to scare the American people, using all kinds of scare tactics and disinformation with twisted rhetoric.

I would like to point out to you a typical example of how wrong it is. First one Medicare, my golly, I just heard the story that this is gutting Medicare cuts, and the dangerous Medicare cuts, et cetera. Let us take a look because I would like to have the American people make their own judgment.

It seems like the argument is Medicare part B. Part B is to pay for a doctor's bills, et cetera, long-term care. The way it is right now, senior citizens pay about one-third, $46.10. They cost Government three times more than that.

So what happens right now, one-third is paid by the senior citizens, two-thirds paid by the other taxpayers, younger generation. The other ones subsidize senior citizens by this ratio.

Take a look at this. Starting next year, our friends want to do this one-quarter paid by the senior citizens, three-quarters by the other taxpayers. We said "no" because in good time perhaps, maybe, but we do not have any money. We would like to keep it one-third, two-thirds relationship, continuing the next 7 years so we can balance the budget.

Where is the cut? This is what they call a cut. They would like to spend this much. We said "no." Let us maintain present situation. They call that a mean-spirited cut, deep cut, all kinds of rhetoric.

Now, even though maintaining this relationship, because hospital costs have gone up anyway, everybody has to

pay a little more. Senior citizens have to pay a few bucks more a month, and their younger generation has to pay a few dollars more to subsidize.

Let us take a look at the next chart. Starting $46.10 a month, eventually at the end of 7 years it is going to go up to $87 a month. Mr. Clinton's plan is $83 at the end of seventh year. Strangely enough, next year, did it to less payment, I do not know why, perhaps election year, then go up. Eventually we are talking about $87 versus $83. The American people knows this. That is what is the difference in the Part B premium than what the Republicans propose and what Mr. Clinton proposes. It is about the same.

Let us take a look at the next one. I mean, hearing this rhetoric that we are trying to put all of this poor working family out in the cold, they are talking about earned income tax credit. Many people do not know what is earned income tax credit. What it is, if you make money, you have a family, but not enough to support family, then Government pays you money. Look at what happens. This time, about this year, the Congress passed a law so you do not have to have children. Anybody can be eligible to receive the Government paychecks without having any children. That was different than original intent. Guess what happened here? Zoom, thousand percent increase.

What we are trying to do is slow down a little bit. The blue line here, slow down by eliminating waste and fraud, and also we are trying to go back to the original intent that if you do not have any kids, if you do not have any children, you are not going to receive any EITC paychecks anymore from Government. That is all we are trying to do.

Where is the cut? Where is the mean-spirited cut here?

Let us take a look at the next example. Next one is a lunch program, taking food away from the mouths of children. What a grotesque twist of rhetoric. Actually, we are spending more money, to be exact, 37 percent more, from $4.5 billion in 1995 to $6.17 billion in the year 2002. Is that the cut? 37-percent increase is a cut?

All we are trying to do is, there are so many programs right now, we are trying to consolidate into one program, also eliminate the middle man—in this case, Federal bureaucracy—so the local school district can get more money, in a sense, the children can get more money for their school lunch program.

Tell me where the cut is.

Finally, now they are trying to scare students. My God, they say we are cutting student loans and other educational aid.

Let us take a look at this. Starting from 1995, continue going up at the end of the seventh year the budget shows student loan, $36.4 billion, 48-percent increase. The student gets 48-percent increase in student loans.

Is there a cut? I think we should stop this rhetoric.

SIESTA FOR CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, today we gain new insight into what this new Gingrich-ite majority meant when they said they would give us a new Congress, and we can see it right here on the floor today. They have brought an entirely new institution to this Congress, not new to other countries of the world. It is known as a siesta.

You see, at a little after 1 o'clock today, when most Americans were out working hard trying to make ends meet, the Gingrich-ite leadership declared a siesta in the Congress. They said at 1 o'clock, after they had paid to bring back Members of Congress from all of the 50 States to pass a bill this morning that could have been approved last night with ease, to suffer a major defeat today on a piece of legislation that would take money away from veterans' care, they said at 1 o'clock, "We do not have any more business today. We do not want to work any more." And unlike some of our friends in other countries in the world who might take a 2- or 3-hour siesta around noontime, this new Gingrich-ite majority proposes to extend its siesta until midnight and well into tomorrow.

It is as if they did not hear the message of the American people that I heard over the Thanksgiving break, a message that said, "Stop your antics. Get to work." The message that said, "We do not appreciate Speaker GINGRICH wasting somewhere between $500 million and $800 million, so zealous with his extremist agenda that he would pay Federal workers not to even work for a week, at the expense of the American taxpayer."

But instead of coming back to work and actually working through these appropriations bills, they declare a siesta.

And is there work left to be done? Well, indeed, if they had not been sleeping on the job or something, we would never have had a Government shutdown in the first place. You see, they had a responsibility to pass some 13 appropriations bills by September 30.

Did they do it? No. They passed 2 of 13, a failing grade where I come from down in Texas. Have they done it today? Have they even gotten half of these bills passed? Well, now, as we begin to approach Christmas, having completed Thanksgiving, they have yet to send to the President's desk almost half of the appropriations bills.

Let me review what pends here as these Republicans enjoy their siesta today:

The Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary appropriations bills have not been presented to this House for action.

The District of Columbia appropriations bill, it says in the latest report that conference was continued on November 17, and it is still continued. We do not have the bill out here to act on.

The Committee on Foreign Operations, the latest report says the conference deadlocked on November 15. That means that the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans cannot agree on the same bill. So it is not out here for us to act on.

The Interior bill, that is the one we defeated just before the Thanksgiving break because of that giveaway that the Gingrich-ite majority wanted to give to the mining companies to take public property and use it for private gain.

The Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education bills, they failed to begin floor debate over in the Senate at the end of September. It has not even passed the U.S. Senate.

Then the Veterans' Affairs, Housing and Urban Development legislation which was taken up and defeated today, recommitted for the second time, the second time that this House has recommitted that bill, the first time because our Republican colleagues wanted to bind and destroy law enforcement against pollution with some 17 binders, and so it was rejected. They came back kind of with their tails between their legs, saying, "We really did not mean to do so much damage to the environment as we did."

Today this House said "yes," but you are doing damage to the veterans that secured this country. You are taking $213 million out of their health care that ought not to be taken out of that health care, and this House soundly rejected and recommitted that bill.

We have got half the business and well over half of the appropriations of the Government of the United States that have not been signed into law, and these folks take a siesta for the rest of the day.

They say they want a balanced budget. Well, they do not have much balance to the way they are getting that budget. The problem is they do not have any balance in the budget that they propose.

I believe in a budget that is balanced. I come from the pay-as-you-go approach of Texas. I want those figures to balance so that we do not leave our grandchildren with debt upon debt.

But how about a little balance for the people that are affected by that budget? Oh, yes, they say we have got to sacrifice. They said this morning that those veterans had to sacrifice to the extent of $213 million out of their health care.

But what sacrifice do they demand of the most wealthy of our citizens? They said, "Could you, please, pretty please, take a tax break at the same time we cut the rest of America?"

That is wrong, and so is this siesta.

BALANCING THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did not rise to defend this Congress. But I can vouch personally for the fact that the overwhelming majority of Members of this body are working quite hard, thank you.

I did want to speak and address some of the remarks that were made by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] because I think he has raised a very important point relative to the role and interaction of the Social Security trust funds with the deficit. I do not have the precise numbers, and I am sure I am going to be looking forward to the Members' discussion over the next several days and weeks. But I would be interested to know the extent to which the Social Security trust funds actually comprise a significant percentage of our $5 trillion national debt.

I would suggest that there are clear implications to that which relate to how, in fact, we are dealing with balancing the budget and whether, in fact, we are using the type of honest numbers we have come to expect.

I have confess that, having spent the Thanksgiving weekend, frankly, with two of the most important people in my life, my two children, I have got maybe a little bit of a different perspective of what we have been doing over the past several months, particularly as it relates to the deficit. Again, I think we all agree there is no issue that is more important than balancing this country's budget once and for all.

I for one was very pleased to see that the President agreed just about 2 weeks ago to the concept that we are going to work together, Republicans and Democrats, to come up with a 7-year plan to finally once and for all balance the Federal budget.

But I have to confess that I think the public expects an awful lot more of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle with respect to how we work toward that objective, and specifically I was very distressed to know that barely was the ink dry on the agreement when the President's chief of staff made the comment that, well, he was not sure we were really going to balance the budget in 7 years, that it might take 8 years or longer.

□ 1415

Then over the weekend, Mr. Carvel, the President's chief political strategist, made the comment that from his perspective, the President might just as well drive a hard line that would result in a continuing resolution or even a Government shutdown until November of 1996, almost over a year from today.

I have got to say there is no more important issue in this body than our once and for all coming to grips with many of the petty, partisan differences that stand in the way of our doing the work that the people elected us to do, which is to find a way to honestly get the Government spending under control so that we can move in the direction of a balanced Federal budget.

Again, I respect the points that are being made by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and I would suggest that they are very much factors that need to be considered in how we go about doing it. But the bottom line is that we need to work toward balancing the budget, and that means making tough decisions relative to cutting spending.

Yesterday, again, the chief of Staff of the White House made the comment that the White House was not going to be willing to agree to any 7-year plan to balance the budget unless we obtained the support of 100 Members of the Democratic side of this House. While as laudable a goal as that is, I think what it is suggesting to me is that, frankly, we may be wasting our efforts, Republicans and Democrats, attempting to work with the White House, and perhaps it is the responsibility of this party, this body, to come to grips together as Republicans and Democrats, to finally get the heavy lifting done on the budget, because I interpret the Chief of Staff's comments yesterday as a suggestion that the White House, frankly, is not really serious about working together to get to a balanced Federal budget.

When we cannot even agree on the number of people who are participating in the negotiations, I would suggest that this is a major embarrassment on everybody involved in the process. As I said, I think the public expects an awful lot more than they are receiving. When we have a government that over the next 7 years is going to spend in excess of $12 trillion, some $3 trillion more in the next 7 years than we spent in the last 7 years, and that is using the numbers from the Republicans budget, then I think that we need to take serious stock of where we are and how seriously we are committed to making the tough decisions that need to be made.

I was pleased this morning to be part of a group from my side of the aisle of Republican Members who are going to be trying to work with Democratic Members, with the Coalition, to try to find a common ground that we need to finally get the type of accommodation, the type of agreement, that will allow us to make the serious decisions we need to make.

With respect to the comments of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and I think it is an important issue that we need to address, the fact that some percentage of our $5 trillion deficit actually consists of funds loaned by workers who were paying into the Social Security trust fund, again we have some serious issues. We need to address it. But first of all, we need to work together to finally get Government spending under control.

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, our budget should reflect our values.

We now have a chance to achieve that important goal. Before Thanksgiving, we voted to return all government employees to work—ending the false distinction between those referred to as essential and those as nonessential.

In addition, the President and leadership from the majority in Congress reached an agreement, in principal, to balance the budget, to use reliable revenue projections, and to protect vital social programs.

As part of that agreement and our action, in the House and in the Senate, we are aiming at December 15th to deliver on those commitments. The American people expect us to reach that target. Another Government shutdown will not be tolerated.

How can we reach that target, what are the obstacles to reaching that target, and what are the values of America? We can reach that target by putting principal and people above politics and party. We can reach that target by discovering our similarities and overlooking our differences.

Now the obstacles, admittedly, are many.

But this Nation and this Congress have faced obstacles before. And we have overcome those obstacles by holding to our values.

We believe in equality. We believe in fairness. We believe in justice. And, we believe in family. Those are values held by every Member of this Chamber.

And, since those are our similarities, there is really no reason for our differences to prevent us from enacting a long-term, balanced budget bill by December 15.

If all of us believe in equality, fairness, justice, and family—and we do—why should achieving a balanced budget in 7, 8, 9 or 10 years be an obstacle? It should not.

If all of us believe in equality—and we do—why should there by any distinction in tax relief between those making $100,000 dollars a year or more and those making $28,000 dollars a year or less?

Doesn't fairness require that we treat our seniors, our children, and the poor

with the same concern and respect as we treat the able-bodied and the well-to-do?

And, what does justice require?

Is it just to insist upon a rigid set of numbers and a rigid time frame that have been subjectively selected?

Is it justice to increase spending by $245 billion on a tax cut, while reducing spending on medicare by $270 billion or on Medicaid by $175 billion or while reducing spending on education and the environment?

Can we not agree that justice requires that if we must spend a dollar to help some, we should not take a dollar and hurt others?

And, family—one of our most important values.

Family is more than a strong father and a sturdy mother.

Family is a healthy grandfather and grandmother.

Family is fit children who can count on and look forward to educational and economic opportunities.

Family, in the larger sense, is a community of friends and neighbors who have jobs at liveable wages, who have safe and sanitary housing, and who can breathe free and drink safe water.

Not one Member in this Chamber will deny those values.

And, the budget we enact, before December 15, should reflect each of those values.

If it does, we would have reached our goal.

If it does not, we have surrendered our values.

And, so, I challenge the Speaker, the majority leader, others with authority in the majority, the leaders on this side of the aisle and all Members of this and the other body—hold fast to your values—put people first—advance a budget bill, but do not retreat from equality, do not shrink from fairness, do not withdraw from justice, and do not wince from family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker,

HAITIAN POLICY SUCCESSFUL, BUT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there have been several explosive developments in Haiti in the last few weeks. The wisdom of President Aristide, no matter what course these developments take, is still the greatest asset of Haiti. The wisdom of Jean-Bertrand Aristide is still necessary for this country to have a new birth. Recent statements by President Aristide and recent behavior by President Aristide are clearly understandable in the light of certain recent developments.

It is important for us to remember that the liberation of Haiti still represents one of the moral and humanitarian mountain tops of United States foreign policy. This Nation took a giant step forward and we did the right thing. Americans set new standards for the hemisphere, and we set new standards for international law and order. Criminals will not be allowed to seize control of a nation, take over its legitimate government, oppress its people, and terrorize its people. Criminals aided by the United States and an army set up by the United States will not be allowed to do this in one of the countries in this hemisphere. We clearly established that policy.

The policy has already succeeded. I congratulate the Clinton administration. But, still, so much more can be done to facilitate democracy, peace, and progress in Haiti. So much more can be done without any great costs, additional costs.

The most basic needs of Haiti right now are judges, jails, and electricity. We have the capacity, the United States and the United Nations forces which are still in Haiti have the capacity, to deliver those three items, those three basics: judges, jails, and electricity.

Haiti needs jails because there are many wrongdoers from the previous regime who are moving about with impunity. They have no fear of the government whatsoever. There are many that have been seized and many that have been judged and put in prison who just walked away because they do not have decent jails or stockades. One thing the U.S. Army or military force can do is build some jails and stockades, but we have refused to do that. It would not cost very much.

Haiti needs an improved criminal justice system. The judges were run out of Haiti. They are spread out among the world; 1 million Haitians are in France, the United States and Canada. They will come home if a clear system is set up with the backing of the United Nations and United States. We can give them judges and jails.

And Haiti needs electricity. That is the basic necessity for industry in Haiti. We promised to do that when we went in there. We have not delivered on that capacity.

Understand if we have these basics in place, you would have an atmosphere and environment established which would create trust between the Haitian people and the United Nations that are trying to help the people. Instead of those few basics being met, what we have is the kind of situation where the United States is withholding documents that it seized from the Haitian military criminals, documents which show who committed the murders of 3,000 people, documents which show who armed the groups that drove our forces away from the pier in Haiti when we first went to Haiti peacefully. All those documents show who the perpetrators are, who financed the coup.

Yet our army, which seized those documents, is refusing to share them with the Haitian Government. It is a kind of racism. I know of no other situation where a country has gone in to liberate and help another country, seized documents which would lead to the prosecution of those people who are guilty of committing serious crimes in the country, and claimed those documents as their own. The Haitian people are suspicious. Jean-Bertrand Aristide is suspicious. The cousin of Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who is a member of parliament, was recently assassinated in broad daylight.

When you add up these kinds of situations, our Government refusing to share documents which would prosecute the wrongdoers, and then a resurgence of violence so strong and so bold as to shoot down the cousin of the President, who is a member of parliament, then you can see what great suspicion sets in, where the Haitian Government under Aristide is wondering what is happening now.

The CIA in the past has not seemed to be operating hand in hand with the White House. The White House and the people there would say one thing, and the CIA would do another. The organization called FRAP, which created so much havoc in Haiti just before the return of Aristide, was financed by the CIA as it turned out.

These kind of contradictions and strange happenings lead to a bewildering array of activities that raise suspicion and eliminate what trust did exist. We can return that trust by providing judges, jails, and electricity, and giving back to the Haitian Government any documents which rightfully belong to that government.

□ 1430

INTRODUCTION OF THE WASHINGTON, DC, FISCAL PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is day 17 of the countdown to December 15. I am here every morning to try to see to it that if you shut down Federal agencies on that date, you do not shut down an entire city, the District of Columbia.

This, of course, was one of the all-time unintended consequences of the last shutdown. If we shut Federal agencies, the District of Columbia automatically shuts down. Mr. Speaker,

these are apples and oranges. The District is a living, breathing city that delivers vital frontline services. A Federal agency is a creature of the Federal Government that delivers services that local communities find important but not vital to their day-to-day survival. Please, let us delink these two entities.

I have yesterday introduced an independent CR for the District of Columbia, so that if on December 15 another shutdown should occur, the District would be free from it. I have spoken to the Speaker, who appeared to be sympathetic to my concerns; the chair of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. TOM DAVIS, has cosponsored this special CR for the District of Columbia.

The shutdown of the District of Columbia was particularly galling and unnecessary, because 85 percent of the money in our appropriation was raised in the District of Columbia from District taxpayers. It should not be up here in the first place. But if it happens to be up here and caught in a shutdown, the very least that the Congress can do, in all decency, is to say, "Here, District of Columbia, you are entitled to spend your own money to keep your own city open." That is all I am asking. As to the Federal payment, some of it would remain, of course, locked up here, and yet we need that cash very much. Bear in mind that the Federal payment is a PILOT, a payment in lieu of taxes, thank you, no gift from the Federal Government, but a payment owed us. Nevertheless, that would be treated in the normal way.

Remember the city which I represent. It is second per capita in taxes paid to the Federal Government, yet it is the only jurisdiction that flies the American flag that does not have full home rule and full self-government.

All of you, wake up and read the morning papers. You know about the condition of the District of Columbia. You know it now has a control board just to borrow, and that it is virtually insolvent. Surely the Congress does not mean to do more damage to the capital city of the United States. What is that damage? Imagine, the District of Columbia, of course, has to pay employees even though they do not work, because they are forced into administrative leave. There is that lost productivity, some of it completely irrecoverable.

These 3- or 4-week CR's do not allow a complicated city to operate, because a city cannot overobligate. If you are obligating on a basis of one-fourteenth, because you have a 14-day CR, and yet you have unfunded mandates like Medicaid or AFDC, you are put in an untenable position. And of course, if the District were overobligated, as we have seen, the Congress would be the very first to object and to criticize.

The District of Columbia has taken its hits and it knows it deserves its licks for what it has not done to keep its city in good shape. The very least the Congress, which has been profuse in its criticism, should do is to make sure it does no further harm to the District.

I have a D.C. Fiscal Protection Act, in addition to the CR for December 15, that would mean that whenever we get to the end of a fiscal year, the District could spend its own money until an appropriation cleared the Congress. Our appropriation is stuck up here on provisions added undemocratically by Members unaccountable to the voters of the District of Columbia. We may not be able to get it out for weeks and weeks.

Do not hold the District hostage. I represent a lot of innocent bystanders. Whatever you think of the Mayor or the city council or the delegate, remember these are high taxpaying citizens who deserve a whole lot better. The last time the District got lost in the shuffle, even though the District was right here "in your face." This time, you will not be able to miss us, because I will be here every day on the countdown until December 15.

HONESTY IN DISCUSSING A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] extended me the courtesy of giving me one of his minutes. I would like to return that courtesy.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND BALANCING THE BUDGET

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] raised the issue of whether there is, in fact, a Balanced Budget Act before us. I had spoken about the fact that, and I say "the fact" that the budget proposed by the majority, by the Republican majority, by Speaker GINGRICH, is going to take $636 billion from the Social Security trust fund in order to so-called balance the budget. I want to quote at this point, so it is not just coming from me, but from Senator HOLLINGS in the other body:

> You will expend another $636 billion of the Social Security trust fund. We said we were raising the Social Security taxes to make certain there was trust in the trust fund through the year 2050.

That is why the FICA taxes, your Social Security tax, was raised previously, to make sure the trust fund was solvent. Now we are taking it.

Again, quoting Senator HOLLINGS:

> When you put together the borrowing from the trust funds that must be replenished, you get the real deficit, the gross Federal deficit, and the gross interest costs.

Finally, again from Senator HOLLINGS:

> Wait a minute. When you take the revenues in, the outlays out, and you look at that figure, that is too high for me to run on in the next election, so we will take an amount of money out of the right pocket, put it into the left pocket, we will take $636 billion from Social Security in this budget that we have under consideration, and put it in the general fund to make it appear we are balancing the budget. You will have to pay back Social Security with interest and at the end of the 7-year budget period, you will owe. At the end of the 7-year period, we will all have to pay back supposedly over $1 trillion into the Social Security trust fund, and no one has any idea, not any Senator or House Member, who is going to introduce the increase in taxes to refund the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Speaker would come here and answer that question.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, it came as quite a surprise to me yesterday in researching the Republican budget plan that was much touted on the floor of this House as being the balanced budget plan of 1995, said repeatedly, that the annual operating deficit for this Nation will actually increase by $33 billion in fiscal year 1996 over this year. I think people need to know that. The budget deficit will increase from $263 billion on an annual operating basis to $296 billion on an annual operating basis.

Part of this, Mr. Speaker, will come from the trust funds that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] just mentioned: The $118 billion that people paid into things like the Social Security trust fund will be used to disguise the true nature of this debt.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is for a balanced budget. I am for a balanced budget. Let us be honest with the American people. Let us not tell them we can spend more in spending, we can receive less in taxes, that we are already $5 trillion in debt, paying $1 million in interest payments every 2 minutes, 2 minutes, and somehow all of this is magically going to work without pain.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is my friend, but let us be honest with this. Let us be honest with the American people. This morning you told me you were willing to borrow $75 billion so you could give people a minuscule tax break. They have to pay that back. That is not a gift. That is just loan sharking. You are taking money from them, you are giving them a little bit back, and they are going to have to pay back a whole heck of a lot more of the time they pay the interest. Let us be honest with the American people.

The second thing I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, is I have had a number of

calls from home. I want to assure the people of south Mississippi that I was one of the first members of this body to be against putting American troops on the ground when President Bush asked me to do it, and I will remain opposed to that when President Clinton asks me to do it.

I traveled to that part of the world a few weeks ago, traveled up to the border posts in Macedonia, had the privilege with having lunch with some fellow Mississippians, a young man from Tupelo in particular, and from four-star officers to sergeant majors. Every one of them privately told me we should not get involved there. That is not our fight.

These people have been fighting each other for 700 years. The only peace they have known recently was the 45 or so years when Tito was in charge there, using the iron fist of communism, and he got the Bosnians to quit killing Muslims and the Muslims to quit killing Serbs and the Croatians to quit killing the others. As soon as the iron fist of communism was gone, they went back to killing each other.

Mr. Speaker, I want to close by saying that they told me that the smart weapons that worked so well in Desert Storm will not work in the cold, wet fog of Bosnia. We are going to send those kids on the ground, a bunch of them are going to die, and nothing good will come of it.

COMMON SENSE AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think a good way to start is to echo what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] just said. I agree with his analysis of Bosnia, and I hope that we can bring some common sense to bear on that issue.

Let us talk about the budget and see if we can get some common sense and a level of agreement on what we are trying to do up here in Congress. A lot of people have said they want to balance the budget. I hope they are sincere. My gut instinct is that some mean it and some do not. The best way to judge whether a person means what they say is to look at what they do.

When I was a prosecutor in the Air Force and a defense attorney, I had this as my guide. I never quite believed everything my client told me as a defense attorney, and when the accused said he did not do it, I did not stop the investigation there. I looked behind what people say, and you judge their actions by their deeds.

So when somebody comes up here and tells you they want to balance the budget, the first question you need to ask them is are they willing to spend within the revenues generated, because if you want to spend more than you take in, you are not going to balance the budget. Does anybody have any idea how much the Federal Government has grown since 1969? I do not have that answer right now, but I have been told it has been several hundred percent. I am trying to find out how much the Federal Government has grown since we last balanced our Federal budget. I think the number is going to be shocking.

We have some folks visiting here today, and those that are listening at home, what is your estimate that the Federal Government spends per person to run the Federal Government, on Federal Government programs? How much do you think we spend per person to operate the Federal Government? Let me tell you what it was for the last 7 years. Over a 7-year period, we spent $145,962 on a family of four. We spent $9.5 trillion over the last 7 years to run the Federal Government.

We have come up with a new budget that balances, that has been certified to balance. Guess how much we spend as Republicans, the mean old Republicans who want to devastate everything? Guess how much money we have spent? Twelve trillion dollars. Where does that $12 trillion come from? It comes from you, the taxpayer; it comes from you, the senior citizen. It is hard to make the money, it is far too easy to spend the money up here, but over the next 7 years we are going to take $12 trillion of your money and run this Federal Government.

I ask one simple thing of my colleagues: Let that be enough. Twelve trillion dollars is enough to spend in Washington, DC. We can argue about how to spend it, we can rearrange the $12 trillion pie, we can move money around, but for the sake of future generations, for the sake of fiscal sanity, please do not spend more than $12 trillion of hard-earned taxpayer money.

Do you know what that equates to, for a family of four over a 7-year period? It is $184,373 that will be spent by your Federal Government on a family of four. It is hard to make that much money and it is far too easy to spend it. If you do not like the tax cuts, fine. If you think we have spent too much money on defense, fine. If you think we have not spent enough money on Medicare, fine. Just agree with me and evey other American who knows the facts. Rearrange the $12 trillion pie, and do not go into our pockets any deeper. We do not have much of a picket left as it is. This is not a shoestring budget. Twelve trillion dollars is unimaginable. They tell me that if you spend $1 million a day from the time of Christ to the present, you would not have spent $1 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the people who are listening here, Members of Congress, to agree on one simple fact: That we can run an efficient nation on $12 trillion, we can satisfy legitimate needs on $12 trillion, and that any politician who wants to spend more than $12 trillion has a problem. They do not need to be up here.

THE IMPACT OF THE CUTS IN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, when he talks about $12 trillion. That is what, for the next hours, the members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities will talk about. I wish we had $12 trillion to spend on education, but we do not. That is why our committee members are joining today in this special order to highlight the spending cuts that will happen.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know about $12 trillion over the next whatever number of years it is, but I know the impact the education cuts are having on my own district from the rescission bill, and the potential for the budget that we will ultimately end up passing, and the lost opportunity we will have, not just for the students who are there this year or next year, but for the next generation that we hope will be the ones who are taking our place here on this floor and taking our place all over the country in the medical schools and in the professions.

□ 1445

In the name of deficit reduction, the Congress is cutting the Federal money available for education programs, and I believe we need to balance our budget. However, I do not believe that we must balance it on the backs of those children.

The purpose of the deficit reduction is to make America stronger, and we agree with that on a philosophical basis. How can we make America stronger if we are not willing to invest in education? Education is talking about the strength of America, again, not for this year, Mr. Speaker, but for the next 5 and 10 years, and even after that. We should not stand by while the Republican majority destroys the educational system that we have all worked hard to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I know in Houston we have made a solid investment in education and have a lot of individual students who are being successful, part of it because of the Federal funding that goes to the schools in our own district. A good example is Franklin Elementary School in my district, which was recognized by the U.S. Department of Education for its educational improvement.

The students at Franklin made exemplary progress in the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills last year. In 1994, only 35 percent to 59 percent of the student body passed the TAAS test as we call it, Texas Assessment for Academic Skills. In 1995, due to innovative teacher methods and a significant Federal investment in Franklin and the freedom that we had last year under title I, that school was classified as a recognized school where 75 percent of those children, at least up to 80 percent, are passing their TAAS testing. So we have a three-quarter success rate in an inner-city school that is eligible and receives both bilingual funding from the State, but also title I.

The students at Franklin are especially hurt by the cuts in title I from the rescission bill this year. Currently, Franklin receives about $200,000 in Federal title I funding. If the House-passed Labor-HHS appropriations bill becomes law, Franklin will lose 17 percent or $34,000 of those funds.

Harris County in the State of Texas receives $81.1 million in title I funds now. Under the House-passed bill originally, Labor-HHS, Harris County would lose $13.8 million, and under the President's budget proposal, Harris County will receive $8 million more. So what we are seeing is a loss, if we add those together of the cuts, plus the potential of $21 million, $21.9 million in loss of Federal funding.

We are having great success in our district. I have visited almost every elementary school in my district. I still have a few left that I go into, and I read, like a lot of Members of Congress do, and I see the success every day. I have an inner-city district that people say, oh, how can you have education success there? We have it every day, and it is because of the dedicated teachers and parents and administrators and people involved in the community.

Mr. Speaker, do not take that success away in the name of tax cuts, and that is what I am pleading. I think today the members of the committee will join in that.

Other educational programs hit hardest are the basic math and reading programs, efforts to promote safe and drug-free schools, and resources for State and local officials to implement higher standards in educational technology. Cuts in these vital programs will cause irreparable harm to students in our local community and as well around the country.

We will be spending $4.5 billion less in 1996, almost a 20 percent of the total Federal aid cut in 1996 than we did in 1995. At the same time, local and Statewide and Nationwide enrollment trends are up. Again, using my own district as an example, our enrollment is up in the Houston Independent School District and in the Aldine School District and the Galena Park School District. We are not seeing declining enrollment. Yet we are saying, okay, you have more students, but we are giving you less money.

The Republican budget eliminates also the Goals 2000 funding, severely undermining State and local efforts to reform elementary and secondary education. In the State of Texas alone, we would lose $29.2 million in the Goals 2000, and we have already completed our planning and begun implementation of comprehensive reforms, as provided by Goals 2000.

The Republican budget cuts Federal support for drug-free schools and community programs to the tune of $266 million, or about 60 percent, sharply reducing drug abuse and violence prevention activities serving students in 97 percent of our Nation's schools. In Texas, we would lose $18.9 million.

The House would cut funds to States ready to implement school-to-work programs by $20.6 million, or by 18 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on. I intend to as we proceed during this hour, but I would like to yield time to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], my colleague.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have come to the floor today to join my colleagues in addressing the serious issues of the Republican budget and the draconian cuts to education. The American public understands the importance of education. They understand now more than ever that we have to prepare the best educated young people for the challenges ahead. They want overwhelmingly to invest more resources, both Federal resources, local resources, in good, solid education for their youngsters and for the whole community.

Unfortunately, this budget takes exactly the opposite track. It disinvests in good, solid, well-established, innovative education programs.

Last Congress, we tried to move forward with an agenda of education reform and support that would truly represent a sound investment in the future of this country, particularly at a time when the old industrial age is yielding to the new information age.

Years ago, 20 years ago, 30 years ago, it would not be unreasonable for a young person to think that with a high school education he or she could leave that high school, find an adequate job, make a living to support a family, and, in fact, spend a whole career with those skills learned in high school. Today, every American understands that this is not the case, that today, in order to be an effective worker in almost every level of endeavor, you have to have postsecondary skills, either college or some technical training. The thrust and the consequence of this Republican budget is that those opportunities for higher education will be diminished.

We also understand, and the American people understand, that we have to have a solid basis in order to start our young people off on a solid path to educational achievement. That is why last year we spent a great deal of time on a bipartisan basis in developing the Goals 2000 program. Goals 2000 is an attempt, I think a very worthy attempt, to act as a catalyst from the Federal level for school reform at the local level, to provide the kind of resources, the directions and the standards that would be very necessary to move our elementary and secondary education system forward.

We also in the last Congress understood that in too many schools the education process is sacrificed to a climate of violence and intimidation, a climate that is too often indicated by pervasive drug use, and, as a result, we passed a Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act.

These legislative measures at the elementary and secondary level were important steps forward, but sadly, too, because of this budget, those initiatives will not receive the resources that are necessary to carry on that important work.

At the level of higher education, understanding, as the American people understand, the need for advanced skills, we sought to strengthen those existing programs, like the Pell grant and the Stafford loan program to make access to higher education something that would be available and affordable for all of our citizens. It makes sense, particularly as we move from this industrial age to the new information age which demands higher skills for everyone in our society.

Again, sadly, the thrust of this Republican budget is to undercut significantly the resources that will be available for higher education. This budget would cut student loan programs by more than $5 billion going forward for those young people that want to go on to higher education, postsecondary education.

This is going to be a tremendous burden on their lives and the lives of their families, because one of the persistent complaints, one of the persistent concerns that I hear from my constituents in Rhode Island, those working people which we all claim to represent, those working families, is that they have one or two youngsters in college and the cost of college is outrageous, and without adequate Federal assistance, they cannot send their children to the schools they want.

In some cases, they cannot send them to school at all or, in other cases, they have to make the very difficult choice of which child will be favored with a college education and which will be told, well, you have to fend for yourself in the job market without that education. That is a very, very cruel choice which I thought that we had basically prevented in the last 30 years by

providing a strong Federal commitment to higher education. But, sadly, we seem to be going back to a point in time when those cruel choices were all too common.

All of this impacts mightily in the localities, the districts and the States that we represent. In my State alone, in Rhode Island, we estimate that next year we will lose about $14 million in resources for education, and that over the next several years, the next 7 years of this budget, we will lose more than $90 million.

Where will these cuts go to? First, I mentioned the Goals 2000 program. This is really the only money for reform and restructuring of our educational system that is available in my home State. It has been eagerly embraced by the commissioner of elementary and secondary education in my State, by all of the districts.

There is an active process, an exciting process of change that is being sponsored by this program; and, sadly, we will lose about $1.4 million roughly all of the money that has been committed. This will affect as many as 71 schools who are participating directly as schools in the program. This is going to set back reform which is necessary and which every American citizen recognizes is necessary. It will set it back perhaps fatally.

In terms of student loans, the budget cuts would raise the cost of a college education by more than $2,000 for over 36,000 college students and more than $9,400 for over 5,000 graduate students in Rhode Island.

Pell grants. Changes in the Pell grant program will reduce support to students in Rhode Island by nearly $2 million. An estimated 1,600 students in 1996 alone will be denied Pell grants as a result of this cut.

Title I program, another program very important to elementary and secondary education that provides compensatory education for low-income American. Under this budget, the funds would be cut by a total of about $3.5 million, and this has a real impact, not only again in the lives of these students but in the tax rolls in local communities. Because as the city of Providence and the city of Central Falls and the city of Pawtucket copes with these cuts, they have to turn, once again, to their very, very strained tax rolls to make up the difference, if they can make it up at all.

So this is not just a problem for the beneficiaries of the program. It is a problem for the fiscal health of our cities and towns in Rhode Island.

I mentioned before the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act which was so important last Congress, which directed resources to a problem that is gnawing at the heart not only of our educational system but of our society as a whole. That, too, is going to lose funds. These budget cuts result in about a $1 million loss in these funds, which are helping to keep programs going, to show young people that drugs are not anything but the path to destruction and that we have to choose another path.

I would also mention one other program which touches upon the issue of education and opportunities so importantly, and that is the national service program. Americorps in Rhode Island is a shining example of a program that is inspired perhaps by legislation but embraced by the business community and the local community as a whole. The director of Americorps in our State, Larry Fish, is the chairman of one of our largest financial institutions. We are very lucky to have every category of Americorps activity funded in Rhode Island.

We have a City-Year program, which young people are spending a year helping out all through the community. We have programs that are helping through the Children's Crusade to mentor young people in schools to help them get through school and get on into college. A wonderful program, but, once again, even though this is supported strongly with corporate contributions and corporate leadership in Rhode Island, this program, too, is being affected mightily, basically almost zeroed out, if not entirely. It would deny 450,000 young people in Rhode Island the chance to serve.

This program is so useful, too, because it embodies in my view the ethic that we should all have as Americans: serving our country, and by that serving getting a chance to go to school and educate yourself so that you can be better prepared as a citizen, as a worker, as an American. Sadly, again this program is being jeopardized by this budget.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, when we look at this budget and we look at the reality of the world, something is sadly wrong. At a time when we have to invest in education, at a time when our economic future is at stake and education will be the key to our success as an economy, as a society, as a world power, and as a source of opportunity for all of our citizens, we are turning our back on funding education.

This is a sad mistake which I hope we can rectify in the days ahead.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island with whom I enjoy serving on our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I will just sum up what he said and what the concern a lot of us have is that balancing the budget requires tough choices, but we should not let the majority balance the budget on education.

The proposed budget cuts make only a tiny part in the size of the deficit. Yet they have a tremendous devastating impact on the future of America's children.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY]. We serve together on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities and we actually sit together and have gotten to know each other over the last 3 years serving on that committee.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I compliment the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, and the members of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities for organizing this special order tonight.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that it was just last year when I convinced this body to approve a landmark resolution, which put us on our way to making our schools the best in the world.

Yes, it is true.

Last year, the House approved my resolution which called on Congress to increase our investment in education by 1 percent a year, until the education budget accounts for 10 percent of the budget in 2002.

At the time, I said that the resolution would send a clear message to those who decide how our Federal dollars are spent. The appropriators received the message that this Congress was serious about improving education.

Well, guess what, folks? Times have changed. We have got a new majority in Congress. And, instead of going forward, we are going backward. Fast.

The new majority in the House blatantly ignored the pledge we made last year to improve our children's education, and has passed some of the most antieducation legislation this Nation has ever seen.

Just take a look at the education budget for 1996 which the House has approved.

This terrible bill cuts: Head Start, chapter one, safe and drug-free schools, school-to-work, and vocational and adult education.

In all, it cuts education by 13 percent in 1 year alone; 13 percent.

But that is nothing compared to what they want to do to our education system over the next 7 years.

The new majority's 7-year budget plan would deny Head Start to 180,000 children by 2002.

It eliminates Goals 2000, which helps schools meet higher national standards and increases parental involvement.

It kills AmeriCorps, which has provided thousands of Americans with college tuition assistance in exchange for community service.

And, it cuts in half, the President's program aimed at helping schools bring technology into the classroom.

Under their budget, my State of California alone will lose, among other things, $1 billion for the School Lunch Program, and over 181,000 Californians will be denied participation in the cost-effective direct Student Loan Program.

My friends, that is the wrong direction, and that is not the way we are supposed to be taking care of our children and their education.

You see, I believe, as do my colleagues here today, that our Nation's greatest responsibility is to provide a quality education for everybody in this country.

We believe this because education is absolutely central to solving the problems facing our Nation.

When we strengthen education, we prepare our children and workers for jobs that pay a livable wage; we get people off welfare and prevent people from having to go on welfare in the first place; we actually prevent crime and violence in our communities; and, we increase respect for our health, respect for our environment, and respect for each other.

That is why, for the life of me, I cannot understand why the new majority is cutting and gutting our education system.

You see, we can balance the budget, but it does not have to be on the backs of our children and their education.

It is time to stop this assault of education.

It is time to pass a budget that invests in education, and reduces the deficit by cutting wasteful military and Government spending; closing tax loopholes; and ending corporate welfare.

It is time to make our Nation's No. 1 special interest our children, and not the fat cats and lobbyists in Washington.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). The gentlewoman is recognized for 39 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the time being yielded to me and I appreciate the ranking member of our Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities taking the time to schedule this special order.

Mr. Speaker, the discussions that the House and the Senate have been having recently with regard to the reconciliation budget is a 7-year plan to bring the Government eventually to a balanced budget, or a zero deficit in 7 years. In discussing the budget reconciliation proposal, which is a 7-year plan, there are so many larger issues, such as the $270 billion reduction in Medicare, $162 billion cuts in Medicaid, and other programs of that enormity.

In the course of the debate in the budget reconciliation measure last week, we did not hear much about the impacts on education, and so I appreciate the time that is being allotted this evening to discuss the impacts on education, because in my estimation it is probably the most far-reaching and devastating of all the cuts that we are making.

I know that the majority feels very strongly about reallocating the functions of Government, to the idea specifically of returning many of the functions that have been assumed by the Federal Government, many of the priorities that have been expressed by the Federal Government over the last 20 or 30 years, and trying to reassemble them and make them State priorities, under the assumption that the States know best how to govern their constituents and are more directly responsible one to the other.

While that is an excellent political philosophy, it seems wholly inappropriate in the field of education because education, after all, is really tooling one generation to the next generation for leadership, for the ability to assume responsibility, to maintain our quality of life, our ability to compete in the world market, and to discover those things that make our economy and our business and so forth much more competitive.

So in the educational system rests the future of this country, not just individually, for the sake of the child or the family or their prosperity, but truly the whole nature of our society and the success of our country lies in our ability to educate our children well. We know that in recent years, compared to other countries, we have been falling by the wayside.

I look at such things as national security as being, indeed, important. But what is more important than the national domestic security of our citizens through adequate education? That is what the forfeiture of funding in education means to me and why I feel that this is a very, very dangerous decision.

If all States were equal in their ability to educate and to provide quality education to their children and adults that need training and education, then perhaps our concerns can be mitigated somewhat by the idea that the States have the capacity and the will to perform in accordance to the national expectations. But we all know that our States are very widely differing in their ability to fulfill this function. One cannot, as a Nation, exercise the luxury of happenstance in terms of the States' abilities to perform. Therefore, the presence of the Federal Government in this important field of education seems to me the most important responsibility that we have to our country and to our future.

So when we see this reconciliation, 7-year balanced budget plan calling for cuts amounting to $45 billion over the next 7 years, it troubles me deeply that we are sacrificing the future capacity of our children and our adults who are being trained under these programs to meet the challenges of the future. I think that this is a mistaken notion of reversion to State responsibilities.

Even within a State, one can recognize that there are differences in capacities of local communities to assume their responsibilities, and we hear States having to come up with ways in which they can balance out their support for education by giving certain localities additional funds with which to function, because the basis for funding education is the local real property tax, and we know that the values of property differ even within one State. Of course, they differ widely all across the country.

If we are going to put the future of our country in terms of our ability to compete with the rest of the world on this notion of equity distributed by real property taxes, that seems to me wildly off the mark. Therefore, the idea of the Federal interest in supporting educational opportunities in our 50 States is so important.

To see programs like title I, for instance, being cut back, even this 1 year, fiscal year 1996, we are apt to lose almost $2 billion if we follow the rate of reductions between the House and the Senate versions. These bills are still in conference and the final figures have not been reconciled.

We have a moment in our legislative discussions to rise to the occasion, and to call attention to the House and the Senate and to the conference committees about this dangerous course that we are embarked upon.

Title I, as we know, is a program that allocates funds to our local school districts that have high concentrations of poor people, youngsters that are educationally disadvantaged through economic circumstances or because of other disadvantages that may surround them in their environment and in their community.

Why is it important that the Federal Government support these communities with large concentrations of disadvantaged children? Well, because if we do not, then we will have large blocks of our children in various places throughout the country ill-educated and ill-equipped to perform in this highly technological society. If they are ill-equipped to compete and they are not properly prepared, they will constantly be a cost factor not only for the local communities but also for the Federal Government, so it is important that we target this money in these special communities.

So one would have thought, of all the programs in education, that this would be the last place that there would be any significant cuts. Yet we see nearly a billion, probably a $2 billion reduction in just 1 year of that program.

For my State, just by State, we only have two Members in the House of Representatives, so that illustrates comparatively the size of my State. Even my State is going to suffer somewhere between a $1.7 million loss as in the Senate version and a $3 million loss if it followed the House version.

That is a very big cut for my State to have to endure in a very, very important program which has been successful. One only has to look at the reports that have been written. The criticisms are not from the funding, the criticisms are because it has not been adequately targeted. The maximum bang for the buck has not been achieved because the requirements of the Federal Government have not been as stringent as they should have been.

□ 1515

But nowhere in these reports and critiques is there a suggestion that the Federal Government funding ought not to go. It still is considered a very, very important program.

Addressing the whole subject of quality education and meeting the expectations of the Nation in terms of what education ought to mean to our society, it was important that the Governors convened some years ago a task force on trying to find ways in which the States could direct their resources and come up with a higher quality of education. So they set this Goals 2000 concept. It was brought to the Congress by President Bush, and now implemented by President Clinton, and yet we find that this is one of the programs that the House has chosen to zero out, and that is a shame because one looks to the Federal Government, it seems to me, for leadership. And here we are taking up the recommendations of the Governors' conference and doing precisely what the Governors conference has suggested, putting the Governors themselves really on the governing board of this group called Goals 2000, and yet the House of Representatives majority party has seen fit to zero out this function. It seems to me this is an absolutely appropriate area for the Federal Government to be involved in.

The next one is also equally disturbing, the safe and drug-free schools. The letters that I receive, the critique that has come to my attention from all over the country because I am a member of this committee, suggest that this program is working very, very well. For a small amount of money that the schools receive, they have been able to do a monumental job of trying to instill in our young people the dangers of drug addiction and drug use and how simple it is to develop an attitude and a philosophy of simply rejecting this intervention in your life. So to see this program cut back so drastically, the fiscal year 1995 allocation was $466 million. The House allocated only a $200-million figure, and in the budget resolution which came up and which we approved, it zeroed it out, and I think that that is a serious mistake.

So as we look at this whole thing, we see any number of areas which are truly regrettable. Vocational education, as my colleague from California mentioned, an area which is so vital in this dynamically changing technological environment, we need to have vocational programs that constantly train and retrain our workers and adapt them to changing circumstances; the vocational education ought to be retained at its high level of Federal participation.

When we look at education, what do people usually say? The teacher is the central focus of the success of the school or the child or the programs, and so we rest our case upon the quality of teachers, the quality of our educational system, the ways in which our teachers are better equipped to handle their classes, and yet here again we find that the programs have been cut back very drastically.

The President, in the fiscal year 1996 budget, asked for $735 million for the Eisenhower professional development program. The House only allocated $500 million. So that is a terrible cut, one that I know will be felt throughout the system.

There is a lot more to be said about the impacts of these cuts, but I notice that my colleague from New York is here, and I would invite him to make his comments at this point, and I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. I thank my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

You know, I certainly agree with everything that she said, and what is really just so shocking about this is that only a year ago it would have been unthinkable to have these kinds of draconian cuts to education.

If you asked the American people how can we best fulfill the future promise of America, they certainly would say that we need to invest in our children's future, that we need to invest in education, that we need to invest in programs for the future, and while we may have some disagreements in Congress over which programs are important and which programs are more important than others, I do not think that there should be any question that we should be increasing funding for our children's future or our Nation's future for education.

If this appropriations bill is enacted, the education cut would be the largest setback to education in United States history. Education would be cut under the Republican plan by 17 percent, while defense spending is increased by 5 percent, and yet we are still giving the $270-billion tax break for the rich.

I do not see where the priorities are straight when we are cutting education. Now, this House, 1996 Labor, HHS, Education bill, in my opinion, many, many of these appropriations bills are horrendous, and to me this is the most horrendous of all the bills. We are cutting education funding by $4 billion. The budget reconciliation package cuts student aid by $5 billion over 7 years. My State of New York will lose $319 million next year and $2.5 billion over the next 7 years.

Major cuts in education are certainly unwise, and unwise as an economic policy as well, and this legislation, amongst all the terrible things it does, as my colleague from Hawaii points out, this legislation eliminates $1 billion from Medicaid funds from more than 1 million children with disabilities. New York City will lose $85 million of that money, and the legislation denies Head Start to 180,000 children in the year 2002 as compared to 1995.

Just last year we were fully funding Head Start, and in a bipartisan approach we were all patting each other on the back to say Head Start is really a program that works. Everyone agreed, and here we are cutting it.

My colleague from Hawaii mentioned we eliminate Goals 2000, the Eisenhower professional development program, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. What could be more important than a program to ensure that we have safe and drug-free schools? Certainly those of us in urban areas know that we have a problem in our schools, and we should be trying to eradicate the drug problem, not cutting back funds to try to eradicate it.

The legislation cuts bilingual education, vocational education, $9.5 million in New York State in vocational education, and title I. Title I, in my district, is very, very important because there are a lot of children with low income and the schools rely on title I funding.

We have a 17 percent cut of $1.1 billion in 1996 in title I funding. Title I funding was put there so that schools that were in poorer areas could get the enrichment, the children in those schools could get the enrichment they deserve. What we are doing is we say we do not really give a darn about the poor and we are just going to cut those funds.

I think in the long run I could go on and on about the things, the terrible things that this bill does, but it is just basically, I think, the wrong approach.

There is fat in the Federal budget. We need to downsize the Federal Government. We need to cut out fat. We need to put programs that work ahead and fund programs that work, and we need to change programs that do not work. But we do not need cuts to education. We do not need the orientation of mortgaging the future of our country by saying that we are not going to continue to expand.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I just wonder how you define the word "cut." How would you define the word "cut"?

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just say to my colleague, we have had this discussion

not only in this bill but in Medicaid and Medicare, and you can play with numbers, you can say, well, we are really giving it a small increase or we are cutting back on what we were going to have. To me, the bottom line is this, because we can all play with numbers and can all show statistics, the bottom line is what kind of programs do we have now in 1995–1996, if I just might answer your question, and what are we going to have under this bill in the year 2002?

Mr. HOKE. You are using specific language, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL]. You are using the word "cut." If you are going to use the word "cut," it seems to me it is very confusing to the public. When a family says they are going to cut their spending for the next year, they are spending $2,000 a month now, next year they are going to spend $1,850 a month, that is a cut. Is it not true in every single one of these education appropriations we are talking about, the spending goes up from 1996 to 1995?

Mr. ENGEL. No. That is not true.

Mr. HOKE. I will grant you it might not be true in absolutely every case. Certainly, overall the appropriations bill for education is substantially more in 1996 than it is in 1995 and substantially more in 1997 than in 1996, more in 1998 than in 1997. It goes up every single year.

If you want to say we are reducing the rate of increase, if you want to say that we are not spending as much as CBO has said we would be spending a year ago, you are absolutely right. But to suggest we are cutting spending and spending less this year in this education appropriation than we were last year is absolutely wrong.

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just answer the gentleman again. Let me say the bottom line is that we know how much funding we need to keep American education looking forward, to increasing the funding for education that we know our children are going to need so that this Nation is going to have a future, and what I see here when I look at this bill, I look at the Republican plan, is that in each and every aspect that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GENE GREEN] and I have mentioned, we are not going to be able to provide the kinds of services that we set as a priority in the last Congress on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. HOKE. You are absolutely right, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just answer you. When we are going to deny Head Start to 180,000 children in the year 2002, to me, anyway you play with numbers, that is a cut. If we are going to say that children who have disabilities are not going to be able to get the funding, that is a cut. If we are going to eliminate or sharply curtail the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program, that is a cut, and we can point to several more instances whereby it is a hard cut, and even if it is not a cut, it is a cut in the services that we will be able to provide for our children because of inflation and because of what we have learned and where we know we have to provide the funds. There is no denying that. There will be a cut in education services to millions of American children, and I personally cannot see that at a time when we are increasing defense spending, giving a huge tax break to the rich. I cannot see us sacrificing education funding for our children.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Reclaiming my time at this point, I still have others to yield to. But let me say that on all of the items that I mentioned, there is a cut in funding for fiscal year 1996 based upon fiscal year 1995.

I am not talking about reductions in anticipated funding. But I want to make sure that everyone understands that in fiscal year 1995, title I was funded at $6.7 billion. The House-passed bill provides for only $5.5 billion. If that is not a cut, I cannot understand what a cut is.

Goals 2000, we had $361 million. The House-passed bill has zero funding. That is obviously a cut.

Safe and drug-free schools in fiscal year 1995 was funded at $466 million. The House-passed bill was funded at $200 million. That is a cut, no matter how you look at it.

Bilingual education, we were funded in fiscal year 1995 at $157 million. The House-passed bill for fiscal year 1996 provides only a $53 million. That is a cut.

Vocational education in fiscal year 1995 was $1.1 billion. The House-passed bill provides $903 million. That is a cut.

The Eisenhower professional development was funded at $598 million for fiscal year 1995. In fiscal year 1996 the House provided $500 million.

So all of the programs that have been mentioned here in the special orders, there are clear cuts in the appropriation bills that have cleared this House. Obviously, they are still pending in the Senate.

The point of this special order is to call attention to these cuts, over $4 billion in total as against fiscal year 1995 spending, and it is not the idea of what more is coming in the future, 7 years. It is what is being done now to the educational support by the Federal Government in all of these important areas.

□ 1530

I am glad my colleague has raised this point, because it gave me the opportunity to clearly point out that we are talking about cuts in current funding.

I am very happy to yield to my colleague from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman from Hawaii yielding, and I particularly appreciate the pointed focus of her presentation relating to education. I was in a meeting and then at my office, and I heard the discussion ongoing, and am sorry that the gentleman has offered to not continue to wait on some time to have this discussion, because you were clearly responding to what I think has been misrepresentations about the direction that our Republican colleagues are taking us, and also their arguments there have not been cuts.

I met with a group of educators in the North Forest Independent School District, which is a school district that has brought itself out of both near bankruptcy, but as well out of the doldrums of poor test scores in and around the city of Houston. Clearly the programs that have been drastically cut are the very programs that these educators have utilized to assist their children in excelling. We already know we can tell our children that they can succeed, but these have been bridges that have helped them.

The Goals 2000 programs are particularly unique when it relates to inner city and rural school children, where they do not have the necessary resources. It is well documented that Head Start provides that extra step, if you will, for many of our children who do not have the privileges of preschool education that is paid for by the private sector because of the economic development level of their parents.

The schools also have had a margin of victory with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. I do not know why anyone would call that a waste of money. And the $4 billion cuts overall clearly tell our educators as well as our children that the successes that they have had are not valuable.

The Budget Reconciliation Act that cuts these proposals is misdirected. Vocational education, the school-to-work programs that have been so successful for some of our youngsters who are not directly interested and or prepared for a liberal arts college education.

I heard earlier the Democrats were being accused of supporting a myriad of job training programs; we do not know which ones we want. I might tell my colleague, the gentleman who was on the floor previously, that we have already consolidated job programs. We have already done an inventory of the effective ones and the noneffective ones, and we can be assured that we have programs that have proven to be successful.

The gentlewoman has been a stalwart spokesperson for real welfare reform. How do you reform welfare if you do not give that dependent mother or father an opportunity for job training and for work?

So when we begin to talk about cutting, I am wondering whether my Republican colleagues understand the

word "investment," because when you invest in job taining, education, then you prepare yourselves for the diminishing of welfare rolls, you prepare yourself for people to be tuned into the work force of the 21st century, you prepare yourself for work.

Mr. Speaker, I would compliment the gentlewoman, and I would thank her for allowing me to bring this to a point of acknowledging the drastic and devastating impact that this will have in my local community.

I close simply by saying part of the cuts that have come about in the education cuts and the job training cuts comes I think as one of the most telling and also the most destructive cuts, because of the negative discussion around it, and that was summer youth jobs that many of us have seen work, because they are partnerships between the public and private sector.

I was on the floor earlier talking about that, because it hurts so much to tell a youngster it is only a baby-sitting job, you were not learning anything from being exposed at an energy company or in a local government office or in the parks department or somewhere else where you have seen that work counts and work is important.

I think and hope that in this budget reconciliation process, even as short as it is, that we give life to the idea that we can balance the budget in a better way, less mean spirited, but we can invest in our people so that we will not have this occurrence as we move into the 21st century.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for her contribution. It is very important that we have this kind of focus on the significance of the cuts in education.

I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her taking this time on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I join this debate to point out some impacts that are now starting to be felt in the State of California, and that is with our superintendent of public instruction. Delaine Easton has written to our delegation explaining her very deep concern with the cuts in the education budget, both those which are in the Health and Human Services appropriations bill and the budget cuts.

California stands to lose some $260 million under the budget now being considered in the conference discussions with the administration. In her words, this is catastrophic for our State. Our State, which has the obligation to educate a very diverse school population that is beset with the whole series of problems that confront many of our large States, are simply not going to be able to do that job in an adequate fashion. When I say in an adequate fashion, I am simply talking about people having the ability to perform at grade level in the basics of education, in reading and writing and mathematics and critical thinking skills.

The growing evidence is that a growing number of students across our State and across this country are simply not becoming proficient in those very basic skills, those skills which are necessary if these students are going to be able to take their place in the American economy and if they are going to be able to adapt to the changing economy once they have their place in the job market.

We see evidence of this now in the State college system. In the State of California, some 60 percent of the entrants in the State college system are in need of remedial education. The frightening part is this is from I believe the top 30 percent of the students who graduate from high school in our State. So now we find ourselves spending money on some of the highest paid professors to deal with remedial education problems that should have been dealt with quite properly at the 4th and 5th and 6th grade of education. But as our superintendent of public instruction tells us, the likelihood of that now happening with these budget cuts is placed in jeopardy.

That is not to suggest that this is a problem of money alone, because it is not. But it is also to strongly suggest, as she does in her communications to the members of our delegation, that the corrective actions necessary in terms of school reform, in terms of accountability, in terms of teacher proficiency, in terms of reducing the administrative bureaucracy, are all placed in jeopardy by these budget cuts. They make all of the tasks of our educational system in California far more difficult.

This does not even begin to speak to the problem of the capital assets of our elementary and secondary education systems in the State of California, where we now find our children, the children that we keep claiming are so important to the future of this country, that we believe are the most important asset of the future of this country, we are now sending them to schools that are dilapidated, that are run down, that are not capable of being properly wired for new technologies, for computer access for these students, where students are constantly confronted with water coming through the ceiling.

That is a whole other issue. But as the State struggles with that, if it loses this kind of program money, if it loses this kind of assistance that generates additional assistance at the State level and at the local level to provide for extra reading help and mathematics tutoring, computer equipment, special training for teachers, all of which every independent report in assessing the American education system and the California education system, done by the California Roundtable, done by our business community, to look at this educational system, none of them have suggested that resources to that system should be reduced. They have all suggested that resources going to that system should be reorganized and should be used more efficiently. But the monies that you gain from the efficient use of that reorganization should be plowed back into that system so that we can better educate a larger number of the children.

Those are not the conclusions that I have reached. Those are not the conclusions that the California Teachers Association has reached or the school principals have reached. Those are the conclusions of independent blue ribbon commissions, dominated in many instances by the business community, who have looked at these systems, have looked at these institutions and said we have a major problem simply in the sufficiency of the resources available to these institutions.

So when we see budgets that are passed by the House of Representatives that are talking about a 17-percent reduction over 7 years in these budgets, we are talking about a trickle down of a critical problem for local education.

Interestingly enough, we find that people in my home community of Martinez and many other communities that I represent in my congressional district, they are voting to try to raise what resources they can in the community to improve school facilities, to try to provide technological improvements to the education system. But at the same time they are making this effort, that they are voting with their pocketbook, what they see is a reduction in resources from the Federal Government. It is not only unwise, but I think it flies in the face of what parents have said they want for their children. I think we have an obligation to take these programs that have been highly successful and make sure that they in fact are delivered to the students of our State and of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank again the gentlewoman for taking this time, and I just want to say that I think superintendent Delaine Easton makes a very forceful case to the Members of the delegation to give very, very strict scrutiny to the cuts that have been made in the education budget and to understanding the impacts as they drift down to the local district level in the State of California.

We have a huge obligation and responsibility to our students to make them world class graduates, and to be proficient at a world class level in the basics of education and in critical thinking. All of the evidence suggests

we will not meet that responsibility and obligation to our students with the educational budget and the trendlines that are put in place by the budget adopted by the House and the Senate.

I would hope that the President would reject it. Should we eventually get to the Health and Human Services appropriations bill, I would hope that Members of Congress would vote against that, I would hope that the President would veto it, and I would hope that we sustain his veto so we can negotiate decent levels of education funding for our children and for our families who have such high aspirations and hopes and desires for their children's education and for their ability to provide for their economic wherewithal in the American economic system.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution in this debate. I concur with the gentleman absolutely that if the conference bill in this area comes back anywhere near what I have just described, the only thing that is left for us to do is to defeat that bill and hope that the Congress concurs with our opinion. If not, if it should pass, I certainly hope that the President will veto it, and the House will surely sustain that veto.

This is an area of critical importance. I cannot emphasize our feelings about this in any stronger terms. I believe fervently that we represent the majority of people in this country that are committed to the Federal participation in education. If we could have a referendum, I am sure that our point of view would be more than supported. I hope that point of view will be recognized by the Members who are conferees on the conference committee, and that we will have an opportunity to restore this funding.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the proposed cuts in education.

I have listened to Member after Member come to the well and say time after time that we must protect the future of the children of tomorrow and their children.

In reality, Members on the other side of the aisle are jeopardizing our children's future.

How can you guarantee the future if you don't take care of the children of today?

The new majority is cutting education so it can give tax breaks to the rich and spend more on defense.

If the Members on the other side of the aisle were really serious about balancing the budget to ensure the prosperity of future generations, they would do it responsibly.

They would not slash the programs that help the young, the old, the poor, and the middle class.

If they truly wanted to help our kids succeed, they would make an investment in education, not eliminate the support that schools depend upon.

In fiscal year 1995, California received $2.5 billion from the Federal Government for education.

Under legislation crafted by the new House majority, California would lose $392 million in fiscal year 1996, and stands to lose a total of $2.59 billion over 7 years.

In fiscal year 1996, there would be $42.4 million less for Pell grants for college, $42.1 million less for local school reform, $122.3 million less for services for disadvantaged children, $26.4 million less for safe and drug-free schools, $18.4 million less for vocational education, and $5 million less for teacher training.

Come on now, who's taking care of whom.

The new majority is taking care of the rich and ignoring the children of today.

If they're worrying about the children of tomorrow then they would take care of the children of today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the special order just presented.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1545

THE IMPORTANCE OF A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we are going to talk this afternoon about the budget, about some of the things we have just heard regarding that, about what the importance is of a balanced budget, and I want to recognize a great fighter pilot, former, a great American, great Member of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and a Californian as well, because I know that he has some important things to say about education, and education particularly in California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no such thing as a former fighter pilot.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And I still am flying fighters, so there is no such thing as a former fighter pilot.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on some of the things my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said. I agree with one thing they said, there are some very, very good schools out there. I have some of the finest schools in Torrey Pines and San Dieguito, all up and down in my particular area. They would compete with any school in the Nation. But across the board our schools are not.

We pour billions of dollars into that but, Mr. Speaker, less than 12 percent of our classrooms have even a single phone jack for fiber optics or computers or software or the programs we need to put in there.

What my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are really talking about is power. Washington-based power in education. When they say we are cutting Goals 2000, the Federal power of Goals 2000 has been cut to zero. Absolutely correct. But we send the money, block grant it to the States, and the Governors have told us that they can run those programs more efficiently than letting the Government talk about it with their rules and regulations.

We only control about 7 percent of the funding for our schools in this Nation out of the Federal Government. Seven percent. But with that 7 percent comes over 50 percent of the regulations and 75 percent of the paperwork to the States. We are eliminating that, Mr. Speaker, and we are giving that power to the State.

If the State wants to run a Goals 2000 without all the bureaucrats in Washington, without having to file all the reports, without having to go through all the paperwork, they can do it, and they have the funds to do it and it is much more efficient. To say we cut Goals 2000 is not a fact. It is there. It is at the State level.

Second, let us look at the perspective of California. We have less than 12 percent of our classrooms across the Nation, as I mentioned, that have a single phone jack. Seven percent of education, again, comes out of the Federal Government. We get less than 25 cents on the dollar back down into the classroom because of all the bureaucracy. What we are doing is eliminating that bureaucracy and absolutely on the Federal level we are cutting it and taking that power out of Washington and the Democrats' ability to spend money so that they can get reelected, so that they can have the power, and we are giving it back to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I think there would be a legitimate complaint if the Republicans were taking that power and shifting it over to themselves, but they are not. They are shifting it back to the people where Government is closer to the people and more effective. But we hear time and time again from the other side of the aisle that the States do not know how to manage their own problems, only the liberals here in the Congress know best for what is good for the individual States. We will hear it over and over again, but we feel differently, Mr. Speaker.

I look at the State of California, and look at how they have destroyed education. One example. The liberals voted to cut defense $177 billion. California is one of the leaders in defense. We have

lost a million jobs with base closures and defense cuts. Ninety-three percent of education is paid for out of the tax dollars of the State. That is a million people. Say that half of them got jobs, probably not as good as they were in the defense industry, but take that out of the budget in Sacramento. How many jobs have we lost?

Let us take just one governmental regulation, meant with good intentions but ruled by extremists. The Endangered Species Act, and how it applies to education. How many jobs have we lost to the gnatcatcher in California? Construction jobs. How many jobs to the spotted owl, where we could not even go in and cut timber that the beetles had destroyed, that are totally dead trees, just to keep the industry surviving? How many jobs in California have we lost in the tuna industry because of the porpoise? How many jobs have we lost in the Central Valley Water Project, that the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] supported, with the farmers, or the salmon with the farmers? And over and over again they have cut jobs.

Now, let us take illegal immigration, Mr. Speaker. We spend $1.2 million a day on the school meals programs for illegals, because there is 800,000 K through 12 illegals in the California State system, Mr. Speaker. Let us take half of that so they cannot dispute the numbers. That is $1.2 million a day at $1.90 a meal. And let us not even take the three meals, let us just take two meals, 185-percent below the meals program. That is $1.2 million a day out of education.

It takes $4,750 to educate a child K through 12 per year, Mr. Speaker. That is $2 billion a year out of the education system, but yet we cannot get help from the other side of the aisle on immigration reform.

I look at the other things that cost us. We have 18,000 illegals in our prison system. When they talk about cuts, we are cutting the Federal bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker. We are sending that money and the extra money down to the States. The rest of the education funding that was taken out of the Federal Government, do my colleagues know what we put it in, in the committee, some of it against my wishes? We put it in NIH for medical research, which we also feel is a national level interest.

I thank my good friend for letting me have 5 minutes here but I wanted to set the record straight.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for just a second.

Mr. HOKE. Sure, go right ahead.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]. I wanted to join with the gentleman for just a minute, because I, too, serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather amazing that Mr. CUNNINGHAM and I serve on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and then we have the gentleman from California, Mr. MILLER, and the gentlewoman from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK, on the other side of the aisle, and we go to the same meetings and we do not seem to hear the same things at all. Basically, my recommendation is that if education is our friend's top priority, running for State Senate might be a thought, because education is the priority of the State.

The State, the folks at home, the parents, the teachers at home should run education, yet we send 10 percent of the money from the Federal Government to our States and we insist on making all the rules. Well, we are, indeed, trying to cut back our costs. We are trying to balance our budget. If students want to be unhappy, I think they should be very unhappy that we only reduced the cost in education by $4 billion. Our committee started out trying to reduce it by $10 billion over 7 years. We ended up, after the Senate, only reducing it $4 billion. This had nothing to do with the students or harming the students or harming education, this was simply a mechanism.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time for a minute, because we have been talking about—and I thank the gentleman from California for his comments very much. DUKE, thank you.

Excuse me, Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I was admonished by the Speaker once that we should not be using first names. But we had all this talk about education——

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You can call me DUKE and I will call you MARTIN.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, we have had all this talk about education, and it seems to me that there are an awful lot of people in this Congress who could use an education about the use of the word cut. The fact is that there really is an opportunity to debate the priorities that are important to this country in this Congress and that there may be a whole bunch of different views regarding that, but we should agree on the ability to use language and that certainly requires a little bit of education.

I have here from the Webster Merriam dictionary the definition of the word "cut." The first one is to reduce in amount. That is the most wisely used definition of the word "cut." It means to be less, to reduce in amount, to be less in the next year than it was in the current year.

In fact, let me ask my colleagues a question, if I may. Are we cutting, using this definition of the word cut? Are we cutting the amount of money that is being allocated to education in this budget?

Mr. NORWOOD. No, we are increasing the spending. If the gentleman will yield, we are increasing the spending in education considerably.

What they are talking about is this imaginary made-up number that is placed out there 7 years from now that nobody knows what is. We are in fact, going to balance our budget by spending less than they project, but we are increasing the spending from 1995 considerably.

Mr. HOKE. Less than was predicted by whom? By Federal bureaucrats at the CBO or OMB, by people who are hired at a staff level to make these things, but not certainly by Members of Congress. Projections that were not made, and amounts that are projected off of baselines that do not exist except in somebody's imagination or in somebody's mental calculations.

The fact is that, and I want to get into this later, because I want to really explore this in detail, because it seems to me it is impossible, Mr. Speaker, for us to have the kind of debate that the American people deserve, that they should have so that they can genuinely ferret out, make decisions for themselves about what is going on here, what is being increased, what is not being increased, what is being cut, if anything, because there are some things being cut, although one would never know it from the kind of rhetoric we hear on the floor. But as long as we abuse language the way that language is abused all the time on this floor, it is going to be very difficult for the American people to get the information that they need in order to make decisions about their representives and who they ought to have representing them.

Mr. Speaker, I think that at the bottom of all of this, more so than anything else, more so than anything else in this Congress, I believe that we need to define our terms so that we are all speaking the same English language, so that we are all on the same page and we are not going to be arguing about how we define words. I will get into that more in detail.

I want to yield a couple of minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], who has asked me for some time, and I see the gentleman has a bag with him.

Mr. WELLER. I do have a plastic bag, which I will point to in just a few seconds.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my friend from Ohio, Mr. HOKE, for bringing this issue to the attention of the House. I think it is extremely important when we talk about some of the changes that need to be made here in Washington. I am one of the freshmen, one of the new guys, and I heard time and time again from the voters of my district, which is the south suburbs and part of the city of Chicago and a lot of farm towns, about how we need to change how Washington works and how we need to send representatives to

the Congress who are going to vote for change.

I have with me something I carry, just like my other colleagues do, and that is our voting card. This piece of plastic that has a little computer chip in it, –I believe. We walk into the House chamber when it is time to cast a vote, slide it in that box and push a red or green button if we are going to vote yes or no. The most important and significant thing about this card is that for the last 26 years Members of the House of Representatives have used this card just like a credit care. In fact, I labeled this voting card the world's most expensive credit card, because for the last 26 years, in fact, since Neil Armstrong walked on the Moon, Members of Congress have used this card, their voting card, to run up a $4.9 trillion national debt.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we think about our own families and our own households, we all know the pain that everyone feels if someone in the family uses a credit card and runs up a huge debt. It is tough to pay that off. Today we have a $4.9 trillion national debt. That is four times our operating budget for the Federal Government.

This bag that the gentleman alluded to that I brought with me has $19,000 in play money in it. The reason that $19,000 is so significant is because every person's share of the national debt today is $19,000. So every man, woman, and child in the State of Illinois, my home State, the land of Lincoln, if we were to pay off the national debt today would have to write a check for $19,000. The interest alone on that debt is $430 a month for a family of four. That is more than the average car payment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we worked to address the fiscal problems of our Nation. For 26 years this country has operated on deficit spending, running up a huge, huge national debt. Now it is time to balance the budget, and there is a lot of benefits for my State, as well as Ohio, and Kansas, and Georgia, and this great country we all live in. We have made a little progress in the last couple of weeks. In fact, even Bill Clinton says now he wants to balance the budget. The President's agreed with the Congress that we can do it and do it in a responsible way over a period of 7 years.

Now, we are still waiting to hear from the President regarding his specific plan on how he would do it and what the fine print is. In fact, we are also still waiting for the Democratic leadership to see their plan to balance the budget over 7 years.

□ 1600

Conservative Democrats and the moderate Democrats, like Republicans, believe that we can balance the budget over 7 years. They have offered a plan and I give them credit for that.

The Republican plan, our plan, does a lot of good things. We balance the budget over 7 years and reform welfare by emphasizing work and family and responsibility. We save our Medicare system from bankruptcy. In fact, we are increasing funding for Medicare by 50 percent over the next 7 years and we are also providing tax relief to working families.

The President says he does not like our plan that saves Medicare and provide tax relief for working families, but has failed to show leadership, I believe, by offering his alternative.

In the early 1980's there was a fast food ad where that one gal said, "Where's the beef?" I think it is time to say, "Mr. President, where's the beef? Where's the beef? Where's your specific plan?"

It is time to stop governing with opinion polls and press releases. We need to actually see specific plans. If we think about it, what are the real benefits for my State if we balance the budget? Our balanced budget plan will increase student loans, the volume of student loans, by 50 percent. Medicaid funding, which is health care for the poor, will go up 55 percent over the next 7 years. School lunch funding will increase more than the President asked for. Medicare spending for the average Illinoisan will go from $4,800 to $7,100 per senior citizen in Illinois over the next 7 years, even while we are balancing the budget.

Those are real benefits, if we think how much money we spend shows compassion. But also there are some real benefits to working families and that is by eliminating the deficit, the dividend is a reduction in interest rates. The Federal Reserve, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve has said if we balance the budget and are no longer borrowing money to finance deficit spending, interest rates will go down. For the average family of four, they will save $2,800 a year on a home mortgage. On a car loan, they would save over a thousand dollars a year in interest costs for lower interest rates. And for students going to college, at the end of that 4 years, an undergraduate student would save about $1,900 on their student loan. Mr. Speaker, those are real savings.

USA Today highlighted the fact that overwhelmingly almost every American would directly benefit from lower interest rates. We have a commitment from the President to balance the budget over 7 years. We know the benefits of doing that. We in the Congress have put a plan on the table for the last several weeks which offers specific proposals which will balance the budget over 7 years. I think it is time for the President to show leadership.

That is why I am so disappointed he is going to leave the country for 6 days. Before he leaves, I think he should show us his plan on the table which balances the budget and shows us how he is going to do it over 7 years, and then we can work out the differences and come up with a bipartisan plan.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] for the time and commend the gentleman for his leadership in making sure that the American people know that the bottom line is we are going to provide a better economic future for our children, free of debt. We have to balance the budget.

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER] for his comments and for bringing these things to our attention.

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

Mr. HOKE. I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana for a moment, and then I am going to open up a free-for-all debate.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], who is the chairman of our Theme Team here, for bringing to the attention of the body some very important facts.

The earned income tax credit, our Democrat colleagues have been saying that we are going to cut that. The fact is, and the American people need to know this, we are increasing it by almost $6 billion over the 7-year period.

The school lunch program, which they said we are going to cut, in fact is going to be increased by almost $2 billion over the 7-year period. Student loans are going to be increased by $12 billion, not a cut like they have said.

Medicaid is going to go up by almost $40 billion over the 7 years, which is contrary to what the Democrat leadership has been telling us. Medicare is going up by over $110 billion over the 7-year period and they have been trying to scare the American seniors to death by saying that we are going to have Medicare cuts.

I appreciate the gentleman for pointing this out. The American people need to know we are increasing all of these things; we are just slowing the rate of growth, and that is going to be good for the country.

Mr. HOKE. Reclaiming my time, I want to take 5 or so minutes, and then I see that my good friend from Kansas is here. But I have to say, and I thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for bringing these things to the attention of the Speaker, because for me it is so exasperating that we hear the abusive language day after day after day after day on the floor. I can only believe that this is an attempt to obscure the real issues, to confuse the American people, and to make it impossible to really define what the differences are in the debate.

The reality is there are differences in the debate. We really do want to zero out Goals 2000. We want to zero it out because we do not think that the Federal Government ought to be involved and we have a real problem with the

kinds of mandates that are being placed on local school systems. But it does not have to do with money in the sense that it is being portrayed on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, I put together here, just for the edification of the Speaker, a graph that shows, and maybe we can see this on television, it shows the total Federal spending from 1995 to the year 2002. We can see we have $1.53 trillion in 1995. This is according to the Republican budget plan that we have passed in the House, that we have passed in the Senate, and that we have passed in conference. This is the plan that is now, but for the President's signature, and remember the President has promised that he is going to sign into law before December 31, 1995, he is going to sign into law a budget that will be in balance by the year 2002. But this is what we have done.

We have passed this with every degree of detail that is necessary. We are going from $1.53 trillion in 1995 to $1.875 trillion in the year 2002. Obviously, not a cut if the definition of "cut" is to reduce in amount. Not a cut.

It goes up from $1.5 trillion to $1.875 trillion, a tremendous increase. I want to go over some of the specific areas, just as the gentleman from Indiana did. We increased spending in education; we increase spending on school lunches; we increase spending on student loans; we increase spending on Medicaid and Medicare.

We have genuine differences of opinion about how we ought to do that and what we ought to be doing. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when the American people listen to this and they constantly hear this scare tactic and abusive language that would have them believe that we are cutting when we are, in fact, increasing spending, that it makes it difficult, if not impossible to make the kinds of considered, thoughtful decisions about what their representatives are saying, what their representatives believe, in order to really know about what the future of our country ought to be and who they ought to have representing them. I think that this is right at the bottom, right at the foundation of the problem that we face in this Congress.

Let me talk a little bit about some of the benefits that will come from this, and then the reason I wanted to have the opportunity speak on my own for just a few minutes was that it seems to me that there is one benefit that is really rarely talked about in the Congress. I hope that we will have an opportunity to talk about some of the economic benefits of the balanced budget, because it will increase job creation, economic development. It includes more disposal income, real disposal income, consumable income; more cars being build; construction, et cetera, et cetera. But there is something we will get with a balanced budget that we do not have today that is critically important to our future, and that is the ability to define as a Nation what we believe Government ought to be doing; what we believe the role of Government should be; what the parameters of its extent in our society and in our lives are.

The way that we will do that, on an economic basis, is by what we are willing to pay for on a pay-as-you-go basis. It is a fundamental concept. It is crystally clear and critically important. That is that we not spend more than we are willing to tax ourselves for.

The problem that we have now is that we do not really know as a society, as a people, as an American culture, what it is that our Government, what the limits of our Government should be, because we, right now, are willing, and have for 25 years, spent more than we have raised in revenue.

So, the point is that when we get to this balanced budget where we are saying we are not going to spend more than we take in, then we are going to be making the tough decisions about how those resources get allocated. The fact is that there is more reality to the debate that goes on in the city councils around this country, and more reality to the debate that goes on in the State legislatures around this country, because that is where when one person wins, another person loses. When one interest group gets funding, another interest group does not, because it is a zero-sum game.

We do not have a zero-sum game at the Federal level of Government. We just keep spending and spending and spending. It is one of the reasons that, as I say, I get so exasperated and so, frankly, disgusted with the rhetoric that we hear in the body when we are told that we are cutting programs that are absolutely not being cut.

There are certain programs that are being cut completely. The Goals 2000 in the House budget was cut out completely; not in the conference report, it is not cut out. But in the House budget it was. Why? Because it is an honest difference regarding policy decisions that we ought to be making in the U.S. House, in the Congress. We should be doing these things. It is clear. But we should not be abusing language and talking about phenomenal increases in spending, in the case of Medicare, for example, we are going from $178 billion in 1995 to $289 billion in 2002. From $4,800 per beneficiary this year to $6,700 per beneficiary in 2002. Yet, we are hearing from the other side, and we will hear from the President himself, that this is a cut.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Will the gentleman yield on the education point? What we hear time and time again is that we are cutting education and that we are cutting student loans, and we are doing all of these horrible things. The fact of the matter is that we have an honest difference of opinion on goals 2000, and whether we want a bureaucrat in Washington, DC, to decide how to educate our children or not. But on student loans, there is an honest difference of opinion on how we handle student loans. We are not cutting student loans. Our student loans increase 50 percent.

Mr. HOKE. From $24 billion to $36 billion in 2002.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. But we do have a difference of opinion on how we get the money to those students to go to college.

The President of the United States, swimming against the tide of history and swimming against the tide of popular support, believes that what we should do is take all the money for student loan, round it all up, and bring it to Washington, DC, in what he calls his Direct Student Loan Program plan, and give Washington, DC bureaucracies a total monopoly. So, every time a student, whether that student be in Ohio or in Florida, or in Kansas or anywhere across this country, any time they want student loan money, they have to go crawling and kowtowing to a Federal bureaucracy in Washington, DC. We believe that we should let the communities continue to have say so in helping students.

Mr. HOKE. The gentleman is completely correct. What the President passed, or what was passed in this House in 1993, called for a tremendous increase in direct student loans, which essentially means that the Government got into the banking business.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let the Department of Education, one of the most inefficient bureaucracies in the Federal Government, totally monopolize it and take it out of the hands of the community. Because we want to empower the communities, and because we want to increase funding for education for these loans 50 percent over 7 years, they are saying that we are cutting.

Now, I must admit, I did not go to Oxford and I did not go to Yale, but the schools that I went to, and we did not learn this new math stuff, but if we go from $24 billion to $36 billion in student loans, at least in the schools I went to in the Southeast, that was called a spending increase. I do not know what Rhodes scholar's math is like, but in my neck of the woods and outside of the Beltway, going from $24 billion to $36 billion is a spending increase.

If I could cite some quotes, because we were just talking about Medicare, I do not think any of us could say it any better than what the Washington Post said. And I see the quotes there, but let me give a couple of other Washington Post quotes before you get into that. This came from last week by Matthew Miller, who used to work in the Clinton administration.

The Washington Post article, and he was talking about the GOP's proposal for Medicare, and he wrote:

Though many of the President's advisors think the GOP premium proposal is sensible and believe it differs little from the President's own plan, the President fired sound bites from the Oval Office yesterday taking the low road in ways that only Washington pundits could recast as standing tall.

For that reason, so the President could gain in the polls, the President sent home 880,000 workers saying that he opposed the Republican plan and he was going to shut down the Federal Government because of it.

□ 1615

The secret is out. The President's plan is just like the Republican plan.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the secret is out. The one thing that I get concerned about is that we hear so much of this rhetoric and demagoguery and medigoguery, as the Post has said, and mediscare and scare tactics about all these things. And we just heard it from the other side that we are cutting, cutting, cutting. I just hope and pray that the American public is not being fooled by this rhetoric.

My friends at home tell me that people are buying into this notion that, in fact, we are slashing Government, that senior citizens are actually being manipulated and exploited and being frightened. And I have two parents that are Medicare beneficiaries themselves, that that is really what we are about here.

I get concerned that maybe we have sunk to such a low level of power hungriness that we are willing to sell out any group, claiming and scare them into believing that they are somehow going to suffer, that the sky is going to fall and particularly those that are the most vulnerable, of course, the senior citizens, to this kind of tactic. It does concern me. The truth is that we ought to be talking about the very legitimate and real differences between the world views, and they are real and they are deep. They deserve to be heard and thought about and not obscured for the American people but, in fact, made clear.

I believe that the clearer that they are made, the more that people will be attracted to them, and they will say, yes, I do believe in the values of limited government. Yes, I do believe in the values of family and faith and hard work and education and personal responsibility. And, yes, the government should not be the institution that we look to in our society first. It should be the institution that we look to last as a genuine safety net for those who truly cannot provide for themselves. But it should not be the first resort. It should be the last resort.

These are real, these are deep differences between the parties. But they get obscured with this language.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one thing that he left out, when he is talking about personal responsibility and family and faith, all these other things that we stand for, one thing he left out was freedom. That is what is so great about the Medicare Program. Once again, our program, at about the same price as the President's program, allows senior citizens to make the decisions with their physicians and their own doctors on what their plan should be instead of having a 1964 Blue Cross/Blue Shield plan codified into law and run by bureaucrats. It has been shameless how they have done it.

If I could just briefly quote the Washington Post from November 16 on Medicare, I think this is one of the most important editorials of this political season.

Mr. HOKE. The Washington Post, they are generally on the Republican side; right? There are two newspapers in Washington? The Times and the Post?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The Washington Times obviously is a conservative newspaper. The Washington Post has long been the nemesis of, considered to be a nemesis of the Republican Party and of conservative plans. But I will tell you by reading the Washington Post the past few most months, it is obvious that they are even turned off by the President's demagoguery.

Mr. HOKE. When one reads these editorials, what is obvious is that there is a level of integrity at the Post. The Post is clearly liberal. They love government in a way that conservatives never will, but there is a level of integrity at the Post that I frankly respect, particularly on the editorial page. They have recognized that the demagoguery of the President and of the Democrat leadership in Congress is really shameful and should end. They have been very clear about this. They are as exasperated as I am, as the gentleman is, and as others in this House regarding the confusion and the obfuscation and obscuring of these issues.

I think I know what the gentleman is going to read.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If I could, let me say that the Post has been, I think, extremely responsible this entire year, even though they are more liberal than——

Mr. HOKE. Even though they are the paper we love to hate.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Let me read this, the most important editorial, I think, of the year:

Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit, and they blew it. The chance came in the form of the congressional Republican plan to balance the budget over 7 years. Some other aspects of that plan deserved to be resisted, but the Republican proposal to get at the deficit partly by confronting the cost of Medicare deserved support. The Democrats, led by the President, chose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that is where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican proposals generally. The President was still doing it this week; a Republican proposal to increase Medicare premiums was one of the reasons he alleged for the veto to shut down the government, and never mind that he himself, in his own budget, would countenance a similar increase.

We have said it before; it gets more serious. If the Democrats play the Medicare card and win, they will have set back for years, for the worst of political reasons, the very cause of rational government in behalf of which they profess to be behaving.

Who could say it better than that? Again, if I could just say personally before wrapping up, I was extremely frustrated with the press coverage of this entire Government shutdown because I thought that many were trivializing it. I said I wish one major publication would step forward and tell the truth. The Washington Post had the medigoguery editorial a month or two back and did it then. They stepped forward this time, cut through it all. Because of the influence the Post has, I believe this message is going to start sinking in.

We are not cutting Medicare. We are saving Medicare. We are not restricting senior citizens access or rights. We are empowering senior citizens. We are empowering medical providers to do what is best for senior citizens and not do what is best for bureaucrats.

Mr. HOKE. And, Mr. Speaker, we are changing the nature of the program itself so that, instead of being top down, it is being bottom under, where the senior citizen, the beneficiary himself or herself, actually has power and control.

In fact, if you are like me, the most important aspect of our plan is the ability for a senior to participate in a medical savings account, the medisave plan, which is an integral part of the Medicare reform. It is one of the Medicare Plus things.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And the provider service networks where physicians can actually get together with their patients and make the decision, what type of plan do we want to put forward for the senior citizen? What is the best option for them. Let us cut out the insurance companies. Let us cut the Federal Government.

Mr. HOKE. Attacked by insurance companies, by the way.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Just you, the senior citizen, and I, the physician, will sit down and decide what is best for you. And if insurance companies and if the Federal Government does not like it, too bad. We have been empowered by this plan.

Mr. HOKE. I see that my friend from Kansas has been waiting patiently to dive in and has some things that he wants to add to this debate.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I am in agreement with what you are saying on Medicare.

Mr. HOKE. What are you in disagreement with us about?

Mr. TIAHRT. What I would like to do is move on to the 7-year commitment that the President has signed.

Mr. HOKE. Could I read this? This is the commitment to a 7-year balanced budget that the President signed into law just last week and this was in the continuing resolution. Here is what it says. It says: The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session. When does the first session of this Congress end?

Mr. TIAHRT. We are currently in the first session of the Congress.

Mr. HOKE. And it will end on the last day of December 1995.

Mr. TIAHRT. And then we will start the second session of the 104th Congress. So that gives us just a short amount of time to implement legislation that gets us on the path to a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002.

Mr. HOKE. Continuing the rest of this, it says that we shall enact, the President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. This is law, signed into law by the President, passed by the Senate, passed by the House.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, the reason I wanted to move on to that is because I heard a startling statement that came from the White House press secretary just yesterday.

It was in response to a question that a reporter asked that said, asked whether or not the White House would prefer to put off this larger budget debate and instead operate on continuing resolution into next year so that we could carry out this kind of thing during the Presidential campaign.

The response from the White House press secretary was, "There are big differences between the President and Congress, and I suspect that those kinds of issues will have to be settled in November of 1996."

And he went on to say some other things about averting a shutdown, but I think there is a real move to avoid a written, signed contract with the American public that this commitment indicates. If you read it again, it says, the President and Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

This is very important because it is a signed document. The President has signed this. Words mean something. I think one thing that we have discerned here with the American public, we saw it with the Contract With America, that words mean something, that we are trying to convey to people that we are very serious about this. The President has agreed to it. This was something that was confirmed in 1994 during the election. We ran on the Contract With America. It was a signed document that we would do things which have been accomplished by this Congress.

Then this year we are talking about something that has been signed, but yet the White House is already hedging on this signature. They are hedging on this agreement, wanting to move it off to the Presidential campaign where they can use 20-second sound bites instead of open and honest debate about what is really important to the American public.

Mr. HOKE. I could not agree with you more. I want to follow up on this with the statement from Mr. McCurry.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kansas is absolutely right. I think that what we are saying here is not withstanding the fact that the President of the United States, pursuant to very, very long, arduous, difficult, tough, detailed, grueling negotiations between his chief of staff, Mr. Panetta, the Speaker of the House, the majority leader of the Senate, the President himself and the minority leader of the House, the minority leader of the Senate and the chairs of the Budget Committees, they worked out this language, they worked and worked and worked. They fought hard over every single word, and these were the words that they came up with that we shall enact legislation in the first session of this Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

And not a week later, before the President's signature is barely dry, his press secretary is saying:

> There are big differences between the President and the Congress. I suspect that those are the kinds of issues that will have to be settled in November 1996, but in the meantime, we can avert the crisis and then have our debate next year during a national election campaign, when we should, as Americans, have that kind of debate. We can avert the shutdown and get on with orderly business.

He is talking about using continuing resolutions, not entering into a balanced budget. That is why, as Mr. WELLER said earlier, that is why the question that we raise is, What exactly is your budget. There are now, what is today, today is the 29th?

□ 1630

Mr. Speaker, we have got about 30 days left before this session of this 104th Congress, this first session, ends.

Mr. TIAHRT. If the gentleman will yield, I think this Congress is heading toward a second shutdown this year, and if it does occur, it will reflect that we are unable to come to an agreement that has been signed by the President. It will be that he has violated his signature to balance the budget in this, achieve a balanced budget, not later than fiscal year 2002 by enacting legislation this session, the first session of the 104th Congress. I do not think that anyone in America is going to accept a violation of this signed contract because you know we have seen some tremendous gains in our economy, and I want to just quickly go over what every person knows in their heart, what most businessmen practice daily, but it is that you must have a balanced budget, and I just want to quote someone that goes beyond myself, who came out of the aerospace industry, someone who is involved in the financial markets, and it is Alan Greenspan, who is the Federal Reserve Chairman, and I want to quote his testimony to the Senate Banking Committee which was November 27, just 2 days ago.

He said that I have no idea what the actual proportion of the 2-percentage-point decline in long-term interest rates is that is attributed to the expectation of a balanced budget, but it is a significant part. He says that he believes interest rates will drop 2 percent if we can balance the budget, 2 percent, and what that means to the average household, American household, is somewhere around $2,300–$2,400 per year less money, a lower interest rate on their mortgage, lower interest rates on their credit cards, lower interest rates on their student loans, on their car loans, any time-borrowed money. It also means more jobs because companies will have more, but he went on to say subsequently, if there is a shattering of expectations.

Now I want to diverge here a minute. There is so much involved in expectations in the financial markets with just the anticipation of a balanced budget. We saw the market rates soar over 5,000, we saw bond, a strong bond market, strong financial markets, because of the anticipation of what we are trying to do here with this signed agreement between the President and Congress, but he says if there is, and I quote again, consequently if there is a shattering of expectation that leads to the conclusion that there is indeed an incapability on the part of the Government to ultimately redress the corrosive forces of debt, I think the reaction could quite—could be quite negative, and I am fearful that were it to happen there would be a sharp increase in long-term interest rates. He is talking about an increase in interest rates.

Now we know, I know, from the economy in Wichita, KS, in my home district, that when interest rates dropped, housing starts increased dramatically. We saw expansions in both ends of Wichita, a real strong economy. So here is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve saying that, if we can balance the budget, which the President has signed to and agreed with this Congress, if we can do this in fact and not have the violation of a written agreement, then he sees a drop of 2 percentage points in

the interest rates, and the corollary, quote oppositely, if it does not occur, if for some reason we are incapable, then we see an increase in interest rates.

Mr. HOKE. Let me reclaim my time for a minute. I also see it is 4:30, and I know we are late for a meeting that I am supposed to be at, chairing as a matter of fact, and I am going to give the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. But let me just read a couple of factual things from a report that was just released by the Heritage Foundation on what a balanced Federal budget with tax cuts would mean to the economy.

The gross domestic product will grow by $10.8 billion more than under current law. In the year 2002 we will have an additional $32 billion in real disposable income over the period, an additional $66 billion in consumption expenditures, and an additional $88.2 billion in real nonresidential fixed investments, a decrease of four-tents of 1 percent in the conventional mortgage rate, the additional construction of 104,000 new family homes than would have been built otherwise, the additional sales of 600,000 automobiles, and a decrease of seven-tenths of 1 percent in the growth rate of the CPI.

Mr. Speaker, the other thing that this study points out, and I think it points it out very clearly, and it is important to point it out to the American people because they will hear the litany over and over, as though it is some kind of Sanskrit mantra, that these are tax cuts for the rich, in order to pay for tax cuts for the rich. Well, you tell me when 89 percent of all of the $500-per-child tax credit go to middle-class families earning below $75,000, family households under $75,000, 89 percent, you tell me are those tax cuts for the rich? Only 4 percent of those tax cuts on the child credit go to families earning above $100,000.

The other thing that I would point out is that, as the gentleman from Indiana will recall, we did in fact raise taxes on the quote so-called rich in the summer of 1993. We changed the marginal tax rate with a 10-percent surtax on the rich, people making a million dollars or more with a 10-percent surtax, so it went from 36 to 39.6 percent.

Now let me ask a rhetorical question. If we wanted to cut taxes on the rich, if that is really what Republicans were all about, then would it not make sense that we would repeal that 10-percent surtax? Would that not be the first thing that we would do? I would think that somebody that wants to cut taxes on the rich, it would be. Did we do that? Is that in this plan? Is there any repeal of that 10 percent, notwithstanding the fact that it was a stupid thing to do in the first place? We should not have raised that tax. We should not have done it because it actually—it works perversely. It does not increase revenues. It actually discourages working, but nonetheless did we do that?

No, we did not do that. We clearly did not do that, and we are not going to do that. It is a middle-class tax cut. What it does is it puts more money in the hands, in the pockets, in the wallets and the purses of the men and women who earn it for their families, and it is for families.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] for this special order. I think it has been very enlightening, and I know many Americans watching it had a lot of their questions answered.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That should be sufficient, Mr. Speaker.

You know one of the problems you have when you are in public life is sometimes you are misquoted, and yesterday I was on CBS' morning show along with Senator MCCAIN, and I was on CNN "Talkback Live," and last night I was quoted on NBC News, Tom Brokaw's news report, talking about my opposition, unequivocal opposition, to sending our troops to Bosnia. But one of the reporters from the AP wire service took one line out of my statement on CBS news which said, you know, "He's hell-bent"; I was referring to the President, "He's hell-bent to send our troops there, and, if he does that, we must support them," is what I meant to say, but we were running out of time, and I said "him." And so they put that on the AP wire, and it went all over the country, and in every major newspaper in the country I was quoted as saying, "He's hell-bent to do this, and, if he does, we must support him." Mr. Speaker, it made it look like I was in favor of sending our troops to Bosnia, which is 180 degrees from the truth. I am absolutely and unequivocally opposed to sending our troops to Bosnia, and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the people who may be paying attention to this special order exactly why.

I met today with the Prime Minister of the Bosnian Moslem Republic, Mr. Silajdzic, and we had a nice long talk with other members of the Committee on International Relations talking about whether or not there were perils involved for our troops in Bosnia. I also had an intelligence briefing along with members of our committee, some of which I cannot go into here tonight because it was a closed briefing, and it was an intelligence briefing, and it is not for public consumption. But the bottom line is, things that I can say that need to be reported to my colleagues and to the American people, is there are 6 million land mines over there, and a number of our troops are going to be blown apart, or lose their arms and legs by stepping on these mines. They cannot be detected by metal detectors, many of them, because they are made out of plastic, they are very cheap, and they blow off the feet, and some of them jump up and will blow of legs and even kill people, but they are designed to maim. Six million of them. They only know where there are about 100,000 to 1 million of them. That means that at least 5 million of them are not known where they are, so that is a real peril to our troops.

Our troops are going to be on a corridor that runs many, many, many miles, probably from around Sarajevo up to Tuzla, and we are going to have troops in a 2½ mile wide corridor, and they will be subject to terrorist attacks, a terrorist, a Bosnian Serb, a Moslem from Iran, a number of people who are disenchanted with the peace accord, maybe some people who live around Sarajevo who fear they are going to lose their homes when the Bosnian Moslems return. These people may perpetrate a terrorist attack on our troops. They could put a truckload of dynamite, just like they did in Beirut back in the early eighties, and drive it through a barrier and blow up a lot of our young men and women. They are being put in harm's way with no end in sight.

The President said they will be brought home in 1 year, but in 1 year will we resolve this problem? After having talked to the leaders of these various countries and these various sects over there, I am convinced that there is not going to be a solution to this. These hatreds go back hundreds of years, and these people do not like each other at all, and it is my feeling that in 1 year we will still be mired down in this quagmire. The only difference is we are probably going to have an awful lot of our young men and women maimed or killed unnecessarily.

I do not think anybody knows for sure how many are going to be lost, but make no mistake about it, there will be many. All those land mines, all of these age-old hatreds, putting our troops in between warring factions, hoping that things will work out even though some people who were supposed to be included in the negotiations have not yet agreed to them. As a matter of fact, the Bosnian Serb leaders are still trying to renegotiate part of the agreement that deals with Sarajevo and the property around that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about sending our troops. I oppose sending our troops. Every time I get more information from the intelligence community or from the leaders of that part of the world, the former Yugoslavia, I become more concerned about the safety of our troops and am more convinced that this will not be a solution to these age-old hatreds.

The solution is to embargo products that are going into the warring factions, to force them to the conference table, to make them sit down and work out an agreement without outside forces being involved because, if they really reach an agreement and they really want peace, they are going to work it out and have troops there of their own to be a barrier between the warring factions. To put our troops, the British troops, and other troops in between all these warring factions is a recipe for disaster, and I think the President is making a very, very major mistake.

I see my colleague from California here who shares my views. He is going to be taking, I believe, the next hour to talk about this issue. But I wanted to make very, very clear to AP and to the people across this country who may have been misled by that AP story that I am unalterably opposed to sending our troops, I think it is a tragic mistake, I think the President is leading us down the road to a real possible disaster, and I think that the American people ought to know there is a better way to skin this cat than putting American young men and women at risk.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1788, THE AMTRAK REFORM AND PRIVATIZATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–370) on the resolution (H. Res. 284) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1788) to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina) laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE,
Washington, DC, November 16, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR NEWT: Pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, I am transmitting herewith the resolutions approved today by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER, *Chairman.*

There was no objection.

WHY WE SHOULD NOT BE IN BOSNIA

The Speaker pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. I did not realize your time was wrapping up, Mr. BURTON. I just wanted to, in a colloquy with you, underscore what you said about the targeting of Americans by people from outside Bosnia. The MOIS, the secret police of Iran, have people in all the areas in Bosnia and around there. They are the security for shipping arms to the Moslem Bosnians through Zagreb with the complicity, the tolerance of the Croatian Government, all the way up to President Franjo Tudjman. They have targeted Americans for over a year.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And they are having Americans killed, you might add.

Mr. DORNAN. Yes.

Now here is what adds a dimension to this today. Someone who has told me who I trust—now this makes it hearsay and puts it in the category of rumor for our friends in the dominant media culture. The liberals will go wild here, but a meeting took place at the White House, all the key players from Defense and from the State Department and security agencies, and Clinton himself expressed concern and asked many questions about the mujaheddin from Iran, the bad mujaheddin, just like we had good and bad in Afghanistan—the Hamas, some of the groups you have named, and the secret police, the terrorist secret police of Iran. He asked about them targeting Americans. He has known about this for a year.

□ 1645

The President is purported to have said, looking at Leon Panetta, my classmate from 1976, "Do not let the Congress get fired up on this. Downplay this when you talk to the Congressmen and the Senators."

In other words, instead of telling the American people the danger that we are in, and, to quote his own words which I will do in a minute, he is asking them to downplay the threat to our Americans.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the fact of the matter is we know there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Moslem terrorists from Iran who are in the Bosnia area right now. We do not know how many. We have no idea. The fact of the matter is that some of those people were involved in such tragedies here in America as the World Trade Center bombing. They do not like our policies, they do not like America very much.

When you put troops, American troops strung out between, say, Sarajevo and Tuzla, that long corridor 2½ miles wide, you are leaving them open for an attack anyplace among that line. That means that you are probably going to have, anyplace along that corridor for Sarajevo to Tuzla that there could be a bomber, there could be a mortar attack, there could be any kind of attack on our troops and they will not know when it is coming.

I remember when President Clinton had a number of us in the White House when we were in Mogadishu, in Somalia. The President came up with a new policy. He said he was going to billet our troops on the tarmac at the airport there in Mogadishu. He said they would be safe. They would be there as a security measure, but they would not be involved in any combat or other operations. This was after we started nation building, we quit the food handling over there.

Two days later the Aideed forces, the terrorist tribal leader over there, lobbed mortars into the exact spot where our soldiers were going to be billeted. That was not anything like Bosnia, yet if we had had troops in that area where the President said they were going to be, and they found out about it, there would have been many of them killed. Think about that when you talk about a corridor between Sarajevo and Tuzla, 2½ miles wide with 25,000 American troops in there. They could pick any spot along there, any time day or night, attack our troops and kill hundreds, maybe thousands of them. This is a recipe for disaster.

I appreciate the gentleman for yielding to me. The President should reconsider, and he should come clean with the American people. If he said what you alleged he said to Leon Panetta, you know, we do not let the Congress get into this thing, then he should be taken to task. I do not know if he said it or not.

The American people need to know the risks. There are going to be young women lose their legs, their arms, their eyes from these land mines, but even a greater risk is the possibility of a terrorist attack from possibly Bosnian Serbs who are going to be upset about losing their homes and the problems around Sarajevo, or possibly Moslem terrorist from Iran. There are a number of people who do not like what is going on over there. They do not like anybody very much. I think our troops are really at risk. It is a mistake to get into this quagmire.

Mr. DORNAN. DAN, stay with me just a minute here, because I have been to Central America with you several times, we have both been to Haiti and been very concerned about what is happening there. We both have taken a personal interest in the calls that are coming into our offices from families of men who are in active duty in Germany and who resented Clinton referring to them as volunteers.

One mother said to one of my staffers,

My son is not a French legionnaire or a mercenary, he did not join the military to fight under any flag, he joined and took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

And he did take a follow-on order that we do not take as Congressmen NEWT would like this probably at this point, that we will obey all lawful orders of our commander. But it is coming down to the word "lawful."

Because you suffered through Mogadishu and spoke so forcefully and eloquently on the floor, I want to share something with you. When I was in my thirties I produced my own TV show. We had, the year I started, just gotten state-of-the-art close-up lenses where we could go in on an ant on the set and fill someone's television screen at home with that ant. Here we are, 27 years later, since I first started in December of 1967, 28 years later, and we cannot call for a close-up with these good Americans down in the control room a couple of floors below us, and it is too bad. I think the day is going to come, just like some day we will have color in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I would like for them to see this map.

Mr. DORNAN. If they can see this Posavina corridor that we are supposed to widen by the Dayton-Wright Patterson treaty, widen and enforce——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the Americans could see the corridor we are supposed to try to defend——

Mr. DORNAN. Hold that steady and maybe the camera here in the southeast corner of the House could come in, point with your finger——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. It is going to run all the way this way.

Mr. DORNAN. Take it from there at the top. The little pink strip there, between the part of Serb-held Bosnia that is against Milosevic's Bosnia-Serbia proper and Montenegro, and this huge glob in the northern part of what is Bosnia, this little, tiny Posavina corridor, 2½ miles, is supposed to be expanded to five.

Keep in mind the Israelis were properly always exercised about the distance from the furthest west point of the West Bank, Judea, from Natanya, by the sea, was 18 miles. They say that is an artillery-lobbed shell. This is 2½. Our men——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. You have been in the military you might tell our colleagues how far a mortar will go, how far they can stay back from that 2½-mile-wide corridor to hit American troops if they wanted to lob something in there.

Mr. DORNAN. The mortars that hit the marketplace in Tuzla when I was in Zagreb the 28th of August, and threw bodies every which way, killed 60 or 70 people and maimed 150; when I look at that "maimed," I always think "Who is blind? Who has no legs there? Who lost all their fingers there?" We always put the death toll in bigger caps than the maimed. That is lives changed forever. A person will never earn the same income. Those mortars could be 5 or 10 miles from the corridor and lob these shells into the corridor.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The point is they could get within a half a mile and be more accurately targeted in. That is the problem.

Mr. DORNAN. I wish almost, like in every television show, we had a monitor buried in the table here so we could see. I don't know how close they can come in on this picture, but I am going to walk over there and give it to you so you can look at this handsome young American soldier's face, First Sergeant Randall Shughart. I visited his grave 2 weeks ago in Carlisle, PA. His parents sent me this picture because they did not like the standard Army picture. They said, "This is more what Randy looked like when he was helping us on the farm." I am sure that as close as they can get, it is just a color picture of a handsome young fellow with a closely cropped beard and a cowboy hat, in his barn. Take a look at this while I tell you this story.

Randy Shughart, together with Gary Gordon, begged the headquarters at Mogadishu International Airport to let them go down and disembark from their helicopter, because they could see movement in the cockpit of Michael Durant's crashed Blackhawk helicopter. Three times they were told no. They were, in a sense, because they knew the odds, begging to die for their friends. St. John the Evangelist 15:13, "Greater love no man has than he died for his friends."

They saved Durant. Durant hugging me, and both of us crying, told me that he owes his life to Randy Shughart and Gary Gordon. All four men had spine injuries when that helicopter made a hard landing. The helicopter that he disembarked took a direct hit of a rocket-propelled grenade and blew out one of the door posts and tore the leg right off one of the door gunners.

I talked to the young Corporal Hall who jumped in and took over the door gun, and they flew back to Newport and crashed the helicopter, totaling it out. So that day we lost Wolcott's helicopter, Cliff Wolcott, killing him and his pilot, and then we lost this one, Durant's, and then we lost that one to a total accident after they were out of it.

They held off for about 30 minutes. I have asked the Army for their last transcriptions. Durant told me the last thing Gordon or Shughart said to him was "Good luck, pal. I hope you make it." Went around the front of the helicopter, heard him take a couple of shots, heard him grunt with pain. Hopefully they died with the rifle shots as the crowd overwhelmed the helicopter and captured Durant.

Durant told me another man was lying on the ground, and I will not give his name because of his parents, and he was taken alive with Durant. They beat him to death. Then they began to so abuse their bodies that now that it is 2 years and 2 months later, a former Congressman said to me tonight, "Congressman, these men are owned by America. Why don't you tell the country what happened to them?"

I will not, but I will go further than I have ever gone before. These five men, including the two that won the Medal of Honor and including Randy Shughart's picture you have there, they did not just mutilate their bodies and drag them through the streets and stick rifles and poles into every bodily orifice, including their mouths, and have women and children dance upon them in the streets for Canadian Broadcasting, the guy won a Pulitzer Prize for his video and film coverage, Paul something, they cut their arms off the bodies. We never got those limbs back. They dumped their burned remains on the steps of the United Nation every 2 days until we had gotten back——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I may interrupt, that was never reported to the American people?

Mr. DORNAN. Never. Look at Randy's handsome face, and he was born in Lincoln, NE. I showed this to our Medal of Honor winner, the Senator from Nebraska, BOB KERREY, and he started at him intently, and I said, "This guy is from Lincoln." And he said, "Are you sure?" and I said yes, I thought he was buried there. And then the Army told me where, so I went to his grave, because the week before when I was at a presidential forum in Bangor, ME, and I had asked where the other Lincoln was, in Lincoln, ME, where Gary Gordon is from. "Two Young Men from Lincoln" is the story I would like to write.

They said, "50 minutes north of here," and I took my son and drove up this first week of November to Gary Gordon's grave. I said to Mark, "I want to see Randy Shughart's grave." His dad, that man there, his father is the one who refused to shake Clinton's hand in the East Ballroom of the White House, and BOB KERREY, Senator, told me he was at this ceremony and remembers it vividly. I said, "How is it BOB, the press never reported that story, that it only came out on talk radio?"

Mr. Shughart, a basic American farmer type, retired in Carlisle near his son's grave. He told me that he said to Clinton, "Why did you fly Aideed down to Addis Abbaba days after those people killed and multilated my son's body?"

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. He was the dictator and tribal terrorist over there that was responsible for that.

Mr. DORNAN. Another Fidel Castro, another General Jopp, another Aristide, the same mold, all of them.

He said Clinton told him, "I did not know about that operation."

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If the gentleman will yield, that is a ludicrous statement for anybody to make, because the administration had their Ambassador over there, negotiating with Aideed during a lot of this stuff that was going on. They knew entirely, from intelligence sources, what was going on. It is absolutely unbelievable that they would make a statement like that.

Let me just add one more thing.

Mr. DORNAN. It is Clinton making the statement to the father of a dead, murdered, Medal of Honor winner.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I just cannot believe that is the case. The President said in his speech——

Mr. DORNAN. He meant the operation, taking Aideed down to Addis Abbaba.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The President said, "I take full responsibility for whatever might happen over there." The fact of the matter is he should take full responsibility for what happened in Mogadishu to those men who got killed. They did not send proper equipment there, they did not send M-1 A-1 tanks, they did not send Bradley armored vehicles. He knew they should have sent those over there. The men trapped there, they did not get to them in that little town for 40 or 50 minutes because they could not get through the crowds.

Mr. DORNAN. Eleven and one-half hours before they relieved the Rangers.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The fact of the matter is we lost some of those men because we did not get there quick enough.

Mr. DORNAN. Four or five died during the night.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The fact of the matter is we are going to lose more young men and women, many more times, 40 or 50 more times in Bosnia. I think the President is making a terrible mistake.

Mr. SCARBBOROUGH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding, and thank him for all of his service on the Committee on National Security, where we have worked together. I certainly appreciate the comments you have made about the horrible treatment that American soldiers have to go through, and humanizing this process.

Let me tell you something that really has disturbed me during this debate. There have been three falsehoods. The first is that we should blindly fall in line behind our Commander in Chief, regardless of what he suggests. We should send out troops, whether we know if there is a vital American interest, a time line, or all of the things we need to make this successful.

I remember back in the mid-1990's, before I was in Congress, and you were here, maybe you can expand on this in a minute or two, just to remind Americans that there can be a loyal opposition. I remember when we were trying to remove Communists, when Ronald Reagan was trying to remove Communists from Central America, there were actually Members of this body that wrote Communist leader Ortega in Nicaragua and apologized for our support of the freedom fighters. These same people tell us that we cannot even debate this openly, so America can decide whether they want young American men and women killed in Bosnia?

Let us make no mistake of it, we have sat through the briefings on the Committee on National Security. Everybody that comes in says, "Young Americans will die if they go to Bosnia and get involved in a civil war that has been raging for over 500 years." What have we kept asking? We have kept saying, "What is the vital American interest?"

□ 1700

They have set up straw men and tried to knock them down, saying that if we did not get involved that somehow our credibility in NATO would be greatly diminished. That is a joke. The fact of the matter is, we are NATO. We have protected NATO countries for a generation from the threat of communism, and we will continue.

Mr. DORNAN. A generation and a half.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. A generation and a half. We are NATO. So that is a straw man.

Then they talk about it expanding and starting World War III. I heard the Vice President make that statement. That is blatantly false. It will not expand. The testimony that we have heard in the Committee on National Security clearly shows that that will not happen.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say that I remember when the other side, when we were in Vietnam, and they were talking about the domino theory, they pooh-poohed that. Of course, now the same people who are doing that are saying, oh, my gosh, this may be a world war. The fact of the matter is, this war is not going to spread unless everybody decides that they want to let it spread.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Is it not ironic that the very same people during the Vietnam war that were protesting in the streets and on campuses across this country were saying, we cannot be the world's policeman. These are the same people, 30 years later, who are saying, let us sacrifice young Americans because it will make us feel good about ourselves.

The fact of the matter is, there is no vital American interest. The Secretary of Defense admitted as much, and it was in Time magazine, that there is not a vital American interest. But what is disturbing to me is, now we are seeing people saying, well, maybe, since we are beyond the cold war, maybe we do not need a vital American interest.

I hear that we have a volunteer army. You notice that is what they are saying. It is a volunteer army, they signed up for this, so we can send them off. It does not matter whether there is a vital American interest, and we spend all of this money on the military, so let us use our military. That is obscene.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. That is why I thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Indiana for talking about the harsh realities of war.

Does it mean that Americans are gun-shy and that we do not believe that any American troops should ever be sent into harm's way? No. But is it asking too much to say, let there be a vital American interest so when the President of the United States picks up the phone and calls a parent and says, your son was just blown apart in Bosnia, but he did it for a good reason. He did it because, and that is where they start to fade out. Because, maybe the NATO people will feel better because we have sacrificed, had human sacrifices in Bosnia.

I do not want to trivialize this point, but it is so central to this argument, we have to define what a vital American interest is.

We have heard the Secretary of Defense, we have heard the Secretary of State, we have heard General Shalikashvili, we have heard a lot of good military men and women come before our Committee on National Security, and all have failed to state that vital American interest. I do not fault them; I fault the Commander in Chief.

Mr. DORNAN. Let my good colleague from Florida pause for a moment while I show the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] another photograph, and a series of photographs starting on the cover of Paris Match magazine that you are not going to forget. I guarantee you that you will be bringing this up at town hall meetings.

First of all, I hand to Mr. BURTON a picture from a war that has great personal significance for me that started in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, on June 28, 1914, when a Bosnian Serb murdered Archduke Ferdinand and his wife, Carlotta, the heir to the throne of the Austro-Hungarian empire, and changed Europe for this whole century and began the bloodiest war in its

time, 11 million killed, the flower of European youth, and it set us up for World War II where 55 to 60 million died, and it set up Stalin and Lenin and communism where 100 million more died, including China.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. And your dad was there.

Mr. DORNAN. I do not have but one studio photograph of my father from World War I.

A gentleman called me from North Carolina last fall and said, "I bought for 100 bucks in a garage sale a bunch of postcards from World War I." He asked my staff, "Does the Congressman have a father who was a lieutenant in World War I?" Yes. I called him back. Send me the photograph.

He sends it, and it is a photograph of my dad with about 15 French children and another young captain. My dad had suffered poison gas, mustard gas twice, shrapnel in his face under his eye, three-wound chevrons turned into Purple Hearts in a ceremony that I witnessed in the Seventh Armory in New York.

If my dad were still alive, he went to his reward in 1975 at 83 years of age, he would be saying to me, in the last 4 years of the bloodiest century in all of history, "We are going back to the hills around Sarajevo where this killing started?"

Now I want to show you both something. I am going to read the text while DAN looks at this and then he gives it to you. I have been on the French Embassy for months to get photographs of the two French pilots in a double seat Mirage 2000 that were shot down while I am at Aviano greeting our pilots back on August 30.

They said, "Uh-oh, we have lost an airplane." My heart starts pounding. Is this guy going to be as lucky as young Captain Scott O'Grady? Is he coming down on our side of the line like a British Harrier pilot 2 years earlier? Is he going to come down into Serb hands?

Then they come in. I was talking to my wife on the phone. You cannot talk on the phone, but it is a French airplane. We take a two-seater. Then we hear there were good shoots. I am supposed to greet the squadron commander. He bends around in the air, goes back to the tanker and goes back to cover him.

On the evening news here you saw their two good parachutes come down. That was August 30. Fifty-two days later, an indicted war criminal indicted at The Hague in the Netherlands by an international war crimes tribunal, Radovan Karadvic, says, "Oh, the two French pilots were kidnapped from the hospital. What were they doing in a hospital 52 days after? They had good parachutes."

I am about to show you their pictures the day of capture.

The French embassy calls me about Frederique Chiffot, C-H-I-F-F-O-T. I misspelled it when I said it on the floor last. The other one is Souvignet, Jose, J-O-S-E. Let me spell his name, S-O-U-V-I-G-N-E-T. These two pilots are in captivity here. One of them looks like he has a sprained ankle, no cuts on their faces. The French Foreign Minister thinks that they have been murdered, beaten to death.

When Karadzic says they were kidnapped he says, maybe by Moslems; Moslems would not do that, not with the support we are giving them; and he said, or by some band of a rogue brigands for a hostage reward. There has been no asking for money.

Look at these pictures. Look at this man's face. The lieutenant, probably the back-seater; well, not necessarily, maybe the captain was the back-seat radar intercept officer. Turn the page. Look at how, like our pilots first captured in Vietnam, he is making this mean grimace into the camera like, I am resisting and I am okay. They are mature men. They are in their mid 30's, you can tell.

Why at Dayton, at Wright Patterson, did not somebody say to Milosevic, by the way, all of this is predicated upon the return of these two French allied pilots who are our friends and comrades in arms? The whole deal is off, and here we are on day 82, 30 days after they announced they were kidnapped from a hospital that they should not have been in, and that could be two Americans in a heartbeat.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Bob, it is probably going to be more than two. We are going to have 25,000 there, plus support troops, in that 2½-mile-wide corridor, and they will be able to attack at any point along that corridor, at any time, day or night, with mortars, land mines, or they can use a terrorist attack with a truck bomb. I am telling you, you are probably going to see, and I hope I am wrong, but you are probably going to see a lot more Americans than two or three.

Mr. DORNAN. Look at the faces of the Serb fighters there. How old do you think they are?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. They are probably in their 20's and 30's.

Mr. DORNAN. And some in their 40's. Are they tough-looking, warrior-class people?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Oh, of course.

Mr. DORNAN. Have you ever seen tougher looking guys in your life?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I saw a 60-year-old gentleman in Sarajevo, a Serb, with an assault rifle on the evening news saying, I will kill anybody that comes in here to protect my family. We are getting involved in a three-way civil war that we cannot begin to fathom, the emotions and the hatred. It is just like Mogadishu that you talked about before.

We are going even beyond the original U.N. charter where we were only supposed to get involved when the sovereign state was attacked. Why are we putting Americans in the middle of a three-way civil war with what you talked about, war-hardened criminals, for the most part, that will kill Americans as soon as look at them?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say something here.

Mr. Speaker, this administration has a history of blunders in foreign policy decisions. Haiti, we are now finding out, is costing us hundreds of millions of dollars, and all hell is breaking loose down there. There are a lot of political killings that have been instigated in part by Aristide's own rhetoric. He is now saying he may not leave power, and he is using almost $2 million of American taxpayers' money to lobby Congress for more money.

We have Mogadishu and Somalia and the tragedies that occurred there, and now we are going to do the same thing or worse in Bosnia? It makes no sense.

This administration needs to get a foreign policy compass. They need to get some direction in their foreign policy, get some experts up there that know what they are doing and know what they are getting us into.

Mr. DORNAN. But where was Clinton this morning? Speaking to the British Parliament, instead of over here counseling with us and figuring out how we can contribute to this.

Now, let me bounce off of both of you my notes from Clinton's remarks on Monday night.

First of all, he did take you on with that first question of yours and me. Because I put 50 questions to him in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just yesterday and put in the Cap Weinberger-Bob Dornan principles, the 10 things that you must satisfy before you put men, and now, thanks to Les Aspin, women, in harm's way.

He said, this is Central Europe. It is vital to our national interests. So he used the word. He said so.

This House, by a vote of 243 to 171 says no, and it shows you that if there is ever a constitutional power that does not involve the purse, the President can send people anywhere in this world.

Wilson asked for a declaration of war. So did Roosevelt. But Harry Truman got into Korea and did not know how to get out and it cost him his Presidency.

LBJ, thanks to Kennedy, got into Vietnam, did not know how to extract himself, threw his hands up on March 31, 1968, and said, I am out of here. I will serve out and try and conduct the war. He did not do anything except keep a bombing pause on for all of 1968 that he made even more severe to try and throw the election to Humphrey and destroyed his Presidency.

Listen to what Clinton says. They, that is you, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. BURTON, and me, and a majority of this

House and Senate, they argue America can now step back. As young people would say, excuse me. Step back? We have almost 500 men in Macedonia. We have air power, sea power. We lost that French airplane and lucked out with our American air crew. We threw 90 percent of the strikes that cost those two Frenchmen 82 days of freedom. Please, God, that they are still alive and being moved from village to village.

He says, we are going to end the suffering. How much money are we pouring into that area with airlift and sealift? You men should walk through the hospital at Zagreb at the airport. You should look at the U.N. facilities and the U.N. personnel there who are all overpaid, and every nickel they get is tax-free, all the bureaucrats.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say, he said he is going to end the suffering and we are going to be there 1 year. In 1 year we are going to be in and out, we are going to end the suffering, and this is a civil war, civil strife that has been going on, as you said, for 500 years or more. I am telling you, you are not going to change these people's attitudes, take away their homes and give them to somebody else, solve all of these problems in a year and make this country whole. It is just not going to happen.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. To expand on that briefly, getting back to the testimony we heard from the Committee on National Security, and I am sure you were there. When a retired U.N. general from Canada talked to us about the folly that you were just talking about, about us believing that we can send in one division in 1 year and bring peace to Bosnia for the 21st century, he said that he was responsible for surveying the crimes against humanity, being a monitor for what the Serbs did.

One morning he was on the roadside and had to go out and look at a slaughter. The Serbs had slaughtered Moslem children, they had slaughtered women, had slaughtered elderly people. As he was looking at, surveying the scene, a Serb came up to him and he said, well, it serves them right. And the U.N. general turned and said, it serves them right for what? And the Serb responded, it serves them right for what they did to us in 1473.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. In 1473.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. And then the general was silent for a moment, and he looked at the committee. A smile went across his face, and he said, and you Americans believe that you can send in one division for 1 year and make a difference? You are kidding yourselves. You had better stay out.

That comes from a man who had been there a lot longer than anybody in the administration and who understands it a lot better than anybody serving in this administration.

□ 1715

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say one thing, there is an old statement, "Those that don't profit from history are destined to make the same mistakes over and over and over again." This administration in its foreign policy decisions has not looked at history. They do not have the underpinning, the background necessary to be making these decisions. Yet they are going right ahead, hell-bent for leather, making these decisions, putting our young people in harm's way.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. The irony is, I know this is sort of the electrified third realm, we do not want to get into it because he is our President, our Commander in Chief. I will just talk about the administration generally.

The irony is that the people that are sitting in this administration now are the same people 20 years ago, 30 years ago protesting the Vietnam war. Not only have they not learned from European history, they have not learned the lessons of Vietnam that they taught the country: that unless the American people are solidly behind a military action, and unless there is an immediate vital interest, we do not get involved in other people's civil wars.

I thought that is what the Vietnam protests were about. I thought that is what the President and many others in good conscience protested about during the Vietnam war, that this was not our war, that there was not a direct American interest, that America had to leave that civil war to Vietnam.

If they wanted to protest that 25, 30 years ago, I am not going to second-guess them or challenge them. That was their right. But why are these same people 30 yeas ago who were telling us that we cannot be policemen of the world and get involved in other people's conflicts, why are these same people, now that they are in charge 30 years later, asking us to do the same exact thing?

Mr. DORNAN. Try just 26 years ago, this very week. Clinton himself, ditching class at Oxford, left for Oslo, Stockholm, Helsinki, Leningrad, 2½ days in Moscow, in Prague, on a tour to help secure victory for Hanoi. It had nothing to do with peace or ending the war in some sort of neutrality respecting the DMZ at the 17th parallel. It was to secure a victory for Hanoi.

Here is an article in the current Insight magazine, the one that has NEWT on the cover. It says, "McNamara met the enemy and it turned out to be him." On Bosnia, "There is a chilling McNamara-like rhetoric" coming from administration people. "Perry's assertion," Secretary of Defense Perry, "is the same guff that McNamara tossed off during Vietnam."

It says, "Only industrial strength arrogance can account for Robert Strange McNamara's visit to Hanoi on Veterans Day. The former defense secretary at least is unchanging in the lack of sensibility that characterized his Pentagon tenure during the Vietnam War."

This is the man, McNamara, that said that we cannot use college men in the Vietnam struggle; they are our future. Clinton told his draft board, "I'm too educated to go."

Now we have, just as you pointed out, JOE, the very same people making sure Clinton does not make any reference to Vietnam in his speeches about suffering, I am looking at my notes again from Monday night, he says 250,000 people have been killed. In Cambodia it was 2 million, 8 times that.

He says 2 million are on the road. They are alive. Because the road in the South China Sea meant sharks, pirates, and the death of 750,000 people, 68,000 who worked with us executed. And always the one order, the one order from Ho Chi Minh that they pursued even after he died in September 1969 was kill Americans.

Are they thinking that when Haitians that we talked about on the docks were jumping up and down and saying, "We're going to give you Somalia," at the end of October, referring to the man who was killed on the 6th, Matt Rearson, they had a dud land at the feet, 5 feet away from a two-star General Garrison. He told me about it himself. The 18 Rangers and helicopter pilots and Delta commandos like Randy Shugart and Gary Gordon, they are yelling about this on the docks of Haiti, 10, 12 days later, and turned around the Norton Sound.

Do you not think that these people in Sarajevo who have constant TV, CNN, probably watch some of our C-SPAN debates, are not aware that the key to get Clinton to bug out is Clinton's next words? "We must expect casualties," he said.

Of all people, who is he to say that?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say on the front page of the New York Times this week they quoted a gentleman from Sarajevo who lives, one of the 60,000 Bosnian Serbs that live around Sarajevo, and he said, "What you're going to see is what you saw in Somalia when you saw that American dragged through the streets dead."

Another lady who lives in one of those suburbs said, "I'll kill myself and my kids before I'll let them take over my home and my property here." And those people are going to be coming back. I am telling you, when people say that they will even kill themselves and their kids, what do you think they are going to do to somebody else who tries to take their property?

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield, once again drawing comparisons between Bosnia and Vietnam, I remember after the war was over listening to the words of the generals for North Vietnam. They said "We knew we could not win the war in

the jungles of Vietnam, but we knew we would win this war on the streets and the college campuses of America."

Mr. DORNAN. In the Halls of the Congress.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. "That is why we kept fighting." The same thing is going to happen now. That is why the Weinberger doctrine, which the gentlemen from California [Mr. DORNAN] also worked on, that is why one of the key components was support from the American people. We have to have a campaign that Americans support. It is the President's responsibility to step forward and explain what the vital American interest is.

Let me just say this. I will tell you this. A lot of people will say, "Well, why are you all talking about Bosnia in such strident terms," and I will tell you, this is my feeling. We have to do it now. It is our responsibility. Because once those young men and women get in Bosnia, at that point I shut my mouth, I follow the Commander in Chief. I will not do what Members of this Congress did in the 1960's and play politics with the lives of American troops.

So now is the time that we have to voice our opposition to this, because once the President makes that move, and I can only speak for myself, at that point I believe we as a country fall in line behind the Commander in Chief if he chooses to do that. But until that time comes, I think we need to point out that this is the most misguided foreign policy decision not only that this administration has made but any administration in this country has made since Vietnam. We have to do all we can to draw the line in the sand and tell the President, do not send young Americans.

I already have men and women from my district over there. I have NAS Pensacola, Eglin Air Force Base, Hobart Field. I have got a lot of other bases.

These are not just the military. It is not abstract terms. We are talking about men and women and the children of people I know, and also my own peers who have children that go to school with my 7-year-old boy in Pensacola, FL, talking about how their father is going to be going to Bosnia. We are talking about killing real people.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Human beings. Real people. The gentleman has said it very well. I do not think anybody could have said it better.

The fact of the matter is that I think everybody in this Chamber, once our troops are on the ground, are going to say, "Hey, we didn't want them there. They shouldn't be there, but they're there and we're going to support our American young men and women who are over there to do a job."

But the fact of the matter is, I will be supporting our troops, but I certainly will not be supporting this President and this policy that he has adopted because I think it is going to get a lot of them killed.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. What frightens me is this: The fact of the matter is that this has been a very emotional decision by this administration and it has been a decision based, I believe, on emotion.

Because I watch TV. I talked about my 7-year-old boy. I saw on ABC News several months back a young 7-year-old Muslim boy was blown off his bicycle, and the boy was screaming and crying, and it looked just like my son. He said, "Please don't cut off my leg. Don't cut off my leg." And the ABC reporter said "Well, the 7-year-old boy's leg was not cut off but he did die 3 hours later."

That hit me, and I said I know what the President has to be saying at times. We have got to do something. We have got to stop the killing. That is what my immediate response is, and that is what a lot of Americans think.

But then you step back and you think through this process, and you are not run totally by emotion, and you say, "Wait a second, it won't be young Bosnians that we are going to be seeing killed on TV 2 months from now, 3 months from now, if we go over there. It is going to be young Americans."

We better make sure that it is a cause worth dying for, to make sure we do not repeat the same mistakes we made in Somalia, where we made an emotional decision to go over there. Then Americans were slaughtered, drug through the streets. Americans then made an emotional decision to bring them back. Let us not make that mistake again. Let us not base it on emotion. Let us base it on sound foreign policy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say one thing about Somalia. When President Bush sent our troops over there initially, it was to feed the hungry masses, and those people welcomed us with open arms and treated our troops very well. It was not until President Clinton made the decision to get into nation-building, which is what he is leading us into in Bosnia, that we started losing troops and ended up having to pull out of there and leaving that dictator Aideed back in power.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. This is what is so frightening. I have heard testimony again before the Committee on National Security and I actually had somebody with a straight face tell me, from the administration, that we needed to go into Bosnia to, quote, reknit the fabric of the Bosnian society, close quote.

That, my friend, is extremely frightening. It is extremely naive, and it is going to be young Americans' blood that will be spilled because of that naive view of geopolitical realities.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the members of the dynamic freshman class of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] have joined us.

I want to put one set of figures into the RECORD and make one comment, because Clinton at least heeded the warnings of this Congress not to put our men and women under the United Nations. I would ask people to please save their Reader's Digest. I will put this in the RECORD following our remarks, Dale Van Atta's article commissioned by Reader's Digest on "The Folly of U.N. Peacekeeping." It begins thusly.

"Sonja's Kon-Tiki Cafe is a notorious Serbian watering hole 6 miles north of Sarajevo. While Serb soldiers perpetrated atrocities in all the Bosnian villages, local residents reported that U.N. peacekeepers," and it hurts me to read these names, "from France, Ukraine, Canada, and New Zealand regularly visited Sonja's, drinking and eating with these very same soldiers" committing the atrocities "and sharing their women."

However, the women of Sonja's Kon-Tiki Club were actually prisoners of the Serbs. These are Muslim and Croatian women.

"As one soldier, Borislav Herak, would later confess, he visited Sonja's several times a week, raping many of the 70 females present and killing two of them" because he felt like it.

Then I go down to Haiti and I see white U.N. vehicles, this wonderful dream that grew out of the League of Nations in my father's war, see white U.N. vehicles lined up at the houses of prostitution in Haiti, and wondered why the United Nations is so disrespected. Well, here is what we are doing, and these figures come from the U.N. peacekeeping ops office up in New York.

At this time, when Clinton says we are going to pull back, we have 2,267 people in Haiti.

I did not know we had 30 in the western Sahara. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is the African expert. I did not know that. The part of Africa that Morocco has taken over. In Macedonia we have 494. When I was there it was 530.

We already have three in Bosnia, an advance team is arriving as we speak in Tuzla, where that rocket hit on August 28 when I was up in Zagreb, could not believe the imagery on the news that night. We have 361 already in Croatia. I do not know if that includes all the hospital people.

We have four in ex-Soviet Georgia. What kind of a Christmas are they going to have? We have 15 still on the Iraqi-Kuwaiti border, and 11 in Jerusalem. Grand total, 3,185.

And not spending Christmas with their families will be 17,000 support troops all around Bosnia that are there now, air power, sea power, airlift, sea lift, hospitals, intelligence, more than they know how to use, and Clinton has the gall to say we are pulling back and not helping, and we are going to close

out this century with American kids dead in the tinderbox of the Balkans?

Let me share some time, and thank you for staying, DAN. I really appreciate it. My wife is calling me all day long, why are you discussing all these mundane things, when for the first time in American history a leader is saying not "They will be home by Christmas" but saying "I think we can have them all in place by Christmas." The opposite of MacArthur, of Truman. I have never heard of such a thing in my life.

Here is the way I want to allocate some time. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have left on my hour?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman has 13 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Then let me share this, and let me cut it just a bit, then STEVE CHABOT of Ohio, I will give you 4 minutes, STEVE, because CYNTHIA MCKINNEY missed her opportunity, and I want all of her people in Georgia waiting for her special order to know she is still here and going to talk about the problem of gerrymandering in Georgia. But, STEVE, I will give you 4 minutes, MARK NEUMANN 4 minutes, SAM BROWNBACK 2 minutes, MARK SANFORD of South Carolina 2 minutes, and JACK METCALF 4 minutes, and that ought to do it. Then on to CYNTHIA.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHABOT].

□ 1730

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for using the French pronunciation of my name, which I do not hear very often. Thank you very much.

I have been listening to the arguments and points made by my colleagues here. I think they made some very good, some very persuasive arguments.

I would just like to reiterate some of the things they have made and make some new ones myself.

First, I think it is important for us to always remember that these people in that very, very dangerous area of the world have been fighting with each other for centuries now, for hundreds of years. They have been battling each other, and, unfortunately, our President is now talking about and pushing forward with a plan which will put young Americans, both men and women, on the ground in Bosnia right in the middle of that bloody mess. I am very concerned that, rather than fighting and shooting at each other, in the very near future they are going to be shooting at Americans, and I hope and I pray that I am wrong. But I am very concerned that many, many Americans are going to come back to the shores of this country in body bags.

There are many other dangers besides the snipers and rogue Serbs or rogue folks on either side lobbing mortars, mortar shells, artillery shells into our U.S. troops. There are 6 million mines in Bosnia. Many of those mines, nobody has a clue as to where they are at. People can be out on a routine patrol just walking down the street and could very easily set off a mine, could be mangled and mutilated or killed, and I am very concerned we are going to lose a lot of people to those very lethal instruments. That is the 6 million estimated mines there are throughout the Bosnian area.

In addition, I think we really have to recognize that, whereas the Serbs have certainly been the most aggressive and have performed the most atrocious acts and have killed the most innocent people, that none of the parties really have clean hands in this incident. The Moslems, the Bosnian Moslems, and the Croats have also allegedly committed a number of atrocities themselves. All three parties have done some very awful things in the past couple of years in that very, very dangerous part of the world. Certainly, the Serbs have been the worst.

In addition, the President is talking about our troops will be out in an estimated 1-year period of time. Again, go back to the point that these people have been fighting for hundreds of years now. How anyone can predict that our troops will have solved the problems over there, kept the peace and then pulled out in a year's period of time, I think that there is no way in the world that is going to happen. If our troops are pulled out, it is very likely that in a very short period of time the atrocities will start again, the fighting will start, and we are going to have the same type of chaos and death that we have over there now. So the 1-year period of time, I think, is a period of time that has been grabbed out of the air, and some would argue that it has to do with the fact that there is an election a year down the road. Who knows why the President picked 1 year.

But I do not think there is any way we are going to be able to go over there and then suddenly peace is going to break out in that very dangerous part of the world after we have been there for a 1-year period of time.

This is in Europe's backyard. It is very, very difficult for anybody to make the argument that this is in the vital interests of the United States. We have an interest to the extent that I think we think it was a good idea for the President to get the parties together. I think it is appropriate for us to play a role in getting people to talk about peace. I think we can play a role in supporting the Europeans through our air power, which we are able to project without great loss of life to American citizens. But I do not think that a legitimate argument can be made that it is necessary for U.S. troops to be at risk on the ground, and it does not take very long for anybody to pick out a couple of examples of the type of things which could very well happen in the very near future in that very dangerous part of the world.

Look what happened in Lebanon. You know, it was something as unsophisticated as a truck filled with explosives to blow up a building and kill over 200 United States Marines in Beirut, Lebanon. In Somalia we went in with the best of intentions to feed people, and then mission creep set in. The goal got expanded. We were trying to build democracies over there. We got in the middle of the warlords. Our helicopters got shot down. American lives were lost, and the bodies of young Americans were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu.

What we are trying to do here is to prevent the President from making a very, very tragic mistake. He certainly has not convinced me that this is in the vital interests of the United States to put United States troops on the ground in Bosnia. From the calls that I am receiving in my office every day, he certainly has not convinced the people of Cincinnati, the people that I represent, that this is the right action. The calls are overwhelmingly coming in that we should not put United States troops on the ground in Bosnia.

I have talked to many, many of my colleagues here on both sides of the aisle, both Democrats and Republicans, and the calls are coming in from people all over this country, "Don't do it. Don't put United States troops on the ground in Bosnia."

The President apparently is determined to move ahead with this venture. I think he is making a terrible mistake. I wish he would listen to Congress, and I wish he would listen to the American people and, please, prevent this tragedy from happening. We do not need to lose American lives in Bosnia. I beg the President to reconsider this effort that he seems to be determined to make. I think it is a very tragic event. I hope I am wrong. I hope and pray that my concerns are unfounded and things will go well.

But I am very, very concerned that I am right, and if that happens, we are going to have many, many Americans who lose their lives in that very dangerous part of the world.

Mr. DORNAN. I thank the gentleman for his excellent remarks. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to start out by saying this is under no circumstances a partisan issue. It makes no difference whatsoever and would not ever make a difference to me whether the President was Republican or Democrat on this kind of an issue.

I listened really carefully to President Clinton's' speech, and I re-read the speech word for word just so I was

certain what he said. The vital United States interests the President laid out in his speech were broad, universal interests and would apply to any trouble spot in the world. This is not satisfactory.

I have said since I ran for Congress that I would support committing American troops only if vital, specific U.S. interests were involved, and the interests that he gave were not.

Militarily, U.S. troops are not needed. Our own Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated that Europe can handle the military aspect themselves. European powers have direct interest in Bosnia, and they should step up to the plate on this. Britain and France have done so and will be part of the operation as it is planned.

You know, it is interesting, Germany had not pledged troops until today. I guess Germany remembers World War II, when they occupied that area for several years during World War II. They understand the problems there of an occupying nation, and it just seems to me that maybe their reason for not joining until today is that they understood better than we do some of the problems that are involved.

The President promised that the troops in Haiti would be home in a year. Remember? It has now been 16 months, and the troops are still there. Why should we believe that Bosnia is different?

One of the things that the President did say was he said he would provide a clear mission statement, a specific operational plan, what are the objectives, how will these troops accomplish the objectives, and what is the exit strategy. Thus far, and he said he would present that, and I assume that that is still coming. I am not being critical at all. We just do not have it yet. We certainly need it before we can make the judgment as to whether or not troops should be sent.

Also we do not have the money to engage this operation. That is another very critical factor. We fight and work very hard to cut $2 million here or $12 million there from the budget. The estimate of the cost of this is $2.1 billion at the present time. Judging from all previous estimates that I have seen, you should multiply it at least by 2, so we are talking about, I believe, close to a $4 billion cost. Remember, this is money that we do not have. This is money that will have to be borrowed if we move into Bosnia.

The idea of balancing the budget is absolutely critical, and there are circumstances certainly where we would go ahead and even if we had to borrow the money, but only if we are certain of what is going to happen, what is the vital U.S. interest that is involved, what is the plan to actually achieve the kind of peace we are looking for and set up the conditions by which we can exit.

Those are the points that I see, and we will try to have an open mind and watch what the President comes up with for these things.

As of now, from what I have seen, my vote would be an absolute "no." I certainly hope and will do everything I can to see that we do get a vote on this in the House of Representatives.

I think the Senate should also vote on whether or not to authorize troops, ground troops in Bosnia.

Mr. DORNAN. I say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], I want to recommend a book to you on Mogadishu. On the cover is the picture of Durand's helicopter crew, the ones that were killed, Ray Frank, three full combat tours in Vietnam, big, handsome, blond David Cleveland, William, his mother called him David, the men called him William, like his father. He was one of the door gunners, and Tommy Fields, another door gunner. It is just called "Mogadishu." It tells a story of a tragedy in the Clinton administration that he just put behind him.

Let me ask you something, I say to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF], there is a report from my district office today. The calls dropped to 100 for the first time. It is usually 200. Not a single person calling my district office, oh, they will call now, detractors and stuff. We are going to ignore their calls, and I have every right to be as tough as I want on this because I am the one who went to Mogadishu less than 10 days after the last man was killed there, to photograph this whole area. They are saying 100 calls a day in my office without one saying "Go; we should go."

How are they in your office from the great Pacific Northwest?

Mr. METCALF. Our calls are running more than 30 to 1 against sending troops to Bosnia, and there comes a time certainly that you should listen to the American people.

Mr. DORNAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD].

Mr. SANFORD. I do not know how much more actually can be added between my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH], my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], go down the list, and therefore I mean you have touched on this idea of 200 American men, best-case scenario, dying. You have touched on the idea of spending $1.5 billion. You have touched on the idea we do not have a clearly defined exit strategy. You touched on the idea of 37,000 American boys being directly involved.

Mr. DORNAN. I have run out of time. We did not give you gentlemen enough heads-up over here.

The documents referred to are as follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, October 1995]

THE FOLLY OF U.N. PEACEKEEPING

(By Dale Van Atta)

Sonja's Kon-Tiki cafe is a notorious Serbian watering hole six miles north of Sarajevo. While Serb soldiers perpetrated atrocities in nearby Bosnian villages, local residents reported that U.N. peacekeepers from France, Ukraine, Canada and New Zealand regularly visited Sonja's, drinking and eating with these very same soldiers—and sharing their women.

The women of Sonja's, however, were actually prisoners of the Serb soldiers. As one soldier, Borislav Herak, would later confess, he visited Sonja's several times a week, raping some of the 70 females present and killing two of them.

U.N. soldiers patronized Sonja's even after a Sarajevo newspaper reported where the women were coming from. Asked about this, a U.N. spokesman excused the incident by saying no one was assigned to read the newspaper.

The U.N. soldiers who frequented Sonja's also neglected to check out the neighborhood. Less than 200 feet away, a concentration camp held Bosnian Muslims in inhuman conditions. Of 800 inmates processed, 250 disappeared and are presumed dead.

Tragically, Sonja's Kon-Tiki illustrates much of what has plagued U.N. peacekeeping operations: incompetent commanders, undisciplined soldiers, alliances with aggressors, failure to prevent atrocities and at times even contributing to the horror. And the level of waste, fraud and abuse is overwhelming.

Until recently, the U.N. rarely intervened in conflicts. When it did, as in Cyprus during the 1960s and '70s, it had its share of success. But as the Cold War ended, the U.N. became the world's policeman, dedicated to nation building as well as peacekeeping. By the end of 1991, the U.N. was conducting 11 peacekeeping operations at an annual cost of $480 million. In three years, the numbers rose to 18 operations and $3.3 billion—with U.S. taxpayers paying 31.7 percent of the bill.

Have the results justified the steep cost? Consider the U.N.'s top four peacekeeping missions:

BOSNIA

In June 1991, Croatia declared its independence from Yugoslavia and was recognized by the U.N. The Serbian-dominated Yugoslav army invaded Croatia, ostensibly to protect its Serbian minority. After the Serbs agreed to a cease-fire, the U.N. sent in a 14,000-member U.N. Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to build a new nation. (The mission has since mushroomed to more than 40,000 personnel, becoming the most extensive and expensive peacekeeping operation ever.)

After neighboring Bosnia declared its independence in March 1992, the Serbs launched a savage campaign of "ethnic cleansing" against the Muslims and Croats who made up 61 percent of the country's population. Rapidly the Serbs gained control of two-thirds of Bosnia, which they still hold.

Bosnian Serbs swept into Muslim and Croat villages and engaged in Europe's worst atrocities since the Nazi Holocaust. Serbian thugs raped at least 20,000 women and girls. In barbed-wire camps, men, women and children were tortured and starved to death. Girls as young as six were raped repeatedly while parents and siblings were forced to watch. In one case, three Muslim girls were chained to a fence, raped by Serb soldiers for three days, then drenched with gasoline and set on fire.

While this was happening, the UNPROFOR troops stood by and did nothing to help. Designated military "observers" counted artillery shells—and the dead.

Meanwhile, evidence began to accumulate that there was a serious corruption problem. Accounting procedures were so loose that the U.S. overpaid $1.8 million on a $21.8 million fuel contract. Kenyan peacekeepers stole 25,000 gallons of fuel worth $100,000 and sold it to the Serbs.

Corruption charges were routinely dismissed as unimportant by U.N. officials. Sylvana Foa, then spokesperson for the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva, said it was no surprise that "out of 14,000 pimply 18-year-olds, a bunch of them should get up to hanky-panky" like black-market dealings and going to brothels.

When reports persisted, the U.N. finally investigated. In November 1993 a special commission confirmed that some terrible but "limited" misdeeds had occurred. Four Kenyan and 19 Ukrainian soldiers were dismissed from the U.N. force.

The commission found no wrong-doing at Sonja's Kon-Tiki, but its report, locked up at U.N. headquarters and never publicly released, is woefully incomplete. The Sonja's Kon-Tiki incidents were not fully investigated, for example, because the Serbs didn't allow U.N. investigators to visit the site, and the soldiers' daily logbooks had been destroyed.

Meanwhile, Russian troop commanders have collaborated with the Serb aggressors. According to U.N. personnel at the scene, Russian battalion commander Col. Viktor Loginov and senior officer Col. Aleksandr Khromchenkov frequented lavish feasts hosted by a Serbian warlord known as "Arkan," widely regarded as one of the worst perpetrators of atrocities. It was also common knowledge that Russian officers directed U.N. tankers to unload gas at Arkan's barracks. During one cease-fire, when Serbian matériel was locked in a U.N. storage area, a Russian apparently gave the keys to the Serbs, who removed 51 tanks.

Eventually, Khromchenkov was repatriated. Loginov, after finishing his tour of duty, joined Arkan's Serbian forces.

Problems remained, however, under the leadership of another Russian commander, Maj. Gen. Aleksandr Perelyakin. Belgian troops had been blocking the movement of Serb troops across a bridge in northeastern Croatia, as required by U.N. Security Council resolutions. Perelyakin ordered the Belgians to stand aside. Reluctantly they did so, permitting one of the largest movements of Serbian troops and equipment into the region since the 1991 cease-fire.

According to internal U.N. reports, the U.N. spent eight months quietly trying to pressure Moscow to pull Perelyakin back, but the Russians refused. The U.N. finally dismissed him last April.

CAMBODIA

In 1991, the United States, China and the Soviet Union helped broker a peace treaty among three Cambodian guerrilla factions and the Vietnamese-installed Cambodian government, ending 21 years of civil war. To ease the transition to Cambodia's first democratic government, the U.N. created the U.N. Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC). In less than two years, about 20,000 U.N. peacekeepers and other personnel were dispatched at a cost of $1.9 billion.

Some of the Cambodian "peacekeepers" proved to be unwelcome guests—especially a Bulgarian battalion dubbed the "Vulgarians." In northwest Cambodia, three Bulgarian soldiers were killed for "meddling" with local girls. One Bulgarian was treated for 17 different cases of VD. The troops' frequent carousing once sparked a mortar-rifle battle with Cambodian soldiers at a brothel.

The Bulgarians were not the sole miscreants in Cambodia, as internal U.N. audits later showed. Requests from Phnom Penh included 6500 flak jackets—and 300,000 condoms. In the year after the U.N. peacekeepers arrived, the number of prostitutes in Phnom Penh more than tripled.

U.N. mission chief Yasushi Akashi waved off Cambodian complaints with a remark that "18-year-old hot-blooded soldiers" had the right to enjoy themselves, drink a few beers and chase "young beautiful beings." He did post an order: "Please do not park your U.N. vans near the nightclubs" (i.e., whorehouses). At least 150 U.N. peacekeepers contracted AIDS in Cambodia; 5000 of the troops came down with VD.

Meanwhile, more than 1000 generators were ordered, at least 330 of which, worth nearly $3.2 million, were never used for the mission. When U.N. personnel started spending the $234.5 million budgeted for "premises and accommodation," rental costs became so inflated that natives could barely afford to live in their own country. Some $80 million was spent buying vehicles, including hundreds of surplus motorcycles and minibuses. When 100 12-seater minibuses were needed, 850 were purchased—an "administrative error," UNTAC explained, that cost $8.3 million.

Despite the excesses, the U.N. points with pride to the free election that UNTAC sponsored in May 1993. Ninety percent of Cambodia's 4.7 million eligible voters defied death threats from guerrilla groups and went to the polls.

Unfortunately, the election results have been subverted by the continued rule of the Cambodian People's Party—the Vietnamese-installed Communist government, which lost at the ballot box. In addition, the Khmer Rouge—the guerrilla group that butchered more than a million countrymen in the 1970s—have refused to disarm and demobilize. So it was predictable that they would repeatedly break the ceasefire and keep up their killing. The U.N. has spent nearly $2 billion, but there is no peace in Cambodia.

SOMALIA

When civil war broke out in this African nation, the resulting anarchy threatened 4.5 million Somalis—over half the population—with severe malnutrition and related diseases. U.N. Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali, the first African (and Arab) to hold the position, argued eloquently for a U.N. peacekeeping mission to ensure safe delivery of food and emergency supplies. The U.N. Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM) was deployed to Mogadishu, the capital, in September 1992. It was quickly pinned down at the airport by Somali militiamen and was unable to complete its mission.

A U.S. task force deployed in December secured the Mogadishu area, getting supplies to the hungry and ill. After the Americans left, the U.N. took over in May 1993 with UNOSOM II. The $2-million-a-day operation turned the former U.S. embassy complex into an 80-acre walled city boasting air-conditioned housing and a golf course. When U.N. officials ventured out of the compound, their "taxis" were helicopters that cost $500,000 a week.

The published commercial rate for Mogadishu-U.S. phone calls was $4.91 a minute, but the "special U.N. discount rate" was $8.41. Unauthorized personal calls totaled more than $2 million, but the U.N. simply picked up the tab and never asked the callers to pay.

Meanwhile, the peacekeeping effort disintegrated, particularly as warlord Mohammed Aidid harassed UNOSOM II troops. As the civil war continued, Somalis starved. But U.N. peacekeepers—on a food budget of $56 million a year—dined on fruit from South America, beef from Australia from frozen fish from New Zealand and the Netherlands.

Thousands of yards of barbed wire arrived with no barbs; hundreds of light fixtures to illuminate the streets abutting the compound had no sockets for light bulbs. What procurement didn't waste, pilferage often took care of. Peacekeeping vehicles disappeared with regularity, and Egyptian U.N. troops were suspected of large scale black-marketing of minibuses.

These losses, however, were eclipsed in a single night by an enterprising thief who broke into a U.N. office in Mogadishu and made off with $3.9 million in cash. The office door was easy pickings: its lock could be jimmied with a credit card. The money, stored in the bottom drawer of a filing cabinet, had been easily visible to dozens of U.N. employees.

While the case has not been solved, one administrator was dismissed and two others were disciplined. Last summer, UNOSOM II itself was shut down, leaving Somalia to the same clan warfare that existed when U.N. troops were first deployed two years before.

RWANDA

Since achieving independence in 1962, Rwanda has erupted in violence between the majority Hutu tribe and minority Tutsis. The U.N. had a peacekeeping mission in that nation, but it fled as the Hutus launched a new bloodbath in April 1994.

Only 270 U.N. troops stayed behind, not enough to prevent the butchery of at least 14 local Red Cross workers left exposed by the peacekeepers' swift flight. The U.N. Security Council dawdled as the dead piled up, and a daily horror of shooting, stabbings and machete hackings. The Hutus were finally driven out by a Tutsi rebel army in late summer 1994.

Seven U.N. agencies and more than 100 international relief agencies rushed back. With a budget of some $200 million, the U.N. tried unsuccessfully to provide security over Hutu refugee camps in Rwanda and aid to camps in neighboring Zaire.

The relief effort was soon corrupted when the U.N. let the very murderers who'd massacred a half million people take over the camps. Rather than seeking their arrest and prosecution, the U.N. made deals with the Hutu thugs, who parlayed U.N. food, drugs and other supplies into millions of dollars on the black market.

Earlier this year the U.N. began to pull out of the camps. On April 22 at the Kibeho camp in Rwanda, the Tutsi-led military opened fire on Hutu crowds. Some 2000 Hutus were massacred.

Where was the U.N.? Overwhelmed by the presence of nearly 2000 Tutsi soldiers, the 200 U.N. peacekeepers did nothing. A U.N. spokesman told Reader's Digest, meekly, that the U.N. was on the scene after the slaughter for cleanup and body burial.

With peacekeeping operations now costing over $3 billion a year, reform is long overdue. Financial accountability can be established only by limiting control by the Secretariat, which routinely withholds information about peacekeeping operations until the last minute—too late for the U.N.'s budgetary committee to exercise oversight.

In December 1993, for example, when the budget committee was given one day to approve a $600-million budget that would extend peacekeeping efforts into 1994, U.S. representative Michael Michalski lodged an official protest: "If U.S. government employees approved a budget for a similar amount with as little information as has been provided to the committee, they would likely be thrown in jail."

More fundamentally, the U.N. needs to reexamine its whole peacekeeping approach, for the experiment in nation building has been bloody and full of failure. Lofty ideas to bring peace everywhere in the world have run aground on reality: member states with competing interests in warring territories, the impossibility of lightly armed troops keeping at bay belligerent enemies, and the folly of moving into places without setting achievable goals.

"It has been a fundamental error to put U.N. peacekeepers in place where there is no peace to keep," says Sen. Sam Nunn (D., Ga.), ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. "We've seen very vividly that the U.N. is not equipped, organized or financed to intervene and fight wars."

[From the Paris Match, Oct. 5, 1995]

OUR PILOTS ARE PRISONERS OF THE SERBS

(Translated by David Skelly)

Two tiny points in an incandescent sky. These images have been holding us in cruel suspense for nearly a month. The two points are two French officers, a captain pilot and a lieutenant navigator, shot down on August 30 in their Mirage 2000-K2, almost directly above Pale, the capital of the Bosnian Serbs, during the first NATO raid. Three exfiltration missions according to the CSAR (combat, search and rescue procedure), which had succeeded in rescuing Captain O'Grady, failed. The Serbs have confirmed that they are holding two men alive, but no one, not even the Red Cross envoys has actually seen them. These photos reached us from Pale. Here are the faces of the two prisoners whom France has been anxiously waiting to see. The first scenes of their captivity.

Peasants turned the lieutenant over to the 'special forces commandos'.

Being helped to walk by two Serbs from their special forces, Lieutenant Jose Souvignet seems to be suffering from a leg wound. Peasants turned the two airmen over to the "specijali," who have been hiding them from the whole world ever since.

The captain, Frederique Chiffot, snarls at his guards.

Contrary to what happened with the American pilot, ours were brought down in broad daylight, above a mountain in an area with a high density of Serbian soldiers. Militiamen in the city of Pale were able to be there when they came down, and so it was impossible for the Frenchmen to escape. As soon as they hit ground they were captured and stripped of their warning, location, and survival equipment. Since these unique photos were taken, probably very shortly after their capture (in the foreground, a militiaman is still holding their helmets), they have probably been moved from their place of captivity, making it very difficult to exfiltrate them.

According to rare Serbian information, it was thought that only Lieutenant Jose Souvignet had a leg wound. But here, Captain Frederique Chiffot, grimacing at the camera, also seems to be supported by members of the militia.

Three attempts already: NATO is doing everything possible to free them.

From September 5th to the 8th, three times over, NATO commandos have flown off in search of the two Frenchmen. These very complicated missions make use of airplanes and helicopters which have taken off from different bases, from Italian territory or the aircraft carrier "Theodore Roosevelt." On board this ship, the Admiral Smith's general staff is coordinating, second by second, the delicate precision engineering of this warriors' ballet. The first attempt was completely American, but the weather was not on our side. The second and third attempts were French and American. Only the latter enabled the commandos to set down on a meadow near Pale. In vain. They had to withdraw under fire from the Serbs before having found the prisoners. When they were taken back up in the helicopter, two had been wounded.

In the control room of the "Theodore Roosevelt" operations are being followed in real time. It was in an identical Mirage 2000 that the two pilots were brought down. Photos of the debris from the crash were widely disseminated in the press by the Serbs.

□ 1745

CHINA'S TOP DISSIDENT CHARGED 20 MONTHS AFTER DISAPPEARANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call attention to the House of Representatives and indeed further attention of our country to a recent event that happened in China. Last week, the Chinese Government formally charged Wei Jingsheng with trying to overthrow the Government of China. This is a source of very serious concern to all of us who care about human rights in China.

As you may recall, Mr. Speaker, Wei Jingsheng is China's foremost democracy advocate. He has been called the Sakharov of China. Many years ago, over 15 or 16 years ago, he was arrested by the Chinese Government for his pro-Democracy Wall activities.

Early on he spoke out for democracy, the need for democracy in China. He had been a soldier and an electrician and was sentenced to 15 years in prison. He served most of that sentence, and about 6 months ago, the Chinese released him when they were trying to put on a good face in order to attract the Olympics to China. You may recall that campaign.

Six months later, he was quickly rearrested after speaking openly for democracy and human rights, granting interviews to foreign reporters, meeting, indeed, with our own Secretary of State, Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights, John Shattuck, and writing essays for overseas publications, including the New York Times.

He was taken into custody on April 1, 1994, and has not been seen or heard from since. His family has not been allowed to see him, and requests from foreign governments and international rights groups for information on his case have gone unanswered.

After repeated inquires by his family, the Public Security Bureau acknowledged in April that Wei was under a form of house arrest. Since then the Chinese officials have merely referred to him as a criminal and have said that, without elaborating, he was under investigation. Now the Chinese Government has acted. They have officially charged him with a capital offense, trying to overthrow the Government.

This is, of course, ridiculous. However, the charge is of such seriousness and the nature of the Chinese judicial system of such concern that I call this to our attention. Trials in China are usually swift, in secret, and behind closed doors. The verdict is usually predetermined and severe. Attempting to overthrow the Government, as Wei Jingsheng is mistakenly charged with, is considered a political crime which can be punished by death.

Many of our colleagues in this body and in the Senate, indeed parliamentarians throughout the world, nominated Wei Jingsheng earlier this year for the Nobel prize. We were proud to do so.

I am calling this to the attention of the House of Representatives because I hope that we will have a resolution out of this body condemning the charges against Wei Jingsheng and calling for his immediate and unconditional release and demanding that if indeed he does go to trial, that foreign media and diplomatic observers be allowed to attend.

I mentioned that Wei Jingsheng had met with Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck in April, and since then he has been, as I say, detained, and now charged. This is very serious for the United States, because our Government has said that we will not use certain methods to improve human rights in China, we would not use economic sanctions, but we would do other things, and right now this administration has not spoken out strongly enough against the charging of Wei.

I recently wrote to the Vice President, Vice President Gore, asking him for a strong statement from the Clinton administration. Only strong public expressions of concern and interest at our highest levels will be read by the Chinese leadership as a true indicator of American policy regarding Wei and other democracy advocates. If we do not raise the issue of Wei's charges, it could be read as tacit consent by the United States of whatever fate China has chosen for Wei Jingsheng.

The public intervention of the Clinton administration is most important in establishing United States policy regarding the treatment of Wei Jingsheng, clearly and unequivocally. The need for public and strong statement at the highest levels, I repeat, of

the Clinton administration is critical given China's foreign ministry statement last week that the United States stop its confrontation with China at the U.N. Commission at Human Rights in Geneva. Such a statement, coupled with Wei's charge, is a challenge to the United States we must answer.

Mr. Speaker, I am very hopeful that the Clinton administration will indeed speak out. They were very, very strong in sending a message to the Chinese about Harry Wu. I commend them for their actions. That was responsible for Harry Wu's release. I hope they will do the same thing in the case of Wei Jingsheng and look forward to working with them and the Members of this body to free Wei Jingsheng.

INJUSTICE IN REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to at least make a statement about what we have heard over the last hour. I would just like to say that George Bush proclaimed a New World Order, but Bill Clinton is making one.

Bosnia is not about war, it is about peace. In the ethnically diverse community of Dayton, OH, three warring ethnic groups came together, sat down at a table, and made peace. I really do not understand how people can advocate pouring billions of dollars into a defense establishment to make war, and at the same time they can deny sick kids Medicaid, they can raise taxes on the working poor, but they are not willing to make peace. I do not understand that.

Also, I would just like to say a few words about an announcement that I heard about today, about the retirement of one of our leaders, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER]. I would just like to say that she is a trailblazer, a role model for all of us, and a real leader. Her leadership in the 105th Congress is sorely going to be missed. But because of her leadership I do not know how many Congresses before, she has made a way for me and other women who now serve in Congress, and her outspokenness on issues affecting families and children and women and men alike, really, has been really a beacon I guess, for all of us.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I thank her for the opportunity to join in paying tribute to our colleague, PAT SCHROEDER. It cannot be said better than you have done commending Representative SCHROEDER for her leadership. It is a sad day for us in the House of Representatives on the day that she announced she would not be seeking reelection.

Whether they know it or not, women across America, and, as you say, indeed men too, owe PAT SCHROEDER a great debt of gratitude. Through her leadership on issues relating to families and children, she has changed the public policy in that regard. It is our most important issue in fact that we deal with here, the issue of children.

But on this day in this House of Representatives, when on the one hand we are talking about the possibility of sending our young people to keep the peace in Bosnia, and at the same time we are talking about human rights throughout the world and talking about family and children, there is a person who served us here with great leadership, an articulate spokesperson for children, for human rights, for peace, and, at the same time, a strong, strong voice on the Committee on National Security, now called I think the Committee on National Security. So her expertise and her voice was heard across the spectrum of issues in our budget priorities. She has led us well. I hope she will continue to outside of Congress. I know she has plenty of wonderful options open to her, but, nonetheless, as happy as we are for her on her decision, it is a sad day.

I speak for myself and my constituents when I say that her presence in this Congress for this country will be sorely missed.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I do want to say one thing. I would like for Congresswoman SCHROEDER to come to this floor and tell the story, because I know she can tell it much better than I would ever be able to tell it, but she came to this Congress at a time when you just did not have women serving on the Committee on National Security and women serving in this Congress. She tells the story of how the chairman had she and the gentleman from California, RON DELLUMS, share a single chair. Those are the kinds of stories that this leader had to endure in order to make sure that I could get a full seat in the U.S. Congress. Her story is a wonderful story that needs to be told, and her leadership has benefited us all.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentlewoman will yield, I would just like to associate myself with those remarks about our leader. She has certainly been a role model for the women in Congress. Her leadership not only will be missed, but it is going to make our work extremely hard, because she has been just a Trojan for women's issues, for children's issues, and more national security issues. So this is truly a sad day for all of us.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It certainly is.

Mr. Speaker, changing our focus a little bit, I would like to ask a question, and the question is, what happens to a jogger, someone who strategizes, maps out a fitness routine, and the regime that is mapped out is done so that a target heart rate can be reached; and, unbeknownst, to our jogger, without any knowledge at all of our jogger, the wrong target heart rate has been given. Then the folks who gave the wrong heart rate allow the jogger to go out and jog. What happens? The jogger could die.

The issue that I am about to talk about is a real issue of life and death, political life and political death. In my opinion, we have a few southerners who have conspired to orchestrate the political death of blacks, Latinos, and women. I have a transcript of a Florida hearing that just took place.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. It was a response to a pretrial hearing on Monday, October 19.

Ms. MCKINNEY. It reads, "At the time the Degrande court drew the districting lines for the State of Florida, it engaged in a good faith effort to adopt a politically neutral redistricting plan that would enhance the voting opportunities for African-American and Hispanic voters. The Degrande court closely followed the dictates of the Voting Rights Act and traditional redistricting principles throughout this process. This court must now reexamine the redistricting lines drawn by plan 308 and decide whether the contours of District 3 are unconstitutional in light of Shaw versus Reno and Miller."

What this means is that in Florida the legislature did not draw the current congressional lines, the court did it, and when the court drew the lines, the court was operating in good faith, trying to do things that were beneficial to all of the people of the State of Florida. Now, because of what happened in North Carolina and what happened in Georgia, all of that is subject to change.

Joining us is the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK]. But let me give you just a brief history.

First of all, the Florida legislature could not pass a plan, so the courts had to intervene so that we could have elections in Florida. Now, there are many reasons why the Florida legislature could not pass a plan, but basically it was politics, politics, and more politics.

□ 1800

Everyone that was in charge of redistricting was running for Congress.

It is hard to take the politics out of politics.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. You cannot take the politics out of politics.

However, the courts drew the plan for Florida, and, basically, we are now at the stage where there was a ruling last Monday in that the courts ruled, with a dissent, that the Third Congressional District was racial gerrymandering but still could be constitutional, and we will go to a hearing or a trial early next year to determine based on Shaw versus Reno and the case of Georiga.

Ms. McKINNEY. I have a question to ask the gentlewoman, before she gets into her remarks, and it is my understanding that her district, the district that she represents, is 50 percent black and 50 percent white.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes.

Ms. McKINNEY. How can race be the predominant factor in a 50–50 district?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, it is not quite 50–50. It is 50.1 or 2.

Ms. McKINNEY. 50.1. So that makes it race-predominant.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, the fact is my district is one of the most integrated districts in Florida, if not in the country.

Ms. McKINNEY. If not in the country.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If not in the country. So race was a factor, but just one of many factors.

In fact, I am very proud of the Third Congressional District of Florida. Many of the people I represent were disenfranchised before my election. If we go back and just look at the way the voter participates in these districts, for example when we come out of an area and we are getting 80 percent of the vote, black and white, what does that tell my colleagues? That tells me that there is balance in my district. I have one of the most Democratic districts in the State of Florida.

Ms. McKINNEY. But the gentlewoman's district was challenged.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Challenged, that is correct, and we are headed to court.

Ms. McKINNEY. I am sure that this is costing the taxpayers of Florida an inordinate amount of money.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. And time, and also the frustration on the people of the Third Congressional District. Often my constituents come to me and say what are they trying to do to our district? Why is it that the voters from the Third Congressional District and other districts in Florida have to wrestle with the question of whether or not we are going to have our district?

Ms. McKINNEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been joined by the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] who served illustriously in the Florida legislature and probably knows more——

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If I may ask the gentlewoman to yield just for a moment to let me say one thing about the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Ms. McKINNEY. Certainly.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mrs. MEEK served in the Florida House, but when she was elected some 13 years ago to the Florida Senate, it was the first time in over 100 years that we elected a black to the Florida Senate, and she was the first black female ever elected to the Senate. So we do not have a long history in Florida of inclusion.

And, in fact, before our election in 1992, it was the first time in over 100 years, I am sorry, 120 years, that an African-American came to this Congress to represent Florida, even though Florida's population, as far as minorities is concerned, is over 40 percent. Good-old-boy politics has controlled how the districts have been drawn throughout Florida.

I do not know about any other place, but I can tell my colleagues about the history of Florida, and I know the gentlewoman from Georgia wants to yield to Mrs. MEEK.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues and compliment and commend them for having called this special order to talk to the country about some of the things that have happened in reapportionment.

I am reminded of a saying that the more things change, the more they remain the same. The gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. McKINNEY] has been on the forefront of this, and so has the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] but I want to say to them that it is just amazing and also ironic that after all of these years we are still fighting for the same thing that many had to fight for years ago.

I need to say to my two colleagues that their efforts will be rewarded, as well as all the rest of us. We must raise the consciousness level of the country as to what is happening in the reapportionment and apportionment fight. As everyone knows, every 10 years the census is taken, and then comes the reappointment process.

I am reminded of the struggle that I have undertaken in this for 10 or more years, and I am reminded of what the poet, Robert Frost, once wrote about; these woods are lovely, dark and deep, and I am tempted to sleep; but I have promises to keep, promises to keep, and miles to go before I sleep.

That is what has happened to my colleagues here. They know this has been a fight from the very beginning. I can recall when I went to the Florida legislature in 1979. There were only two blacks in the Florida legislature, and they were certainly not treated, Ms. McKINNEY, the way we are treated today. They were treated as blacks, and they pretty much were isolated from the other people there.

When I went, in 1979, I was able to participate in the reapportionment of the Florida legislature, and because of that we were able to bring on Ms. BROWN and all of my other colleagues who came after me.

Ms. McKINNEY. If the gentlewoman would allow me to reclaim my time for a moment. The tool that the gentlewoman used was the Voting Rights Act.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Yes, I did, and it was under attack even then. The most amazing thing is that we were able to bring Ms. BROWN and five other people there in the House but we were unable to get a congressional seat. We had the numbers then. There were enough African-American inhabitants in the population of Florida, but my colleagues would be surprised to know that every congressperson from this body, from Florida, had either a paid consultant or someone there to be sure that their influence could be felt in the reapportionment process.

Ms. McKINNEY. So, actually, what the gentlewoman is saying is that the Members of Congress and the legislators were picking their voters before the voters had a chance to pick their representatives.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Absolutely. My colleagues would be surprised at how they utilized the black populace, in that they really fought hard to get the African-Americans, particularly the Democrats, because what they wanted to do was to be sure they had enough African-Americans in their district, in their congressional district, to be sure that they came back to Congress. Because, naturally, it was sort of traditional and fully accepted during that time that if an individual were black, they were Democrat and they would vote for a white Congressman who represented their district.

I want to give my colleagues another example of what happened, and I am surprised that they are looking at the gentlewoman from Florida's district and talking about gerrymandering, because hers certainly is not nearly as gerrrymandered as the district that sent me to the Florida Senate. When I came from the house, I was on the reapportionment committee and I could see what was happening to us in the Florida house. I lived in Liberty City. My representative in the Florida Senate lived across Biscayne Bay, a body of water, all the way over on Miami Beach. He represented 103,000 African-Americans. Yes, he was our representative in the senate.

It shows my colleagues that this gerrymandering, that I am a living example of what happens. So I insisted that that seat be removed from over on that side and we be given the representation that we so direly deserved and needed, and that is how I got to the Florida Senate, by doing what the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida are doing now, fighting for the representation that I knew that we needed to have.

Ms. McKINNEY. Congresswoman, there is an article here that I have from the Florida Times Union of November 24 where a noted political scientist from the University of Georgia is quoted as saying if a white Congressman has a 10-percent or 20-percent minority constituency, they might not have a person who votes 100 percent of the time with the black agenda but they will get those votes from him some of the time. So, apparently, representation some of the time is Ok.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. It was OK because what they were doing was using

us as mayonnaise on the sandwich to be sure that they got a chance to come back to Congress instead of utilizing us and using us to represent us.

I really feel very emotional about this situation, and to see now that my young sisters have picked up this battle and they are running hard and winning it, it just gives me such pleasure to see when the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida stand up and talk about this.

We did not have the technology available that my colleagues have now. I had to draw my maps with a piece of crayon to try to quickly show, because we were not allowed on the computers at that time, and the computers were just coming in, and they had these maps already drawn. But I think with the two of my colleagues, their maps and their legal representation, they have it all.

Ms. MCKINNEY. We have everything except the Supreme Court.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Everything but the Supreme Court, that is right.

And what Mrs. Bethune would say, when she saw the kind of fight that the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida have put up, she would say what hath God wrought. So God has wrought that these two sisters here would keep up this fight, which we have had all these years, and to stand here tonight and to see how the two of my colleagues are pushing forward to be sure that we do not get misrepresented again, and that the people that we represent will have representation in Congress and in the statehouses and all over this country.

I have been in several legal fights for reapportionment, and even though I am a little beyond the age that these young women are, I expect to continue to do so. But it is good to be here in the Congress and to know that, Ms. MCKINNEY, there are people in this country who know that the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida and the rest of us have served notably here in the Congress, and it was not because of the color of our skin but the content of our character.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Oh, you are wonderful.

We also know that this cold wind that has blown across the South did not start in Georgia and it did not stop in Florida. Actually, I think it probably started in North Carolina. And we have the subject of the North Carolina redistricting fight on the floor with us.

And we also know that it swept through Texas, and we have the gentlewoman from Dallas with us; and we hope that Alabama will be spared, but we have the gentleman from Alabama with us, and I will yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank and applaud the gentlewoman from Georgia and the gentlewoman from Florida for organizing this special order this evening so that we can highlight the issue of voting and the issue of democracy in this country, really.

I came in when my colleagues were all paying tribute to our colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado, PAT SCHROEDER, who has indicated that she is not planning to run again after serving out this term, and I want to join with them first in paying a special tribute to her and join in expressing the sentiments that others have expressed, that she will be missed very much by those of us who have admired her and followed her lead on many issues.

Second, I want to say that tomorrow, in Durham, NC, there is an opening of a traveling exhibition which is called "The long road up the hill. African-Americans in Congress." I was on the phone before I came over here talking to a newspaper reporter in Raleigh-Durham about that exhibit, and I pulled out the press release that had been issued about that exhibit. It catalogs the history of African-Americans in the Congress of the United States, and I thought it might be helpful to take a minute or two, if the gentlewoman would allow me, to put this in a historical context.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I certainly will.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. The gentlewoman says this hurricane started in North Carolina in 1993 or 1992. It really started in the South more than 100 years ago.

□ 1815

And I think we really need to keep that in perspective. So, if I could, let me talk a little bit about the historical context that we are dealing with.

Between 1870 and 1897, after the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments had freed the slaves and granted them citizenship and the right to vote, Southern States actually elected 22 black men to Congress. And this is not a sexist thing. It just happened that all of them were men at that time. Some had been slaves; other had been born free. All of them, ironically, during that period from 1870 to 1897, were members of the Republican Party, which was the party at that time that most black people associated themselves with.

In 1870, a black minister was tapped to fill Confederate President Jefferson Davis' unexpired Senate term. Hiram Revels of Mississippi became the first American of African descent to serve in the Senate. That same year, Joseph Rainey was sworn into office in the House of Representatives; Jefferson Long of Georgia was sworn into the House 1 month later. Rainey went on to serve five terms, often speaking in favor of civil rights legislation, outlawing racial discrimination in juries, schools, public accommodations and transportation.

Many of the early African-American Congressmen introduced bills calling for education and land ownership for blacks and removal of what was called cotton taxes. Most of those bills died in committee because their sponsors often lacked the support of their white colleagues. That might sound familiar to some of us in this day and time.

During the chaotic Reconstruction years, defeated white politicians disputed the elections of blacks to Congress 21 times. So, this is not a new phenomenon that we are dealing with. Congressmen whose elections were challenged often were not sworn in until a House committee had reviewed the evidence and found in their favor. Several black lawmakers were not seated for many months. Some were not sworn in until a short time before the end of their terms. Two duly elected Congressmen who were elected, black Congresspeople, never, ever got to serve.

Finally, a story that I can relate to, by the time we got to the late 1800's, there was only one black African-American left in the Congress of the United States. He was a gentleman from North Carclina. His name was George H. White, and he was the last former slave to serve in Congress. He took the oath of office in March 1897, and after an election in 1898, in which the evidence indicated that even in precincts where there were only 200 or 300 people registered, in some cases 700 or 800 people voted and he was voted out of office. He took to the floor of the House of Representatives in 1901 and made a historic speech in which he professed to be speaking on behalf of the outraged, heartbroken, bruised and bleeding, but God-fearing people. He went on to predict that someday, someday, black representatives would rise up and come again to this House of Representatives. That was in 1901.

His prophesy did not become a reality that we would have another black Representative in Congress until 28 years later, Mr. Speaker, 28 years later.

Ms. MCKINNEY. But how many years from North Carolina did it take?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. That was the next point I wanted to make. It was not until the gentlewoman from North Carolina, EVA CLAYTON, my colleague, and I were elected in 1992, 91 years later, that an African-American was elected to Congress from the State of North Carolina.

So, the point I am making, and I will yield back to you all to carry this on, is this is not a new phenomenon. We have been fighting this battle since years and years and years ago, and we fought it in the face of literacy tests, where people were required to read and interpret documents before they were allowed to vote; grandfather clauses, which prohibited people from voting unless their grandfathers had voted, keeping freed slaves from casting ballots; poll taxes which kept poor people, blacks and whites alike, from voting;

lynchings, which were flourishing throughout the South, and now in that historical context, the Supreme Court would ask us to be color-blind as a Nation and go back to a situation where we are absent minority representation in Congress.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield just for 1 minute?

I have my horror story that I want to put in. Florida's horror story. At the time Josiah Wells was the first Member of Congress from Florida. He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1879 from Gainesville, FL. I represent Gainesville, FL, which is in the Third Congressional District. Josiah Wells' election was challenged and he lost his seat after only 2 months in office. However, by that time he had already been reelected to a new term. But listen, believe it or not, his next victorious election was challenged after the ballots were burned in the courthouse fire, ending the first congressional career of Florida's first black Representative. It took Florida 120 years to elect another African-American.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following for the RECORD.

Next week, the Supreme Court will hear arguments in yet another round of reapportionment cases; it has an opportunity to end the mischief started in 1993 when it announced its decision in Shaw versus Reno. In the Shaw case, the Court ruled that white voters can state a claim under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment if they allege that a district is so irregular or bizarrely shaped that it could only be understood as a racial gerrymander. Last term, in reviewing a Shaw-type attack on the congressional redistricting plan in Georgia, the Court went a step further. It ruled that where race is the predominant factor in redistricting that has resulted in the substantial disregard of traditional redistricting principles, then a district is presumed to be unconstitutional.

When Shaw was first handed down, a number of civil rights groups and political observers felt that the decision would have minimal impact. But the Shaw decision has taken on a life of its own. Cases attacking congressional districts as alleged racial gerrymanders are pending in Florida, Texas, North Carolina, Louisiana, State legislatures, and local governments.

Of course, it troubles me a great deal that the end result of all these cases may return us to the pre-voting rights days when the Halls of Congress were reserved for white males. In those days, congressional districts drawn to protect white incumbents, no matter how bizarre or irregular they looked, and regardless of the all-white racial composition, the districts were viewed as politics. Eliminating districts where minority voters comprise a bare majority of the voters will return us to the days of segregation when Congress resembled an all-white club.

As troubling as all this is, I am equally concerned that the Supreme Court has refused to look at facts. The Court has consistently overlooked that in each of the States where the challenged majority minority districts were drawn, racially polarized voting patterns existed. What this means is that before the majority minority districts were drawn, a factual basis existed that minority voters were politically cohesive, that is, they supported minority candidates, and whites usually voted as a bloc to defeat the minority voters' preferred candidate. This is important because not only is the creation of majority minority districts necessary to overcome the effects of the white bloc vote, but the Supreme Court itself has consistently recognized in decisions spanning the last 20 years that such racial bloc voting has been the principal cause of minority vote dilution.

What is especially troubling about this is that the Court seems to have accepted racial bloc voting as a fact of political life, but chooses to ignore the reality of its impact. Thus, in the Georgia case, the Court said that the deliberate creation of majority minority districts may increase the very patterns of racial bloc voting that majority minority districts are said to counteract. In fact, the developing evidence that the opposite may be true, that creation of majority minority districts may be reducing, not increasing, bloc voting.

Consider, for example, the majority minority congressional district in Mississippi created in the 1980's. The district was barely majority black and in 1986, Congressman Mike Espy was elected. In his first election, Espy generated only 21 percent of the white vote. In Espy's reelection bid in 1988 and 1990, nearly half of the white voters in the district voted for him. Other members of the Congressional Black Caucus have reported similar increases in white support after their initial reelection. We attribute this increase in crossover voting in two circumstances: First, our decision to represent all our voters regardless of race; and second, a reduction in white fear and harmful stereotyping that may have predated our initial election.

The creation of minority opportunity districts comprised of a majority black voting age population does not entrench racial bloc voting. Although, there is a need to study the evidence that is available on this point, what evidence there is suggests that the creation of majority-minority districts promotes a political system in which race does not matter as much as it did before.

Along with a number of African-Americans, I was elected to Congress in 1992 in a district that was one of the most integrated in my State. My district is roughly 50 percent black and 50 percent white in voting population. Does that sound segregated or gerrymandered? All of my constituents are important to me, whether they are black or white. That would be true whether my district was 50 percent black or 99 percent black. My district is one of the most Democratic districts in the State of Florida. Many of my voters had been disenfranchised.

Redistricting since the 1990 census has marked tremendous gains for women and minorities. 1992, the year I was elected to Congress, was very historic for Florida. For the first time in over 120 years, an African-American was elected to Congress from Florida. At the same time I was elected to represent the Third Congressional District, my colleagues, Representative CARRIE MEEK and Representative ALCEE HASTINGS, were also elected to represent Florida in Congress. Sixteen new African-American Members, most from the South, were seated in the House of Representatives and one African-American Senator, CAROL MOSELY-BRAUN, was seated, expanding the number of Congressional Black Caucus Members to 40, the largest ever. There are now 57 women, 19 Hispanics, 8 Asians, and 1 American-Indian. This is the highest number of minorities to ever serve in the history of the U.S. Congress. Despite these gains, less than 2 percent of the elected officials in this country are black. We still need the Voting Rights Act, we still have a long way to go. I, and others, would not have the privilege of serving in Washington if it were not for the courage and sacrifice of those great leaders who led the way before us.

Let me tell you a little bit about a great leader, Josiah Wells, who was Florida's first Member of Congress. Josiah Wells was first elected to the House of Representatives in 1879, from Gainesville, FL, which is in the Third Congressional District. Josiah Wells' election was challenged and he lost his seat after only 2 months in office. However, by that time, he had already been reelected to a new term. Believe it or not, his next victorious election was challenged after ballots were burned in a courthouse fire. And thus ended the congressional career of Florida's first Black representative.

Once Reconstruction began, 21 black Congressmen were elected from the South between 1870 to 1901. However, after 1901, when Jim Crow tightened his grip, no black person was elected to Congress from the South for over 70 years. It is more timely than ever, to study what happed to black representation during Reconstruction. This period may seem like ancient history, but what happened then seems to be happening all over again.

The court would do well to consider these facts, rather than assuming the worst about the body politic and African-American Members of Congress. Integrated districts like mine are good for minority voters because they provide for electoral opportunities where none previously existed. They are also for democracy in the sense that they help to break down racial isolation and polarization.

When a minority group like African-Americans, who were denied a representative in the Florida delegation for 120 years before my election in 1992, are able to elect their candidate to Congress, it makes our Government more legitimate because it is more inclusive and less prone to bias. I cannot understand why the Supreme Court would want it any other way, yet their decisions up to now are leading us precisely down that path. Because I have faith in the system and in the rule of law, I remain hopeful that the Court see these truths to be self-evident.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. The point is that there were funny things going on in that time, and there are funny things going on now; all designed to assure that the minority community does not have representation in this body.

White I do not want to dwell on the historical context, I do think it is important to get it into a historical context so that people understand that

this is not something that we come to complain about just because it is happening in 1990. This has been going on for well over a hundred years, and for us, it has been going on in this country ever since we came to these shores.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I think the gentleman's point about the historical context in which this whole drama that is not being played out must be viewed is very important. To reiterate, 21 times blacks had their elections challenged, blacks in Congress had their elections challenged. Right now, we are looking at challenges that have been filed or are planning to be filed in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina legislative districts, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, New York, and Illinois. You are absolutely right, that this is not anything new.

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. If the gentlewoman would yield just for 1 more minute, because I am going to have to leave and I do want to put this in a slightly different context also, in addition to the historical context, because the Supreme Court has suggested that all of the sudden we should wave a magic wand and will that the Nation and its voters be color-blind and this problem will be solved.

Often, in talking about this and getting people to understand how ridiculous that notion is, I make reference to what has recently transpired in South Africa where they had a very small white minority controlling that country for years and years and years. Then they had a miraculous historic transition to a real Democratic government.

The question I ask is, "Do you think that the United States of America would have been satisfied if the black majority in South Africa had come forward with a proposed democracy that said we are going to be color-blind; we are not going to take race into account at all; we are not going to assure the white minority in South Africa representation in this new Democratic government?" Do you think that the United States of America would have stood still for that kind of thinking?

My answer, obviously, is no, because it would have been ridiculous to think that all of those years of history could have just been wiped out and we could have created a color-blind society, a color-blind democracy in South Africa. It could not happen.

If the white minority in South Africa was going to have any chance of having a fair shot at representation and having its views reflected in that democracy, the only way it was going to happen was to set up a system that allowed them to have representation.

Yet, if we take that scenario and we reverse the roles, our Supreme Court essentially is suggesting that exactly what we would have rejected in South Africa is what we should be doing in our democracy here in the United States.

It is outrageous. It makes no sense in terms of fairness. It makes no sense in terms of the political and historical realities of the situation.

So, I applaud the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON and the gentlewoman from Georgia, Ms. MCKINNEY and the gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. BROWN. I applaud all of these gentlewomen for doing this this evening, and bringing this issue back into focus. Especially, since on Tuesday of this coming week, the Supreme Court is, again, hearing oral arguments in the North Carolina case and in the Texas case.

Our Nation and our people need to be focused on this issue and why it is important to have every segment of our society represented if we are to have an effective democracy in this country.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Will the gentleman yield just for one moment before he leaves? Can the gentleman from North Carolina shed some light on what the Supreme Court will be reviewing as far as Shaw versus Reno?

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. I think there is a real substantial question about what they will be reviewing. They set up a series of criteria in the original Shaw versus Reno decision. Many of those criteria were not even mentioned when the Supreme Court decided the Georgia case. They seemed to change the criteria.

So, the North Carolina case has been tried under criteria that we do not know whether are applicable criteria any more or not. I am hoping that they will evaluate the case on the criteria that they set up in the North Carolina case. But even if they do not, if they evaluate it on the criteria that they set in the Georgia case, that race cannot be the predominant factor, I still am confident that even on that standard, the districts can and should be upheld both in North Carolina and in Texas.

□ 1830

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentleman, with respect to his South Africa comments, raises an interesting question that I am glad you answered.

We have with us a gentleman from Alabama, who is a strong fighter, always has been a strong fighter, and now he comes to the floor of this House to make sure that what happens in this whole redistricting arena is not something that catches people off guard. We want to make sure that folks are not asleep while this quiet counterrevolution takes place.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the historical analysis that both Members gave dealing with the State of Florida as well as North Carolina. We also have a history in Alabama. I am the first African American to represent African Americans or anyone else in the State of Alabama in 117 years.

I, too, come, being the fourth from the State, the fourth African American. But let me tell you about the second and the third. They never served. They were elected, but they never served, because their elections were a challenged, and that is a tragedy. But it is all reflective of what our country has undergone during our short history.

Unfortunately, there are those in the majority that believe in democracy but do not believe in diversity. They will use such terms as equality, such terms as colorblind society to justify why there are not nor should not be African-Americans in Congress or in the State houses or in city halls anywhere in this country.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, what is colorblind? Does that mean we are invisible?

Mr. HILLIARD. I would think in the context that it is used by those who are against diversity, against African-Americans participating in the democratic process in this country, it means invisible, yes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, that means that you do not participate.

The point I was making is a very simple point. Throughout history, those persons who have been in the majority always seek ways and vehicles to protect their majority status in every respect, if you look at any country.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, protecting majority status, there is nothing wrong with that. Our presence in this body does not threaten the majority status.

Mr. HILLIARD. Well, it does not threaten it from the standpoint, from your standpoint. That is because I am sure you believe in diversification. You believe in participation by everyone. But protection of the majority status to those persons that I have come in contact with and, as I say, I am from the South, means that everything has to be the way of the majority, which means they do not appreciate diversity. And they are not interested in districts if the districts produce African-American Representatives, or any minority Representatives.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a 10-year-old son. My son accompanies me on the floor of this House. Now, if my presence here threatens the majority status, how do I explain that to my son when he clearly looks around and says: "Well, mama, there ain't enough of you. There ain't very many women in this body. There ain't very many African-Americans in this body." So what is threatened by my presence in this body?

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, it is the same type of threat that is pervasive throughout our society. Even if we look at affirmative action policies,

which is very much akin to this issue and to this argument. Set-asides, 5 percent. It is a threat because it is not 100 percent. They want 100 percent. So they are against affirmative action. They are against set-asides. And we are only talking about 5 out of 100 percent. But that is 5 percent that is too much, because they cannot have it also. That is the type of threat that is in our society. It has been here.

Ms. MCKINNEY. So those who have 96 percent are not satisfied unless there is 100 percent?

Mr. HILLIARD. Absolutely. Unfortunately, this is also the philosophy of the highest court in our land and the Supreme Court. And it does not allow for diversity in anything.

I am going to yield, because my colleague from Texas has been here patiently, and she has some things to say.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Let me express my appreciation for the sponorship of this hour. I will not dwell on the history of Texas because we all know it. But I want to dwell on the present.

We have encouraged our children and our grandchildren that this democracy is worth dying for. We have said that this is our country, and we are going to fight for this country, that this is the greatest country in the world. But they do not understand that, when you follow the rules, get education and training, that the opportunities are different for you.

Mr. HILLIARD. And limited.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I believe strongly that I have represented the district that I was elected in as well or better than any previous elected official. I have answered mail. I have never referred to my constituents as "you people." I have been responsive. I have not just sent form letters. I have researched the issues. And I try very hard to come before them to listen. I have learned a lot by listening.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague has given representation all of the time whereas before it was representation some of the time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, the representation from my area and for me meant seeing my elected official once every couple of years at some of the churches or buying a ticket or a table to a church or the NAACP banquet. That was my representation.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. You mean your representation was not showing up once a year at the festival?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I can guarantee you, they showed up every other year and at the churches.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I think representation, one of the things that the research will have shown is that, when African-Americans are elected, they represent all of the people. When we fight for school lunch programs, I want every last one of our kids to eat all over the country, really.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. When I look out for corporate opportunities, for research and development, rarely are those large businesses owned by people that look like me. But I believe strongly that, when we have a strong business community and lots of research to look out for the future, that it is good for all of us. But all of us then must have some opportunity in it.

We will fight the wars. We will help to do things. But when we are treated as invisibles or unwanteds, then it does not encourage my children or my grandchildren to go to college, to go to training, to be well equipped, because they see parents are having a struggle after they have done it. They do not know whether there will be an opportunity.

There is no understanding in my community why the district that I represent is being attacked. Because, you see, it is less than 50 percent African-American, and we have districts in Texas that are 88 and 90 percent Anglo, but they are constitutional. I do not understand that. Are they unconstitutional because it happens to be a few more that the incumbents allowed me to put in a district, because our efforts in Texas were to preserve the incumbents?

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentlewoman from Texas, from Dallas, as well as the gentlewoman from Houston have both endured constitutional challenges to their districts where the lower court found that their districts were unconstitutional.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. The second time around.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the district in Dallas was found unconstitutional, and the district in Houston, more than ably represented by Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, was also found unconstitutional.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I forgot to say that 20 years ago Barbara Jordan represented this district, and that is really frightening because we are talking about regression here. This is the district that was held by Barbara Jordan, one of the first females elected to Congress.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Barbara Jordan's historic district has now been found unconstitutional.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Georgia because we have spent many hours discussing our families and our sons. How important it is for us to give encouragement to young people, as my colleague from Texas has already mentioned. I listened passionately, as others were speaking passionately. I might remind us, as this comes somewhat to a close, of the words that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT] offered about the last African-American preceding this era who served here in the House and who had to leave not of his own accord in 1901. I think it is important because, as the American people are watching, they are looking at two gentlewomen from Florida, and the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from North Carolina, and all of us look alike. And they might wonder what is this issue.

It is an issue of democracy. It is an issue that would be as attractive and should be to our Hispanic brothers and sisters, our white brothers and sisters, our Asian brothers and sisters, because it is a question of disenfranchising people. And on December 5, 1995, we will again be in the U.S. Supreme Court challenging some of the districts in Texas and North Carolina.

Might I say something that I take great offense at, in fact I am appalled, and I might simply give just a very small, small summary of that case. The petitioners in the Richards versus Vera case, the Texas case in particular, came to sue that whole redistricting plan. They sued the whole State of Texas. They said the whole plan was wrong. But when it came down to a final solution, the only districts that they held unconstitutional were the 29th, Hispanic district, the 30th in Dallas, and, of course, the 18th, all of which were very much diverse, mine being under 50 percent African-American. But the court said that these districts were like racial apartheid.

I take great issue to describe democratically drawn districts that allow people to select a person of their choosing as an ugly term compared to South Africa of racial Apartheid. To the American people, that is not true. It is something that you should not accept. It is simply the adding of diversity.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out what the gentlewoman has referred to. The entire map of Texas was challenged, and they picked over this district. Talking about the lower court, the three judge panel found this district here, which is 91 percent white, constitutional. They did not find anything wrong with that district. They had to leap all the way to Barbara Jordan's district and say: Now, no, we do not want people like Barbara Jordan in Congress, so her district is unconstitutional; but this district right here withstands constitutional scrutiny.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Until the Voting Rights Act was in place, the Hon. Barbara Jordan would not have been in the U.S. Congress to represent all of the people and all Americans.

Ms. MCKINNEY. The gentlewoman is absolutely right.

I would like to conclude by saying that I know that there are people who understand this issue, who are not asleep during the counterrevolution and who truly appreciate that there is something wrong when a district like

the Sixth District of Texas can be found constitutional, and the districts that we all represent can be found unconstitutional or can be challenged as to whether or not they are constitutional.

□ 1845

I received a letter dated November 9 from Richard Hamilton from Fleetwood, PA, and he says, "I'm a white northern conservative Republican. You have gained my respect through this speech. I wish there was some way I could help you with your problem. To lose someone like yourself through this redistricting is a tragedy for your district."

This comes from the pen of a conservative, a staunch pro-gun, pro-life, small-government, low-taxes conservative:

Government needs people like yourself. Your voting record, I'm sure, would be directly opposite to my views. No matter. This is a democracy. Even though I may not agree with some of your views, I respect them. Having heard you, I would be compelled to vote for you. You are qualified in every sense. I would be honored to have you represent me in Congress. Sounds crazy; doesn't it?

Mr. Speaker, it does not sound crazy at all. Mr. Hamilton gets it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield for just a moment, we say the word "democracy." And I applaud her for that letter because that is a commonsense American, and that is why I think this evening is important, so that individuals understand that we are not trying to grab something that does not belong to us or grab something for our personal selves. What will happen is your constituents, those who you represent at this point, will be denied the opportunity to select someone of their choosing, and that person can be of any array of individuals, but they have the opportunity now, more than they have ever had before in history, to do so, but this body is also a republic.

Some people always hear the word "Republican" because it is in the majority right now. A republic means that you have a representative body and that we are all not alike. Before the Voter Rights Act of 1965 they were all alike, and in fact until women got the right to vote, they were all alike, and it is since these laws have created opportunities we have seen women coming to the U.S. Congress, and we have seen minorities, and particularly African-Americans, Hispanics, and we have Asians coming into this body; that is a republic. That is what we are saying to the American people.

Why would the Constitution be selected to undermine the rights of citizens to select someone of their choosing?

Ms. MCKINNEY. The Supreme Court has taken the bold step of declaring the district that I represent unconstitutional. I do not lose. The people of America lose. And if each one of us is taken out of this body, what kind of republic, what kind of democracy, can America claim?

Is it that the Congressman from Alabama wants to say some concluding words?

Mr. HILLIARD. I just want to add that it is important that we preserve American democracy, and in order to preserve democracy we must make sure that all persons in this country are represented, that all persons participate, and there is no other way of doing it.

Thus through district representation it is what our forefathers would have fought for if we had had districts at that time, but because of the fact things were so small, there were so few Americans, there was not a need for it.

But things have changed. Our Constitution has changed, and it has changed because it wanted to make sure that protections that were not granted before to those persons who were absent are now granted.

So we need to, along without our forefathers, make sure that everything is constitutional and everyone has an opportunity to participate.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I have a piece of legislation which has been introduced, House Resolution 2545, which proposes a solution to this problem. It gets us to color blindness, it gets us to republican representative democracy, it gets us to the kind of participation that we all want and value in this country.

In the next special order we will talk about some solutions to this problem that do not rely on single-Member districts which have been the tool that the Voting Rights Act allowed us that are now under attack because they have been so successful.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. In closing, next week, when the Supreme Court will hear the arguments in another reapportionment case, let me say that I have faith in the system, and I do believe that the Supreme Court can clear up what they have started in 1993 in Shaw versus Reno and acknowledge what really drives districts. It is not race; it is politics. It is politics, my colleagues. It is politics.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I would just like to say in conclusion thank you to all of the Members of this body who have come to me personally and, I am sure, have come to each of the other Members who are on this floor right now to express their concern about what is happening in redistricting, and how valuable our participation is and how valuable the notion of diversity is to having policies produced that are meaningful to the broad spectrum of the American electorate.

MONTGOMERY BUS BOYCOTT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, this Friday marks the 40th anniversary of the Montgomery bus boycott and the creation of the Montgomery Improvement Association. This Friday marks the start of an American journey. In my home State of Alabama, 40 years ago, African-Americans said they were sick and tired of being mistreated and humiliated; sick and tired of being kicked by the brutal feet of oppression; and sick and tired of being denied access to full American citizenship.

This was the most significant boycott of the civil rights movement. On December 1, 1955, when Mrs. Rosa Parks decided not to stand up and move to the rear of the bus, this was the day when African-Americans stood up to injustice and moved to the forefront of the struggle to outlaw discrimination, segregation and the notion of separate but equal.

For 13 months, African-Americans in Montgomery refused to ride the buses. They refused to accept an unjust system that demoralized and humiliated them.

The strength and spirit of these courageous citizens captured the consciousness of the entire world.

A lawsuit was subsequently filed challenging the constitutionality of bus segregation. The United States Supreme Court found that the Montgomery, AL statutes regarding the segregation of passenger seating was in violation of the Constitution of the United States. On December 21, 1956, 13 months after the boycott began, African-Americans boarded Montgomery City Line buses free to sit where they pleased.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a resolution recognizing the Montgomery bus boycott as the beginning of the American civil rights movement. It is proper and appropriate for the House of Representatives to commemorate this historical event and pay tribute to the courageous women and men who placed themselves in harm's way in the pursuit of justice, fairness, and equal treatment under the laws.

I urge my colleagues to support and cosponsor the resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HEFNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of medical reasons.

Mr. COSTELLO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today after 8 p.m. and Thursday, November 30, 1995, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHUMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. FOWLER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today and on November 30.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. HAMILTON in three instances.

Mr. KLECZKA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. FOWLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HILLIARD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. FLANAGAN.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. REED.

Mrs. FOWLER.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. MORAN.

Mr. COX of California.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. BARCIA.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 30, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1720. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred when food was provided to all participants of Task Force 130, U.S. Army South [USARSO] and charge against Developing Countries Combined Exercise Program [DCCEP] funds, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1721. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act totaling $45,488 in the fiscal year 1989 Operation and Maintenance, Air Force appropriation, which occurred in the 3d Tactical Fighter Wing at Clark Air Base in the Republic of the Philippines, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1722. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of four related violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1723. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-150, "Budget Support Temporary Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1724. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a correction to the proposed regulations governing communications disclaimer requirements (11 C.F.R. sections 110.11), pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(d); to the Committee on House Oversight.

1725. A letter from the Chief of Staff, The White House, transmitting certification that no person or persons with direct or indirect responsibility for administering the Executive Office of the President's Drug Free Workplace Plan are themselves subject to a program of individual random drug testing, pursuant to section 624 of Public Law 104-52; jointly, to the Committee on Appropriations and Government Reform and Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. QUILLEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 284. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1788) to reform the statutes relating to Amtrak, to authorize appropriations for Amtrak, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-370). Referred to the House Calendar.

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. BUNNING of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. NUSSLE, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GOSS, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BASS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. EWING, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FOX, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRISA, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. CLEMENT):

H.R. 2684. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for increases in the amounts of allowable earnings under the Social Security earnings limit for individuals who have attained retirement age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 2685. A bill to repeal the Medicare and Medicaid coverage data bank; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2686. A bill to provide for additional lobbying reform measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM (FOR HIMSELF, MR. SCHUMER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 2687. A bill to amend the anti-car theft provisions of title 49, United States Code to increase the utility of motor vehicle title information to State and Federal law enforcement officials and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H.R. 2688. A bill to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that the reduction in additional optional life insurance for Federal retirees shall not apply if the beneficiary is permanently disabled; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. POSHARD:

H.R. 2689. A bill to designate the U.S. Courthouse located at 301 West Main Street in Benton, IL, as the "James L. Foreman United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H.R. 2690. A bill to establish limitation with respect to the disclosure and use of genetic information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, and Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 2691. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination regarding exposure to hazardous substances; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CANADY:

H. Con. Res. 116. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make technical corrections in the enrollment of S. 1060; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HILLIARD:

H. Res. 285. Resolution to recognize and celebrate the 40th anniversary of the Montgomery bus boycott; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Ms. WOOLSEY (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WYDEN):

H. Res. 286. Resolution to limit the access of lobbyists to the Hall of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

178. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to establishing a sister-state relationship with the Province of Taiwan of the Republic of China; to the Committee on International Relations.

179. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to requesting the Congress to amend the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act to clarify that the term "public lands" means only Federal land and water and that any extension of Federal jurisdiction onto adjacent land and water is expressly prohibited; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 26: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 104: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 497: Mr. TATE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. TIAHRT, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 528: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. TANNER, Mr. WISE, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 572: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 580: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 852: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 972: Mr. BAESLER.

H.R. 1073: Mrs. LINCOLN and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1074: Mrs. LINCOLN and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1152: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 1202: Mr. LEACH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1305: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1448: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1496: Mr. FILNER and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1656: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. YATES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1701: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1733: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1818: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1834: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1876: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 1883: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 1893: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 1968: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1985: Mr. MARTINI, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FOX.

H.R. 2009: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2144: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 2205: Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 2240: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2264: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2265: Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 2531: Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. HORN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 2551: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2557: Mr. WELLER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 2566: Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 2602: Mr. MICA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2622: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 2664: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. KIM, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. YATES, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BARR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COX, Mr. PARKER, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 2671: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. MCCARTHY, Ms. FURSE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. COBURN.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. BATEMAN.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

48. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council of the city of Compton, CA, relative to urging the President and the Congress of the United States to abandon strict partisanship and conduct serious negotiations on the Federal budget; to the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1788

OFFERED BY: MR. CLEMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 36, after line 21, insert the following new section:

SEC. 617. RAILROAD LOAN GUARANTEES.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 101(a) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 801(a)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) continuation of service on, or preservation of, light density lines that are necessary to continued employment and community well-being throughout the United States;".

(b) MAXIMUM RATE OF INTEREST.—Section 511(f) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 831(f)) is amended by striking "shall not exceed an annual percentage rate which the Secretary determines to be reasonable, taking into consideration the prevailing interest rates for similar obligations in the private market." and inserting in lieu thereof "shall not exceed the annual percentage rate charged equivalent to the cost of money to the United States.".

(c) MINIMUM REPAYMENT PERIOD AND PREPAYMENT PENALTIES.—Section 511(g)(2) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 831(g)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) payment of the obligation is required by its terms to be made not less than 15 years nor more than 25 years from the date of its execution, with no penalty imposed for prepayment after 5 years;".

(d) DETERMINATION OF REPAYABILITY.—Section 511(g)(5) of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (45 U.S.C. 831(g)(5) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) either the loan can reasonably be repaid by the applicant or the loan is collaterallized at no more than the current value of assets being financed under this section to provide protection to the United States;".

H.R. 1788

OFFERED BY: MR. NADLER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 11, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 209. TRACKAGE RIGHTS FOR FREIGHT TRANSPORTATION.

Section 24904 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking "rail freight or" in paragraph (6);

(B) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (7);

(C) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and"; and

(D) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(9) consistent with safety and with priority for intercity and commuter rail passenger transportation, make agreements for rail freight transportation over rights-of-way and facilities acquired under the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 (45 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) and the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976

(45 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), notwithstanding any provision of law or contractual provision restricting the ability of Amtrak to enter into such an agreement."; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1) and (3), by inserting "or (9)" after "subsection (a)(6)".