

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, December 7, 1995

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHAW].

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 7, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable E. CLAY SHAW, Jr., to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### PRAYER

Bishop Dwight Pate, Church Point Ministries, Baton Rouge, LA, offered the following prayer:

God the Father and Creator of mankind, on this seventh day of December, nineteen hundred and ninety-fifth year of our Lord, we come with thanksgiving in our heart, and a mouth full of praise for You allowing us another day to carry out Your appointments on this Earth.

We acknowledge here in this great House that every good and perfect gift comes from the Father of light. Grant unto us knowledge and wisdom to judge ourselves. Grant unto us the understanding to govern our daily affairs.

Touch our hearts to be true laborers together for the cause of uniting the Nation. Because where there is unity there is strength. Let Your counsel of freedom flow like rivers of anointed oil for where Your spirit is there is always liberty. Amen, 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.

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

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

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LINDER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundegran, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 660. An act to amend the Fair Housing Act to modify the exemption from certain familial status discrimination prohibitions granted to housing for older persons.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 790) "An Act to provide for the modification or elimination of Federal reporting requirements" with an amendment.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 99-83, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints Rabbi Chaskel Besser, of New York, E. William Crotty, of Florida, and Ned Bandler, of New York, to the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Chair will entertain twenty 1-minute speeches on each side.

### WELCOME TO BISHOP DWIGHT PATE

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to introduce to the House and to the American people a man who has had a great impact on many lives through his good work, his teaching, and his message of good will.

Bishop Dwight Pate is from my home of Baton Rouge, LA, where he leads Church Point Ministries, a large church of over 4,000 members, as well as an academy where teaching prepares and inspires many people who have lost their way to live meaningful and good lives. Homeless people, those addicted to drugs, and all who have lost their way in our society can find the path to healing through Bishop Pate's ministry. Bishop Pate's hard work has built an institution that is invaluable to his community, and his teaching has healed and inspired. His ministry brings his community together for worship and dedication to make their lives better.

His work is the work that helps make America great. I want to thank Bishop Pate for his great service and welcome him to the U.S. Congress.

### IT IS TIME TO DEBATE THE REAL ISSUES AND STOP ENGAGING IN POLEMICS

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, for much of this year this House has reverberated with speeches condemning fellow Members of Congress and other fellow figures. Many of those speeches have bordered on hate. Some people on my side of the aisle have used language against the President that has been inappropriate. On the minority side of the aisle, the speeches against the Speaker have been filled with venom.

The fact is that we are going to have political differences over issues and policies. We should debate vigorously those matters. But in the citadel of democracy there should be much more civility than we have seen this year.

Those of you who wanted the Committee on Ethics to report on the Speaker, they have. Can we now stop the personal vilification? Can the leadership on both sides of the aisle begin policing our own ranks to stop Members from using the House floor to vilify each other or express personal hatreds?

Many of us, myself included, have engaged in polemics on this floor. If what I have said in the past has been offensive to someone, then I intend to lower my voice and stick to debating the real issues, like balancing the budget. I would hope that others will do the same. It is time to stop anything that can be interpreted as meanness, venom, or hate.

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

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

### WE CANNOT HAVE A DOUBLE STANDARD

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in somewhat response to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and I agree with the hate and venom, but I want to point out that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] and I had a privileged resolution on this floor that had no hate or venom. It was rather innocuous, merely calling for a report from the Committee on Ethics.

That was voted down twice, without debate, on a motion to table. I am here really to point out to you the double standard, and I have a news release from the Speaker of the House in 1988 calling for a special counsel, in which he states that the outside counsel shall have full authority to investigate and present evidence and arguments before the Committee on Ethics concerning the questions arising out of the activities of House Speaker Jim Wright.

He goes on to say that the special counsel should have the right of subpoena and also states the committee shall not countermand or interfere with the outside counsel's ability to take steps necessary to conduct a full and fair investigation.

We cannot have a double standard, and that is all we ask for, Mr. Speaker.

### WE SHOULD WORK TOGETHER TO SOLVE THE NATION'S PROBLEMS

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

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 13 months there has been an orchestrated campaign to demonize the Speaker. I think that this campaign that has gone on to try to destroy him is unfortunate. Of the 65 specific allegations that were made in the complaints to the Committee on Ethics about the Speaker, all were technically dismissed or fully dismissed except one.

Of that one, there has been a special investigator brought in to work with the subcommittee to look at that one narrow little charge, which a former IRS commissioner has already suggested to both the Speaker and others is no violation whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us have an obligation to ourselves and an obligation to this institution to be honest and to be forthright and to make sure that the integrity of the institution is maintained. The politicization of the Committee on Ethics over this last year I think is unfortunate, because these issues have been resolved by five Democrats and five Republicans working together, and together we can all

continue to work to solve the Nation's problems.

### BRING BIPARTISANSHIP BACK TO DELIBERATIONS

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I spent 8 years on the Committee on Ethics and part of that time during the investigation of former Speaker Wright. I have not chosen to speak on the issue of the Speaker and his involvement with that committee until this very moment.

It seems to me that if we want to restore comity to the institution, to bring bipartisanship back to our deliberations, to take some of the poison out of the atmosphere, this issue needs to be resolved and fully resolved within the confines of that committee.

I have tremendous respect for the individuals who serve all of the institution by putting time in, together, day after day, in that room. But until the issue is resolved, because of the nature of the speakership, by an outside counsel, we will not be able to get beyond this very difficult point that we seem to be hung up on today, and have been, frankly, for most of this year.

I applaud the committee for finally taking the step of moving to instill more confidence in their deliberations. I do believe, however, that they must give the outside counsel the latitude to put to rest all the issues that have been raised. To do something other than that is to do different than we did when Speaker Wright was in the committee's deliberations, and would be, I think, unfortunately a truncated approach to getting this Congress beyond the cult of personality and back to work.

### ETHICS PROCESS BEING ABUSED FOR POLITICAL GAIN

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, to compare the Wright investigation to the Gingrich investigation is like comparing a gnat to a hippopotamus.

Last night, the Ethics Committee unanimously dismissed 64 of 65 allegations against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. Both Republicans and Democrats concluded that most of these charges were unwarranted, unnecessary, and not worthy of further investigation.

The 65th charge is narrowly focused on a technical tax law that requires an outside expert to investigate. And even this charge has been found to be baseless by a former commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service.

Let there be no mistake. This effort to destroy NEWT GINGRICH is not about

finding the truth. It was not about discovering the facts behind his book deal. Those allegations were dismissed.

It was not about his college lectures. Those allegations were dismissed.

This is an effort to change the subject, as Republicans try to change the country for the better. At great expense and great fanfare, liberal Democrats have abused the ethics process for political gain.

### PUTTING CREDIBILITY BACK INTO HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, finally. Fourteen months we have waited patiently. We asked that we have a report. We asked the Committee on Ethics to do what it was supposed to do, to rule on the ethical conduct of its Members. That is its obligation.

We finally have them acting, and I applaud their action. And I applaud today some of the Members stepping forward and saying "Hey, this is a new day. Let's go forward with some bipartisanship." Let us stop the rancor on this floor. Let us put credibility back into this institution. But let us not forget that the Speaker is not immune to review from his ethical behavior.

Three guilty verdicts, one dismissed, one to be investigated, one pending. We are all in here together. The Committee on Ethics is our committee. It is a membership committee. It is our grand jury. I regret we have had to bring pressure to bear for them to act, to do what they were asked to do in the first place. This is a time to move forward in a more bipartisan and a more ethical process.

### MORE IDEAS NEEDED FROM WHITE HOUSE ON BALANCING BUDGET

(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, it is without venom or vitriol that I rise today to respectfully suggest that the major story in Washington yesterday took place not here, but at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, where the President of the United States again opted for showmanship over statesmanship, wielding Lyndon Johnson's pen from 1965, the pen LBJ used to sign the Medicare Act even as the current President was vetoing the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. And, in doing so, again the President opted for fear over facts, when he talked about nonexistent cuts in the Medicare budget. That simply was not true.

Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest that the President of the United States and his Cabinet-level officials

get out a sharpened pencil, instead of LBJ's pen, and go to work formulating a plan to get us to a balanced budget in 7 years, because a sharpened pencil is what American families use around the kitchen table to decide how they are going to spend money.

And, oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, one unintended act of symbolism: When the President reached for LBJ's pen, there was no ink in the well. There are no ideas coming from the White House, nor from the minority.

#### DEFENDING AMERICANS LOOKING FOR A BETTER LIFE

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, after the President's wise veto of the radical right budget, NEWT GINGRICH tried to bash the Great Society.

Well, I wonder if GINGRICH even wants a good society.

A good society protects the health and welfare of its most vulnerable—the Gingrich society hangs them out to dry.

But the Speaker thinks he can get away with that rhetoric since he used to be a history professor.

Well, let's talk history: the proud history of the Democratic party—and compare it with the sad history being written by today's GOP.

And the latest chapter: the Speaker's sharp rebuke by the Ethics Committee.

We Democrats are the party of FDR's New Deal that gave America economic security. Today's Republicans are the party of the New Deal—a shady book deal to give himself economic security. We are the party of Harry Truman who said the "Buck Stops Here." The Gingrich party tells GOPAC contributors "The Bucks better get here" if you want any help.

Democrats are the party of JFK's "Camelot"—today's Republicans are the party of "Scam-a-lot," as one Gingrich ethics scam after another comes to light.

Republicans try to defend the Speaker's millions in illegal contributions. We Democrats will defend millions of Americans looking for a better life.

□ 1115

#### STRUGGLING OVER THE BUDGET

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today is December 7 and we remember that this is Pearl Harbor day. It was the beginning of the World War II struggle in the Pacific. Today we are starting another struggle over the budget. The President's budget is now available. It

is hot off the presses, and I am very optimistic. I hope it is as close to the 7-year Republican plan as the President's Medicare plan is to the Republican Medicare plan.

According to James Glassman of the Washington Post, the expenditures in the President's Medicare plan in 2002 is within 2 percentage points of the Republican plan, 1.6 percent, actually. I am sure all of us have heard about the massive \$270 billion cuts to Medicare. Well, the President's plan is within 2 percentage points.

Mr. Speaker, let us get to the truth of the matter. After all, telling the truth is one of the Ten Commandments. We should move beyond this cheap talk. If the President's plan is that close, 1.6 percent, then maybe we can reach an agreement on the 7-year balanced budget plan. Then we will do what the American public wants, what the Congress wants, we will do the right thing and balance the budget in 7 years.

#### UNITED NATIONS SEEKS PROTECTION FOR CROATIAN CURLY-HAIRED PIG

(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, after an expensive study on endangered farm animals, the United Nations has determined that the world must protect the Croatian curly-haired pig. That is right, while millions are starving in Africa, and many thousands are being slaughtered in Rwanda, the United Nations is immersed in animal husbandry.

If that is not enough to bust your chops, while the United Nations is studying the ham hocks of Croatian curly-haired pigs, with American tax dollars, I might add, American troops are landing in Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, I say the United Nations has officially become the mother of all pork. I question on the House floor today, I want to know what they are using to smoke those hams with. I think they are using something that is an illegal contraband everywhere in the world.

With that, I yield back the balance of all of the rest of this pork. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker.

#### DEMOCRATS VOW TO GET EVEN WITH SPEAKER GINGRICH

(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, remember back when Speaker Jim Wright had to resign from Congress due to his ethics problems? Remember when the Democratic whip, Tony Coelho, had to resign from Congress due to

his ethics problems? Back in 1989 the Democrats held NEWT GINGRICH responsible for Wright and Coelho and vowed to get even with him, saying they would destroy GINGRICH if it is the last thing we do.

Well, we have to give the Democrats credit for trying to do just that. Majority whip Bill Alexander filed 467 ethics charges against Speaker GINGRICH in 1989. All charges were resolved. This year the Democrats filed 65 charges against Speaker GINGRICH and all but 1 has been resolved by the nonpartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The last charge involves a complex Tax Code which an outside counsel will look at.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to quit all these ridiculous character assassinations and get down to the legislative business at hand and work on balancing the budget.

#### EAST TIMORESE SUBJECT TO WORST HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN THE WORLD

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today the small emerging nation of East Timor was brutally invaded by the nation of Indonesia. Over the past 20 years, the people of East Timor have been subject to some of the worst abuses of human rights in the world. More than 200,000 East Timorese, almost one-third of their entire population, have been killed or have died from starvation after being forced from their villages by Indonesia.

Mr. Speaker, this attack cannot be countenanced. This violence must end. That is why today, with my colleague from New York, Mrs. LOWEY, I am introducing the East Timor Human Rights Accountability Act. This bill simply says that no United States aid to Indonesia can be used to further the occupation of East Timor or to violate the human rights of the people of East Timor. If it is, this aid will end.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York for joining me and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in sponsoring this legislation.

#### DEMOCRATS SEEK TO DESTROY RATHER THAN FIGHT IDEAS OF SPEAKER GINGRICH

(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, last evening the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, as we have heard, dismissed 64 of the 65 allegations against our Speaker. There will be more to

come. This has been a systematic effort to destroy an individual rather than fight his ideas. There will be more to come.

The gentleman from Florida who spoke, Mr. JOHNSTON, who has been putting the privileged resolution on the floor that has been tabled twice, was quoted in his own hometown paper in Florida as having said I am part of a small group that meets weekly to pour over everything the Speaker says to find where we can file ethics charges against him.

This is an old story. We have heard it said here that in 1989 they said, and I quote, "We will destroy GINGRICH if it is the last thing we do". There will be more to come.

Mr. Speaker, we are proud that the Speaker can stick to his issues and the ideas. It is unfortunate that the other side is not willing to engage the ideas.

#### HISTORY BEING REWRITTEN REGARDING COMPLAINTS FILED AGAINST SPEAKER

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, history is being rewritten down here in this well today. I want to tell my colleagues that when I listen to the other side, I have heard of putting lipstick on pigs, but they are really going crazy this morning.

Now, the way I see it is, there were 6 complaints filed, not 65. Six complaints. Three of them he was declared guilty by the bipartisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Guilty, guilty, guilty. Three complaints. Please, let us not rewrite what has been done. It is a record of this House.

On one of the others, they moved to get a special counsel to look into it. That is very serious. One is still pending, and there are more supposedly coming to be filed. I think these are very serious. We should not play partisan politics with this, and this is not get-even time. The Democrats don't have to do anything to Speaker GINGRICH. All we have to do is stand back and let NEWT be NEWT. He is doing it, and I think it is really causing great trouble.

#### COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT PROVIDED THOUGHTFUL AND THOROUGH CONSIDERATION OF COMPLAINTS AGAINST SPEAKER

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

Ms. DUNN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Connecticut, Congresswoman NANCY JOHNSON, and her bipar-

tisan Committee on Standards of Official Conduct for the thoughtful and thorough job that they did, the thorough consideration, and the fact that they threw out 64 of these 65 complaints against our Speaker.

I want to be clear also, Mr. Speaker. Ethics charges are serious charges, and they should not be used for partisan purposes. So I am delighted the committee has declared in a unanimous bipartisan report that 64 of the 65 charges are dismissed. And the last charge, which was a matter of tax exempt status for a university, will be observed by an outside adviser.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Democrats are on the wrong side of history. Their ideas have been rejected by the American people and their institutions are the cause of our \$5 trillion national debt. The liberalism they have defended for a generation has left a legacy of debt, a culture of dependence and the breakdown of our American families. As they see it, the only hope left to them as a party is to destroy one man's character. It is wrong, it will not work, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct report proves it.

#### SPEAKER'S PLAN TO ABOLISH MEDICAID IS BAD IDEA

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when is Speaker GINGRICH going to get it? His plan to abolish Medicaid is a bad idea. He is not listening to seniors, seniors who will lose their long-term nursing home care. He is not listening to the American Medical Association, who warned him this week not to end the Federal guaranty to health care coverage for low-income women and for children.

Let us hope he listens to the participants at yesterday's White House conference on AIDS, participants who made it clear that his proposal will be devastating for people with AIDS. I wonder if my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, that half of all people with HIV and AIDS in my home State of California rely on Medicaid for health coverage? Destroy the Medicaid safety net and people with AIDS will be denied treatment and care and will be forced into expensive hospital emergency rooms.

Mr. Speaker, listen to persons with HIV and AIDS, listen to the American Medical Association, listen to seniors, women, and children. Do not pay for special interest taxes by taking away health care from the most vulnerable Americans.

#### LET US NOT PLAY POLITICS BUT BALANCE THE BUDGET BY 2002

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thought today with the President's budget coming out it would be a new sort of "Honesty In Congress Day," but I see the rhetoric has shifted from facts and figures and how we achieve a balanced budget to character assassination.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a joyous day for some of us, as we see the President's budget that is going to turn out very close to what the Republicans have proposed, if we are going to reach that balanced budget in 7 years. I look at Jim Glassman's column today. It says it is scandalous how close Congress and President Clinton actually are on the key elements of the Federal budget. If Americans understood these numbers, they would be outraged.

I look at the New York Times article that says White House documents reveal similarities in the GOP plans for Medicare. Mr. Glassman says, "In my own judgment, it is," that lack of the deal, is Clinton's fault.

Mr. Speaker, there is closeness to this agreement. Let us get together. Let us forget partisan politics. Let us get a balanced budget by 2002.

#### PRESIDENT VETOED BUDGET THAT MADE DEVASTATING CUTS IN MEDICAID AND MEDICARE

(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 am glad to hear my Republican colleagues defending Speaker GINGRICH today. You heard that right. They are defending the Speaker they elected earlier this year. But that is not what I am here to talk about, I am here to say I am proud that the President vetoed the Republican budget yesterday with the same pen Lyndon Baines Johnson signed Medicare and Medicaid into law, because he believes that the deep and devastating cuts in Medicare, education, and tax increases on working families is not in line with the priorities that Americans have set. Thank the Lord he vetoed that bill.

The budget made devastating cuts in Medicare and Medicaid in order to finance a tax break, a tax break before we even balance the budget. It was unacceptable and I am proud the President did that.

Now that the budget has been vetoed, let us do what my colleagues said, let us get about balancing the budget in a fair way. Democrats and Republicans alike agreed in a continuing resolution to balance the budget in a way that protects Medicare, education, the environment, and working Americans. Let

us do that bipartisanly and we can have a balanced budget for all of America.

#### PROFESSIONAL CHARACTER ASSASSINATION

(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, for the past year a small number of Members of this body have been involved in what can only be described as professional character assassination. It is an example of classic stump water politics. That is where you throw what is handy and you stress what sticks. Well, they have hurled 65 charges at our Speaker and none of them have stuck. The only remaining issue is a technical tax question.

At the Speaker's request, we have remained silent concerning the withering assault on the Speaker's character. We will be silent no longer. The stump water politics and the professional character assassination must end. The business of this Nation must proceed.

□ 1130

#### ETHICAL QUESTIONS REGARDING SPEAKER ARE REAL

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, throughout this morning's discussion, one would get the impression that the ethics questions we are considering here today are purely a matter of partisan politics; that is, the Democrats versus the Republicans as usual.

Some people want to count the number of complaints. Some people want to say, well, this is stump water politics. All I want to do is read what the bipartisan Democrat and Republican Committee on Standards of Official Conduct had to say, and I think the words will speak for themselves.

Referring to the Speaker, they said in a letter of December 6, 1995:

The committee strongly questions the appropriateness of what some would describe as an attempt by you to capitalize on your office. At a minimum, this creates the impression of exploiting one's office for personal gain. Such a perception is especially troubling when it pertains to the office of the Speaker of the House, a constitutional office requiring the highest standards of ethical behavior.

Mr. Speaker, this is not back water, stump water politics or partisan politics. Both Democrats and Republicans agree there is a problem. We now have a special counsel. We will leave it to him to look into the details.

#### CHEAP SHOT AT CBO

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, relevant to the President vetoing the only balanced budget in a generation for reasons that do not hold water Americans should note an editorial entitled "Cheap Shot" in yesterday's Washington Post.

Senator Minority Leader Tom Daschle has recklessly attacked—without foundation and for the cheapest of political reasons—one of the most valuable institutions in the government. His problem is with the Congressional Budget Office. It was set up in 1974 to fill a void by providing Congress with dispassionate, nonpartisan analysis on which to base budget decisions. It has steadily done so . . . and in the process greatly strengthened Congress as an institution while elevating the annual debate.

Maybe someday it will fall from that high standard. That day is not yet. But Mr. Daschle is disappointed by one of CBO's current positions . . . he is free, of course, to say he disagrees . . . what he chose to do instead . . . was smear the agency.

The remarks he made undercut the very process whose integrity he pretended to protect. They did leave a stain, but not on CBO.

#### EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to voice my concerns over the education and job training cuts of \$4.5 billion in the majority party's proposed budget.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, \$4.5 billion taken out of the national education budget to cover the tax breaks for our corporate welfare community. I am a firm believer in education and its role in our society, and I have seen the success of such programs as vocational education, national student loans, and school-to-job training programs.

Mr. Speaker, take this away from our children and our dislocated workers, our working families, and we place ourselves back into a recession, an education recession.

I honestly believe, Mr. Speaker, that this institution has an obligation to this Nation to make education affordable to everyone. We have an obligation to this Nation to make education accessible to everyone. We need only to examine the benefits of the GI educational law that offered educational opportunities for the hundreds of thousands of GI's, who would not have obtained college education if this program was not provided by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all Americans should go into the 21st century with every opportunity to succeed. I believe we should give all Americans an opportunity to enhance their skills, further obtain educational knowledge to prepare themselves adequately for the job market.

If you take away this opportunity—you cut the chances for anyone to succeed. You make it that much more difficult to the average person to make ends meet.

I urge my colleagues to think seriously about the ramifications of this \$4.5 billion cut to education and job-training programs and give our children, families a break for the future.

#### PRESIDENT'S VETO OF BALANCED BUDGET

(Mrs. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that one of our colleagues spoke about the fact that the President vetoed the balanced budget bill yesterday that came across his desk with the pen that was used by Lyndon Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman failed to say was that that pen was out of ink. I think that is significant. The President then dipped that pen into an inkwell to give it new life, and there was no ink in the inkwell. So, the President did not veto this very important bill with Lyndon Johnson's pen, but just an ordinary pen.

Mr. Speaker, in vetoing this bill, he vetoed a bill that was so incredibly important to the American people that our telephone systems in the House and the Senate experienced meltdown because of the numerous, thousands and thousands of calls that came in not only to the House and the Senate, but also to the White House.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that the only objection, or the only thing that the other side of the aisle can talk about is character assassination about the Speaker.

#### ETHICAL CLOUD LINGERS OVER HOUSE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, after reading the report of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, it is little wonder that some of its Members drug their feet for 14 months, because it reflects a pattern of ethical abuse.

Charge: Misuse of the House floor for apparently commercial purposes. Finding: GINGRICH guilty. Charge: Improper promotion of GOPAC. Finding: GINGRICH guilty. Charge: Commingling of political and official resources. Finding: GINGRICH guilty.

And the Rupert Murdoch book deal, so bad that the committee on a bipartisan basis strongly questions the appropriateness of what some will call capitalizing on your office and says we need even a new rule because of this impression of exploiting one's office for personal gain.

Now, all the GOPAC dealings, the tentacles of GOPAC, the tax-free foundations, the book deal, the college course, so bad that they have called in an independent counsel. Not some tax adviser from H&R Block, but an independent prosecutor to get to the bottom of this. Until that is done, an ethical cloud is going to linger over this Congress.

#### MUCH ADO ABOUT NOTHING

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, the Ethics Committee has finally reached a unanimous conclusion about the wild attacks that have come from liberal Democrats against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH: Much ado about nothing.

They have concluded that 64 of the 65 charges brought to the Ethics Committee about Mr. GINGRICH were without merit. The 65th charge requires an outside counsel because it is narrowly focused on a technical tax law.

I urge the American people to focus not on the media hype, but on the big picture.

Republicans are trying to balance the budget for the first time in decades. We are doing this to provide a better future for our children, to get lower interest rates for families today, and for a stronger America.

Instead of joining with us to balance the budget, liberal Democrats have launched a smear campaign meant to derail our legislative agenda. And as the Ethics Committee has concluded, these charges are baseless.

I urge my colleagues to stop playing political football with the Ethics Committee. It was established to bring greater integrity and respect to this institution. When you drag the Ethics Committee through the mud, every Member of this House gets dirty.

#### AT LAST, AN OUTSIDE COUNSEL

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, last night, after more than 14 months of deliberations, the Ethics Committee found Speaker NEWT GINGRICH guilty of violating House rules on three counts. The Ethics Committee has also taken the long overdue step of appointing an outside counsel or prosecutor to investigate Speaker GINGRICH and untangle the web of nonprofit and political slush funds he directs.

In addition, the bipartisan committee rebuked the Speaker for accepting a \$4.5 million book deal from media mogul Rupert Murdoch. In their words: "the committee strongly questions the appropriateness of what some could de-

scribe as an attempt by you to capitalize on your office".

Though long overdue, the Ethics Committee has begun the process of investigating the Speaker of the House. It is high time.

The committee found Speaker GINGRICH guilty of violating House rules on three occasions. Could this be just the tip of the iceberg? The special counsel will find out for sure.

#### TIME FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, when President Clinton vetoed the Balanced Budget Act yesterday, not only did he reject the first balanced budget to hit the President's desk in 25 years, he also vetoed the only plan that will save Medicare for the next generation.

Under the Republican budget plan, Medicare spending per beneficiary will increase over the next 7 years from \$4,800 to \$7,100 and the Democrats call that an unacceptable, draconian cut. The last time I checked, going from \$4,800 to \$7,100 is an increase, not a cut.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the President to get his priorities in order. Does he want to help deliver a balanced budget to America, or does he want to try to demagogue the issue for political points. The Republican majority wants a balanced budget. The American people want a balanced budget. It's time for the President to show leadership—give us a balanced budget.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROTECTION ACT

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the last shutdown, I began this countdown on the floor to help Members understand the special outrage of closing down the Capital City.

Mr. Speaker, this is day 9 of the countdown to December 15. Mr. Speaker, 85 percent of the money in the D.C. appropriation is money raised from D.C. taxpayers. How would Members feel if the Congress used their own local money to shut down their district over a national dispute in which they were uninvolved?

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] says that the Federal shutdown was dumb, but shutting down the District of Columbia was dumber. The District of Columbia is already on the operating table suffering an acute financial crisis so severe that the city has a control board. Even a month-to-month continuing resolution would cripple the District of Columbia. Doling out money in small amounts makes it almost impossible to run a complicated city and pay obligations on time.

Mr. Speaker, that is why a bipartisan bill, the D.C. Fiscal Protection Act, is being marked up on Friday. It is the responsible and fair thing to do.

#### SUPPORT AMERICA BY SUPPORTING A BALANCED BUDGET NOW

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last night the President vetoed the only balanced budget seen in 26 years.

The President's veto is a blow to our children and the future of this country. To me a balanced budget means prosperity, it means growth, it means stability. It means that our children will live in a country that can give them more than it gave us. To me, it means freedom.

The President vetoed all this.

Republicans sent the President a balanced budget—not because it is good politics, but because it is good for America. We see a future where there's workfare, not welfare; where there's independence, not dependence.

Republicans believe that people, not the Government, drive the Nation and they—not us—have made it the best and most prosperous country in the world.

Support America—support a balanced budget now.

#### SPEND AND SAVE MONEY WISELY

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, when we pass a budget, we must make sure we protect our elderly, our students, and our working families.

One way to do that is by spending our health care dollars wisely.

The Medicaid Program is designed to supplement Medicare for the elderly and provide health care for children and the disadvantaged.

A plan aimed at preventing pregnancies among teenagers could mean significant savings in our health care expenditures.

Many in Congress have complained about the problem of teenagers having babies.

Demagoguery is easy; meaningful action and deeds are more difficult.

I hope we will get beyond the talk and pass a budget that is wise in how we spend money and how we save money, yet fair in how we protect the health of the old, the young, and the average American, fair to the elderly, fair to the young, and fair to the average citizen.

### VETOING THE BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, the President has missed a historic opportunity to reverse his spending addiction. Since his 1992 campaign, Bill Clinton has told America that he would balance the budget in 5 years, 10 years, 8 years, 9 years, and even 7 years.

When the President vetoed the balanced budget plan he showed the American people his true colors. The President does not want to balance the Federal budget. Not now, not ever.

America, don't be fooled. The President will say anything.

He will tell you that Republican efforts to balance the budget are extreme. He will tell you that Republicans are cutting Medicare. He will tell you that Republicans are taking food out of the mouths of children. He will tell you that Republicans are taking away student loans.

That is not true. He tells you this because he loves big government, big spending, and big taxes.

□ 1145

### GOPAC

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of a sense of deep outrage. Not long ago this House passed legislation on lobbying reform, but it seems the Speaker feels he and his personal slush fund were exempt from it.

It's no wonder that the Speaker refuses to act on campaign finance reform, when there are allegations that GOPAC financed his own campaign to the tune of \$250,000. The evidence is so damning that last night the Ethics Committee issued a stinging rebuke to Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

My colleagues, I call on the Speaker himself to release the list of past GOPAC donors, and the list of past GOPAC contributions to his own campaign.

Mr. Speaker, if you really have nothing to hide, then you have nothing to be afraid of. The American people demand the truth, it is time for you to come clean and end this charade.

### BALANCED BUDGET PEN

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, the only thing that stands between this country and a balanced budget is President Bill Clinton. Unfortunately, he vetoed the only balanced budget bill in the Oval Office yesterday. Instead of

balancing the budget, the President has made it clear that he wants more spending, not less spending.

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the American people's priorities are just the opposite. It seems to me that the people want a smaller, less costly, and more efficient Federal Government. The American people want to keep more of their hard-earned money through tax cuts, not tax increases. The American people want an economy that stimulates job creation, not stifles economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, by vetoing the Balanced Budget Act, it's obvious the President doesn't know what the American people want. So I'll tell him. The American people want a balanced budget, and they want it now.

### HOOKED ON REAGANOMICS

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I have noticed that for the last few weeks, my Republican colleagues have stopped talking about saving Medicare. That's probably because no one believes that cutting \$270 billion from Medicare while providing \$245 billion in tax breaks will save anything except the lifestyles of the rich and famous.

Now the Republicans talk only about balancing the budget. However, their so-called balanced budget proposal actually increases the deficit next year and the year after that. This should come as no surprise considering that their tax breaks come first, while leaving the hard spending cuts to future Congresses. That is exactly what Ronald Reagan did to increase our debt by \$3 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, it appears my Republican colleagues can't help repeating the mistakes of the past. I suppose that's what happens when you're hooked on Reaganomics.

### WHAT ARE THE DEMOCRATS TALKING ABOUT

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a moment to comment on what we are hearing from the other side of the aisle today. Particularly because yesterday the President vetoed the most important bill, the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, that has ever come across his desk. And after 2 years and 11 months, we are still waiting to see his version of a balanced budget.

Here is what most of the Democrats are talking about today: Speaker GINGRICH. Let me just tell my colleagues, selective memory is a fine thing, but there is a fine line between self-righteousness and hypocrisy. Or have they forgotten the House bank and post of-

ice scandals that happened on their watch? Have they forgotten the two votes in the last Congress when they voted to block a Committee on Standards of Official Conduct investigation into Dan Rostenkowski, who was then a member of the House Democratic Party leadership, for allegations of misconduct and ghost employees, the same gentleman who is under indictment today? They have forgotten that.

Here is the bottom line with this discussion. If my Democratic colleagues had any ideas on how to solve the major problems facing our country, they would be down here talking about them and not just continuing this character assassination against the Speaker.

I think the American people see through it. It is time to get on with the people's business. It is time to do the right thing for our kids and our country, and it is time to balance the budget.

### DEMOCRATS HAVE NOT FORGOTTEN

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, no, we have not forgotten. We thought you had. But finally after the filing of many complaints against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH and 14 months later, the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct found the Speaker guilty, guilty, guilty on one, two, three counts of violating House rules by misusing official resources and the committee appointed a special outside counsel to investigate another serious charge about the Speaker's political GOPAC operation.

Well, it is about time. Believe me, the American public does not appreciate double standards. What is good for the goose is good for the gander. No one should be so big, so important, so powerful they can violate the rules of this House and the laws of this country without suffering the consequences. NEWT may be Speaker; however, he, too, must account for any and all wrongdoing. It is about time.

Let us get on with the business of finding out who NEWT GINGRICH really is.

### DOING WHAT WE WERE SENT HERE TO DO

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let us face it. What is going on here is an outrageous attempt to reverse the election results of 1994. The defenders of big government did not like the fact that a Republican majority came in and agreed we were going to balance the

budget and reduce the size of the Government. So they turned to outrageous personal attacks against the Speaker of the House.

The fact is the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, led by a very able, nonpartisan, tough lady, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] dismissed 64 of the 65 complaints. There was nothing wrong with the Newt book deal. They never said he was guilty of anything. But the other side is going to continue these character assassinations because they view that as the only way they can regain control, reverse the election, and once again turn back the clock and go for more spending, more deficits, and the ruin of this country.

This freshman class was sent here to get the job done. We will not be deterred by these types of personal attacks on our leader. We will stay here to balance the budget and do what the American people sent us here to do.

#### THE GOPAC DEAL

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, about 6 months ago I addressed this House about the GOPAC deal with NEWT GINGRICH. My words were written down then necessarily. But the mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly well. So the mills of the gods have caught up with Mr. GINGRICH, and the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has said that it is time to really look at the true facts.

The Republicans have showered this floor with acrimony, swaggering bravado. I have heard the President vilified and called a bugger. I have heard welfare recipients called alligators, all from this side of the aisle. So to say now that we are trying to assassinate Mr. GINGRICH's character is wrong. We are not trying to do that.

I am happy to say today that the President of the United States vetoed the reconciliation bill and well he should have. Regardless of the type of pen that he used, he turned back this really, really vicious attack against the poor and the elderly and the underserved of this country.

#### ETHICS COMMITTEE RESULTS

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

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to stand before this House and thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], for her courage. She is one of the most ethical people I have ever met.

I think colleagues on both sides of the aisle can agree. During this thor-

ough, bipartisan investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, she was not allowed to defend the actions of the committee. The investigation committee had six different specific complaints. Five of them were dropped. Only one is being looked at, and that is to hire a special counsel to investigate the tax implications of two nonprofit organizations which helped the Speaker in his course, a course that was in 21 universities, a course for which he never received a penny.

Was he guilty of encouraging people to call an 800 number to learn more about this course? Yes, if you call that guilt.

Was he guilty he had an unpaid advisor help him during the transition to decide who he should hire in his office? Yes, if you call that guilt, I do not.

He had a town meeting and he advertised his town meeting on the floor of the House.

Bottom line: The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct dropped five of the six complaints and is having a special counsel look at the one remaining issue, the tax implications of the Speaker's college course.

I salute my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who serve on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. They worked hard and resolved a number of difficult issues on a bipartisan basis. I hope we can now get back to the business of balancing our Federal budget.

#### PRESIDENTIAL VETO

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the more the American people know about the Gingrich revolution, the less they like.

I was so proud yesterday when the President vetoed the Gingrich budget. It is what the American people have asked him to do. The American people have spoken. They do not support a budget that cuts Medicare and Medicaid, education and the environment to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. Last month the President cut a deal with the Republicans to balance the budget in 7 years while protecting the priorities of the American people. The budget that the President vetoed yesterday failed to meet that agreement because it did not protect the values that the American public holds so dear. It is time for the Republicans to send the President a balanced budget that protects the priorities of the American people and then he will sign it and then we can get on with the business of the people.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING WITHDRAWAL OF PRIVILEGED RESOLUTION

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], offered a privileged resolution concerning the investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of Speaker GINGRICH. This request was nonprejudicial. It was not a character assassination. It simply asked for a report of the activities of that committee.

Last night's action by the committee and the assurance that the House will receive a report on the investigation was welcome news. I regret we had to resort to a privileged resolution to get such a report, but in light of last night's announcement, I am announcing that we will not offer our privileged resolution as planned today.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

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

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. RES. 291

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the further conference report to accompany, and the amendment reported from conference in disagreement 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. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, and against the motion printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference to dispose of the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, are waived. The conference report, the amendment reported in disagreement, and the motion shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its final

adoption without intervening motion except debate pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 291 allows for the consideration of the further conference report to accompany H.R. 2099, making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development and various independent agencies.

In my opinion, this is probably the most important of all of the appropriation bills. It provides the money required to meet the needs of our veterans and also provides the funding necessary to ensure adequate housing for the needy, the disabled, and the disadvantaged. Members will recall that the House voted to recommit this conference report on November 29, and I hope we got it right this time.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration, and against the motion to dispose of Senate amendment No. 63 as printed in the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference.

Finally, the rule provides that if the conference report is adopted, then the motion printed in the joint statement of managers to recede and concur in Senate Amendment 63 with an amendment shall be debatable for 1 hour. Senate amendment 63 was reported in technical disagreement, and pertains to the funding necessary to carry out the orderly termination of programs and activities under the National and Community Service Act of 1990.

Mr. Speaker, this is basically the same conference report with various technical changes recommended to improve the bill.

Those who rely on veterans benefits and housing assistance should not have to go through the anxiety of wondering whether or not their benefits will be reduced or discontinued. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and to support this conference report.

□ 1200

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding the customary one-half hour of debate time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we strongly oppose this, the second rule that has been reported

to provide for the consideration of the conference report on the Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill. We oppose just as strongly the conference report itself that the rule would make in order.

Even though the House voted on November 29 to recommit the conference report, ostensibly because of cuts in funding for veterans programs, it was clear at the time that many Members were just as concerned about the unprecedented cuts included in this bill in spending for the environment and for housing.

Interestingly, the new conference agreement is virtually identical to the one the House voted to recommit. In fact, no changes were made in veterans funding, as the recommittal motion demanded. What the conferees did was take this opportunity to make so-called technical corrections, including one that weakens HUD's antiredlining regulations.

We are concerned, Mr. Speaker, that the conferees not only did not respond to the wishes of the House, but also took advantage of the recommittal to further weaken our Nation's commitment to fair housing laws.

We would not be in this position at all if the legislation before us did not so flagrantly violate the rules of the House. As has been the case for all the rules for considering this legislation, the one before us today sanctions flagrant and wholesale violations of the House rule that prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill. By protecting the major and substantive policy changes contained in the bill, it continues the objectionable trend that has developed this year of allowing the Committee on Appropriations to subvert the authorizing committee process.

When we Democrats were in the majority and proposed rules that protected by waivers even the most minor and technical provisions, our Republican colleagues protested loudly and vehemently. Had we attempted to protect the kind of major policy changes contained in this appropriations bill, you would have screamed in indignation, and you would have been right to have done so.

We have tried to be patient with the majority's frequent, flagrant, and unwarranted waivers of rule XXI, the prohibition on legislation in an appropriations bill, that have been contained in the rules for consideration of appropriations bills this year. We recognize from our years of being in the majority it is nearly always impossible to avoid all violations of rule XXI in an appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, however, the waiver provided in this bill goes far beyond the bounds of what can reasonably be considered legitimate or appropriate. While the conference agreement is less

draconian than the House-passed bill, the waiver still sanctions the Committee on Appropriations' rewriting of environmental and housing laws. It sanctions the Committee on Appropriations' usurpation of the function of the authorizing committees, which is an egregious misuse of the waiver.

It has become increasingly clear that the new chairmen of the authorizing committees are willing to cede their responsibilities to the Committee on Appropriations. They should, rather, defend the integrity of the legislative process by insisting on their committees' right to make major policy changes the way they should be made, after following the deliberative committee process of hearings and full consideration of authorization legislation.

Indeed, the Committee on Rules itself should be disturbed about the precedents that are being set. Instead, the Committee on Rules is acquiescing to this subversion of an open and accountable committee process. As the history of this bill demonstrates, many of these policy revisions would have been unable to withstand the scrutiny of full scale debate.

Despite the fact the conferees made improvements in the radical bill originally approved by the House, we are still faced with legislation making drastic follow policy changes that will seriously affect virtually all of our citizens. Consider what this bill does to the environment. For example, it slashes funds for environmental protection by a unprecedented 21 percent. These cuts would cripple EPA's enforcement efforts, seriously weakening the implementation of virtually every environmental law, including the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Safe Drinking Water Act, and the law regulating the use of pesticides. It would limit EPA's authority to initiate cleanups at new Superfund sites.

In addition, five legislative provisions remain in the bill, language protected by this rule. Many of the other controversial 17 riders approved by the House have simply been shifted to report language, where they are less visible, but where they still pose an equally serious threat to public health.

The riders retained in legislative language include provisions barring EPA oversight of wetlands policy, limiting EPA authority to list new hazardous waste sites for cleanup under the Superfund law, and barring EPA from issuing a new standard to protect the public from contamination of drinking water by radon. These are changes that hamper the EPA's ability to protect the health and safety of our citizens.

When the funding cuts and legislative changes contained in this bill are combined with the changes to environmental policy made in other bills the House has passed this year, including the Clean Water Act revision and the so-called regulatory reform bills, this

effort amounts to nothing less than a full scale assault on the environmental protection laws that have served our Nation so well, and which many of us believe need to be strengthened, not weakened and not repealed.

The other area that is cut drastically by this conference report is housing, where funding is reduced by 21 percent or \$4 billion from this year's level. Homeless programs are cut by 27 percent. Here, too, the funding cuts in the legislative changes in the bill amount to significant changes in housing policy, resulting in a dramatic shift in the course of our Nation's commitment to affordable and accessible housing for all our citizens.

For example, this bill means that no new public housing will be funded, even though the number of families who need help continues to grow each year. If all that were not enough, this legislation also eliminates all funding for a number of programs, including the President's AmeriCorps National Service Program, the Community Development Bank Initiative, the FDIC Affordable Housing Program, and the Office of Consumer Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the provisions of this conference report represent the misguided budget priorities of the Republican majority. Those priorities are forcing Congress to make deep cuts in domestic programs in order to pay for unnecessary increases in defense spending, including \$7 billion for more weaponry than the Defense Department requested, and for tax cuts that will mainly benefit the wealthiest among us.

Mr. Speaker, again, this is a bad rule for an unworthy bill. It protects egregious violations of our rule prohibiting legislating in an appropriations bill, and it does so in order to allow Congress to make damaging changes to environmental and housing laws. The rule should be defeated.

The President has, and properly so, vowed to veto the bill, because it does not uphold the values so important to the American people. What we should do is to send this bill back to conference today, where the conferees should take seriously the need to make substantive changes in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the ranking member on the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, why are we considering this bill today?

Just last Wednesday, by a vote of 216 to 208 the House wisely recommitted this horrible VA/HUD conference report because it made too many cuts in veterans health benefits.

So if the bill is so bad, why is it here again? If a majority of the House couldn't bring themselves to vote for this bill last week what's going to make them vote for it this week?

I had hoped the conferees would have gotten rid of these unfair veterans cuts but the only changes to this bill are a few technical changes and a few new commas and semicolons.

This bill is nearly exactly the same bill that was carried out of here in a coffin last week.

My guess is that the only difference between last week's bill and this week's bill is a few broken arms. Otherwise I can see no reason why anyone would support this dreadful bill.

And, it doesn't stop with veterans health cuts. This bill still guts Federal safeguards that protect our air, water, land, and public health from toxic pollution. It is a dangerous attack on American families, and American veterans, and it belongs in the trash can. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and defeat this bill, again. Veterans need their health care this week just as much as they needed it last week.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule on a bad bill. It should be rejected. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], for making this time available.

The bill has not been changed. The Wall Street Journal says it. What does it say? It says that the House Republican leadership determined to overcome an embarrassing loss last week and will try again to pass a compromise \$80.6 spending bill, but without restoring additional funds for veterans medical care. It goes on to say that new construction funds will be cut back by the GOP.

But this is where the leadership hopes to get votes, by adding language that raises the hopes of additional medical clinics in the home district of three lawmakers, who it goes on to name.

I think that is wonderful. But what we really need is a bill which is fair and decent and which takes care of the veterans. I would point out to my colleagues that there is not a new nickel in this bill for veterans care. The same abuses with regard to the environment are there, the same improper legislation in an appropriations bill is there.

Remember, the bill last week was overwhelmingly rejected by this body, and the reason was that it did not provide adequate care to American veterans. Better than 1 million veterans will not be getting care and better than 40 facilities will close which are now providing health care to veterans because of this bill and budget. Also better than 5,000 people who are providing health care to American veterans will lose their job at VA under this bill.

The quality of care for American veterans will continue to erode to satisfy

my Republican colleagues' desire to balance the budget at the expense of the poor, the unfortunate, and the veterans.

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to follow up on what the gentleman from California said, and that is that the rule should be defeated with regard to this conference report, if only because we have continued to have this battle over authorizing language or riders in the bill.

As you know, on two occasions in this House, we have asked and we have voted to remove the antienvironmental riders that apply to the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA. Yet we still have some of them in the bill. We have the rider that deals with wetlands that essentially guts the EPA's ability to veto a bad wetlands decision. We also have the rider that says that no Superfund sites can be added to the national priority list. And many of the 17 riders that we voted against on the floor of this House twice still exist in the report language of the bill.

If I could just talk about the two provisions that remain in the statute itself, one with regard to the Superfund Program. The Superfund Program is actually cut back in this legislation by about 19 percent. If no new sites can be added, it really cripples, if you will, the efforts to the EPA when they find hazardous material and contaminated hazardous sites. When they reach a certain level that they should be added by the Superfund, all of a sudden they cannot be considered and cleaned up pursuant to the Federal program.

When you talk about wetlands protection, particularly from my home State of New Jersey, this is a very serious problem in areas which are rapidly developing. The EPA has not traditionally exercised its authority on wetlands that much.

□ 1215

They are very discreet, I would say, in exercising their veto over the Army Corps of Engineers' actions. So it makes absolutely no sense to say in this appropriations bill, in this conference report, that EPA's ability to deal with wetlands protection is simply taken away.

Overall, the bill continues this onward thrust to dismantled our ability to protect the environment. The cuts in the EPA are around 20 percent overall. The cuts in enforcement are 25 percent. I have said over and over gain, if we cannot enforce good environmental laws, what is the use of even having them. And I am afraid that is what this is all about. There are many people here who simply do not want to see our environmental laws enforced, so they go, in a roundabout way, to make sure

they cannot be enforced, to make sure the polluters are able to do their thing, so to speak, by cutting back on enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to go. We should defeated the rule and we should also defeat the conference report.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, first off, I want to acknowledge the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURTHA], a good marine, back there.

Mr. Speaker, I tend to get excited and upset when I see political shenanigans going on around here. I was very proud to have served in the U.S. Marine Corps. I was very proud to have been elected to come to this body 18 years ago. I was very proud to have served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for 10 years and serve as the ranking Republican on that committee.

I would like to invite all my colleagues to come up to my Saratoga office, where I have a wall half as wide as this room here full of plaques from every major veterans organization in America, national veterans' organizations, talking about how much we have done for the veterans of this Nation.

Then I see this kind of shenanigans on the floor here where somebody comes on the floor and they say we are not providing enough money for veterans. These same people that are saying this, and this is why I get so exasperated, are people that voted against peace through strength day in and day out, year in and year out, when we were trying to bring down the Iron Curtain and stop the spread of international communism around this world. These same people voted against the defense budget day in and day out. They voted against contra aid in Central America when we were trying to stop the spread of communism right here in this hemisphere. They voted against the deployment of intermediate range missiles, which was finally what really brought the Soviet Union to their knees. They voted against aid to El Salvador. They voted against every single defense budget that I can recall, even when we had an effort to try to strengthen the CIA.

All these so-called veterans supporters were voting against all of these things, and yet they have the gall to come on this floor here today and say we are not spending enough money for the veterans.

Upstairs, Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Rules, when they made these same kind of ridiculous arguments, we pointed out to them that in this appropriation bill, which provides for the funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of

Housing and NASA, and a myriad of other agencies and bureaus, we pointed out that almost every one of them were being cut. I think maybe every one of them were being cut except for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. SONNY MONTGOMERY, from the other side of the aisle, the ranking member on the Veterans' Affairs Committee today, and one of the most standup men I know, he and I and the gentleman from Arizona, BOB STUMP and the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS, and others fought to get a level of funding for the medical care delivery system, that part of the budget, up to about \$600 million, over a half billion dollars, and we succeeded. And, oh, how the liberals complained because we were cutting housing and we were cutting the EPA.

We just heard a little of it down here on the floor a minute ago, cutting NASA, cutting all these other sundry agencies. Well, up in the Committee on Rules I made the offer. As my friends know, we lost. We could not maintain that whole \$600 million in additional spending when everything else is being cut and finally had to settle for about \$400 million. But that is almost a half billion dollars more than last year. I said, I will make this offer. Where do we want to take it out of the rest of this budget, because that is where it has to come from? Do we want to take it out of housing? Oh, no, we cannot take it out of housing. Do we want to take it out of EPA? Oh, no, we cannot take it out of EPA. Do we want to take it out of NASA? Oh, my gosh, no. We had people from Texas there and they would not take it out of NASA.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are today with this phony argument saying that they want to recommit this bill and reinstate and add another \$200 million for veterans. Let me tell my colleagues, that is the most phony argument I have ever heard in my life. And I tell my colleagues, I personally resent it, and I want everybody to come over here and I want them to vote for this rule. Then I want them to vote for this bill, which, in my opinion, gives a fair and adequate increase to the veterans budget.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the gentleman at the microphone is an outstanding marine veteran, but he is not the only veteran in the House.

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely. I just pointed to another good one.

Mr. MOAKLEY. The gentleman can point to another one here.

Mr. SOLOMON. Absolutely.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have our differences on what is wrong. The only thing I am making a point of is that this budget came in with \$200

million less than the House position. Is that not so, Mr. SOLOMON?

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asked me how I could fix that. We were not informed on how those on the other side of the aisle were putting the budget together, when they had all those raw figures. We are closed off of that room. So at one time, after the gentleman brings the budget, he says where would I fix it?

All I am saying is, if the House came in with that figure originally, the veterans need that money today as much as they needed it last week. And when the bill was recommitted, no one looked at that veterans figure to try to make some changes. It is still the same figure as it was when the bill was defeated here last week. That is the only point I am making.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman makes a good point. I worship the ground a former President walked on, and I have not talked to him since last February 6, when we passed the line item veto. That was Ronald Reagan. He taught me something, and it always bothered me, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and that is when we compromise, are we compromising our principles?

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if we really believe in something, we should not give in. He said, JERRY, in all the years I was President, for 8 years, he said I could not have it all my way. We had to compromise. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say to Mr. MOAKLEY, there is another body over there, and we have to live with them. We cannot just ignore them.

Now, we have 250 veterans hospitals out there, and all of these outpatient clinics and all of these people. We need to keep those going. The money expires. We have to pass this bill. Somewhere along the line we had to compromise. So if we can get \$400 million more for the veterans medical care delivery system, and it came out of NASA, HUD, and Housing and we cannot get another penny out of there, I think it is time we compromise.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time we voted for this bill because I think it is fair for everybody. What does the gentleman think?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield once again, I would say, no, I think we should stay with the House position on the veterans. It was the veterans who came forward that were responsible in killing this bill, and I do not see any changes that affect them in here. I would be very surprised if a lot of people from your party do not walk in with casts on their arms if they are forced to change their votes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time once again, let me

say that I think the people in my party will do what I ask them. I hope the gentleman does not change his mind, because we are just getting the President's new budget.

The President, when he finally got around to giving us a 10-year balanced budget, according to his figures, he was going to cut veterans benefits by \$9 billion within the first 7 years of that 10 and then \$17 billion overall. We just got this new budget he set up this morning, and lo and behold, what does it have in it? Four billion dollars, not \$200 million. Four billion dollars in additional cuts in veterans benefits.

I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I want him to stick with me and fight that with every ounce of strength he has.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has erred on his figures.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I am reading it out of Congress Daily in the Washington Post. Do they make errors?

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS, my very good friend, who has done such an admirable job in one of the most difficult positions in this Congress, and that is having to appropriate funds for this whole myriad, this big part of this entire budget.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague yielding, and I did not want to intervene in the magnificent discussion between members of the Committee on Rules, but I must say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] that your colleague and ranking member on the Committee on Rules is absolutely wrong when he suggests that we did not make an effort to find this money.

As a matter of fact, when we got our direction from the House, the biggest difficulty with that motion to recommit was the fact the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] chose not to find offsets. It was obvious he was playing a political game in the process.

Mr. SOLOMON. That is what I resent.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Having said that, nonetheless, we went back and took a very, very hard look. The reality is that the only account in this bill that had an increase had to do with VA medical care, some \$400 million. There are significant reductions, actual reductions, in housing and EPA and NASA, in FEMA, and all of them less under the CR, to say the least. As we go forward, those accounts will be affected very significantly.

But to suggest we did not try to find that money, the reality was that we could not go back and get more out of HUD. Maybe the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] wants that, I am not sure. We could not go back and get more out of EPA. Maybe Mr. OBEY wants that, but I am not sure. He did

not indicate it. We did try to find the money, and came to the conclusion that the only account that had been increased was VA medical care; and, indeed, it was appropriate for us to have the House recognize that support for our veterans.

It is very, very important that we not distort this process. Some in the House, maybe the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], I am not sure, some in the House believed the President was going to veto the defense bill, and from that they would take away some money from defense and give to these social accounts. Now, that did not occur. The President let that bill become law. We did not get a veto.

I never expected it, frankly, but we did not get extra money. Maybe that was their wish list, whereby we would provide more money for every one of these social programs. But, indeed, that did not occur, and because of it, this bill is fairly balanced and should not be distorted further because of the political process that appears to be taking place on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say to the gentleman, we are doing everything we can to cooperate. We voted, many of us the other day, for the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill. There was a lot in there I did not like. It was too much spending. But we have to keep the Government running. We have to keep it going. This is an effort, a compromise to do that.

This is probably the most important part of the entire budget except for the Department of Defense. That is why we need to compromise and pass this bill today.

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

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask, does the gentleman know of any veteran or veterans organization that is not interested in our Nation reaching a balanced budget? Do not the veterans organizations, at least they have expressed it to me, feel very strongly that our whole economy and their benefits and everybody else's benefits, Social Security, the whole gamut of what the Government provides, depends on our reaching a balanced budget as soon as possible so that the work of the gentleman from California and his committee, and all the other committees, and the gentleman from the Committee on Rules, in trying to contract the Government spending and keeping those benefits flowing in a rational manner all lead to a balanced budget which benefits everyone? Is that not what the veterans want for our country? I ask that rhetorically.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time once again, I would

say to the gentleman, yes, everyone does, and so does 69 percent of the rest of the American people.

I am going to ask the gentleman to yield back the balance of the time and I will move the previous question, but I would hope that everyone would come over here. We have the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], we have four more appropriation bills to nail down here in some way and we want to work together.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me say I find this debate ironic. This is December 7. A fairly significant military event happened on that day, as all of us know. I think it is ironic that on December 7 we are being asked by our Republican friends on this side of the aisle to adopt an appropriations bill which will reduce funding for veterans medical care by \$213 million below the amount originally provided in the House bill.

□ 1230

Do we want that money restored? You betcha. Do we want more money in this bill in general? You betcha. I make absolutely no apology for that.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] said that those who brought this motion to the floor, in the gentleman's words, had voted against providing aid to the Contras. You bet I did. It was an illegal war. The gentleman said that we voted against aid to Salvador. Not me. I voted for a significant amount of aid to Salvador.

The gentleman said we voted against the Pershing missile. No, I did not. I supported the Pershing missile. I thought that was the one missile that was necessary to bring the Soviet Union to their senses. I think the gentleman ought to get his facts straight.

Second, let me point out that the President is going to veto this bill. It is \$900 million below where the President wants it on the Veterans' Administration, and \$1.6 billion below on the Environmental Protection Agency. While my colleagues have very reluctantly eliminated the antienvironmental riders in the bill, they still have included many of those same riders in the statement to the managers, which still puts pressure on the EPA to follow those antienvironment suggestions being made by this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would make the point that this bill, when it comes back from conference, has \$1.5 billion more to use, and yet the account for veterans medical care is reduced by \$213 million. We do not believe that makes sense.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle can talk all they want about there being a nominal increase in the funding for veterans medical care, but the increase provided will not keep up

with inflationary cost increases to provide VA medical care. I think the committee understands it.

Mr. Speaker, this reduction will mean that nearly 50,000 veterans will be denied treatment at VA facilities; nearly 20,000 inpatient visits will not occur; nearly 430,000 outpatient visits will not be accommodated; more than 2,700 personnel years in the VA will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly think that is the kind of present we want to give our veterans on December 7. I would urge, after this rule is disposed of, that we vote for the recommittal motion when it is offered again, to insist that the committee do what this House said they ought to do in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this committee does not have to reduce EPA funding in order to facilitate this request of ours. What they do need to do is go back to the drawing board and get a new budget allocation from the Committee on Appropriations central office so that they do not have to skewer the progress we want to make in veterans health care and in environmental protection.

Mr. BEILENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

Mr. QUILLEN. 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. Evidentially a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 175, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 842]

YEAS—242

Allard	Brewster	Combest
Archer	Brownback	Condit
Army	Bryant (TN)	Cooley
Bachus	Bunn	Cox
Baker (CA)	Bunning	Crane
Baker (LA)	Burr	Crapo
Ballenger	Burton	Cremeans
Barr	Buyer	Cubin
Barrett (NE)	Callahan	Cunningham
Bartlett	Calvert	Davis
Barton	Camp	Deal
Bass	Canady	DeLay
Bateman	Castle	Diaz-Balart
Bereuter	Chabot	Dickey
Bilbray	Chambliss	Doolittle
Bilirakis	Chenoweth	Dornan
Bliley	Christensen	Dreier
Blute	Chrysler	Duncan
Boehlert	Clinger	Dunn
Boehner	Coble	Ehlers
Bonilla	Coburn	Ehrlich
Bono	Collins (GA)	Emerson

English	Knollenberg	Roberts
Ensign	Kolbe	Rogers
Everett	LaHood	Rohrabacher
Ewing	Largent	Roth
Fawell	Latham	Roukema
Fields (TX)	LaTourette	Royce
Flanagan	Laughlin	Salmon
Foley	Lazio	Sanford
Forbes	Leach	Sawyer
Fox	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Franks (CT)	Lewis (KY)	Scarborough
Franks (NJ)	Lightfoot	Schaefer
Frelinghuysen	Linder	Schiff
Frisa	Livingston	Seastrand
Funderburk	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Gallely	Longley	Shadegg
Ganske	Lucas	Shaw
Gekas	Manzullo	Shays
Gilchrest	Martini	Shuster
Gillmor	McCollum	Skeen
Gilman	McCrary	Skelton
Goodlatte	McDade	Smith (MI)
Goodling	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gordon	McInnis	Smith (TX)
Goss	McIntosh	Smith (WA)
Graham	McKeon	Solomon
Greenwood	Metcalf	Souder
Gunderson	Meyers	Spence
Gutknecht	Mica	Stearns
Hall (TX)	Miller (FL)	Stenholm
Hamilton	Molinari	Stockman
Hansen	Mollohan	Stump
Hastert	Montgomery	Talent
Hastings (WA)	Moorhead	Tate
Hayes	Morella	Tauzin
Hayworth	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
Hefley	Myers	Thomas
Heineman	Myrick	Thornberry
Heger	Nethercutt	Tiahrt
Hilleary	Neumann	Torkildsen
Hobson	Ney	Trafficant
Hoekstra	Norwood	Upton
Hoke	Nussle	Vucanovich
Horn	Oxley	Waldholtz
Hostettler	Packard	Walker
Houghton	Parker	Walsh
Hunter	Paxon	Wamp
Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)	Weldon (FL)
Hyde	Petri	Weldon (PA)
Inglis	Pombo	Weller
Johnson (CT)	Porter	White
Johnson, Sam	Portman	Whitfield
Jones	Pryce	Wicker
Kasich	Quillen	Williams
Kelly	Quinn	Wolf
Kim	Radanovich	Young (FL)
King	Ramstad	Zeliff
Kingston	Regula	Zimmer
Klug	Riggs	

NAYS—175

Abercrombie	Dicks	Hinchesy
Andrews	Dingell	Holden
Baessler	Dixon	Hoyer
Baldacci	Doggett	Jackson-Lee
Barcia	Dooley	Jacobs
Barrett (WI)	Doyle	Jefferson
Becerra	Durbin	Johnson (SD)
Beilenson	Edwards	Johnson, E.B.
Bentsen	Engel	Johnston
Berman	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Bishop	Evans	Kaptur
Bonior	Farr	Kennedy (MA)
Borski	Fattah	Kennedy (RI)
Boucher	Fazio	Kennelly
Browder	Fields (LA)	Kildee
Brown (CA)	Filner	Klecicka
Brown (FL)	Flake	Klink
Brown (OH)	Foglietta	LaFalce
Cardin	Ford	Lantos
Clay	Frank (MA)	Levin
Clayton	Frost	Lewis (GA)
Clement	Furse	Lincoln
Clyburn	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Coleman	Gephardt	Lofgren
Collins (IL)	Geren	Lowey
Collins (MI)	Gibbons	Luther
Conyers	Gonzalez	Maloney
Costello	Green	Manton
Coyne	Gutierrez	Markey
Cramer	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Danner	Harman	Mascara
DeLauro	Hastings (FL)	Matsui
Delahunt	Hefner	McCarthy
Deutsch	Hilliard	McDermott

McHale	Peterson (FL)	Stupak
McKinney	Pickett	Tanner
McNulty	Pomeroy	Taylor (MS)
Meehan	Poshard	Tejeda
Meek	Rahall	Thompson
Menendez	Rangel	Thornton
Mfume	Reed	Thurman
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Torres
Minge	Roemer	Torricelli
Mink	Rose	Towns
Moakley	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
Moran	Rush	Vento
Morano	Sabo	Visclosky
Nadler	Sanders	Ward
Neal	Schroeder	Waters
Oberstar	Schumer	Watt (NC)
Obey	Scott	Waxman
Olver	Serrano	Wilson
Ortiz	Sisisky	Wise
Orton	Skaggs	Woolsey
Owens	Slaughter	Wyden
Pallone	Spratt	Wynn
Pastor	Stark	Yates
Payne (NJ)	Stokes	
Payne (VA)	Studds	
Pelosi		

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen
Bevill	Fowler	Tucker
Bryant (TX)	Hancock	Volkmer
Chapman	Istook	Watts (OK)
de la Garza	Rivers	Young (AK)

□ 1253

Mr. SKAGGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 842, I was on the floor and voted my voting card. Evidently an electronic malfunction occurred and my vote was not recorded. If it had been properly recorded, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 291, 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. COMBEST). Pursuant to House Resolution 291, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of Wednesday, December 6, 1995, at page 35553.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] will each 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 and on the Senate amendments reported in disagreement and that I might include

tables, charts, 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, it is a pleasure once again to bring to the House floor the conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1996 Appropriations Act for the Department of Veterans Affairs, housing, and other independent agencies. Following Housing passage of the motion to recommit, I anticipated that the conferees would follow the direction of the House and add an additional \$213 million to the VA medical care account.

Unfortunately, when that motion was made, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] chose not to supply necessary offsets so it would be in order to facilitate our effort in responding to the House's direction. So as a result of that lack of direction, Senator BOND and I made a serious effort to locate offsets but soon discovered that removing \$213 million from the other accounts, to say the least, would distort our bill considerably.

As Members can see from this chart, which outlines the major agencies in this account, it is apparent that most of our agencies have been reduced very significantly from the 1995 appropriations year. HUD, for example, is down by \$350 million. NASA down by \$352 million. EPA is down by \$235 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious by this chart that there is only one account, there is only one account within this bill that had an increase. And that increase was some \$400 million for VA medical assistance. It is true that when the bill left the House we had more money in this specific account, but everybody knows that when we deal with the other body, we must make sure that we try to make sense out of the priorities of both bodies. In this case, it is very obvious that the priorities involved making sure that we did not continue with further reduction in programs like important housing programs as well as important programs in EPA.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important for the House to recognize that the present CR that we are dealing with for EPA, for example, creates major adjustments in terms of money availability. If we look at the current CR we are working under, EPA is cut by 11.5 percent. For housing programs, for example, they are 12.5 percent below the levels of the current conference report.

□ 1300

This is a far, far greater reduction than the reductions in the VA-HUD bill that is before us today. These remain-

ing eight days provide a window of opportunity for narrowing the differences that divide the Congress and the White House. With every passing day, indeed with every passing hour, this window of opportunity is closing.

If the White House is serious about resolving the differences that remain between the White House and the Congress, the time to act is now. We are suggesting to the administration that they take a hard look at what a CR really means. If we should decide by the action on the floor today not to send this bill forward, not to have an opportunity to change it between now and the time it actually goes to the White House, then indeed it is very likely that all of these programs will operate under a CR that is considerably longer than ever anticipated and a continuing resolution that is even more severe than these numbers we see on the chart before us.

If indeed Members of the House want to give support to important housing programs, if they really care about EPA, if indeed we are interested in seeing that these programs go forward in a way that makes sense, the important thing today is to vote no on the motion to recommit that will be before us shortly and, beyond that, vote aye on final passage in this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, just 1 week ago I stood before the House in opposition to the conference report on H.R. 2089, the fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD and Independent Agencies appropriations act. As I stated then, this bill grossly underfunds many critical programs upon which this Nation depends for decent and affordable housing, veterans benefits, a safe and clean environment, science and technological investments.

Earlier this year, the House demonstrated that it shared my position with regard to protecting our environment and adopted the Stokes-Boehlert motion to instruct when the House appointed conferees. Then upon bringing the conference report to the floor for consideration, the House registered further concern about insufficient funding for yet another important program, veterans medical care, and re-committed the bill to conference.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report brought back for consideration shows plain and simple that the leadership does not care that the House wanted this bill changed. The basis of recommitment was to maintain the House position for veterans medical care. Nothing in this bill has changed with regard to that instruction.

In fact, it appears that the leadership's interpretation of recommitting a bill based on specific instructions means merely changing votes of Members who voted to recommit the bill. I

think that veterans and veterans organizations should watch today to see which Members voted with them just 8 days ago in favor of more money for veterans medical care by recommitting the bill, and now, without any changes in the bill, changed their votes against adding the additional funds barely a week later.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report completely ignores the House instruction. This is total disrespect, disregard, and defiance to this body, after it re-committed this bill with instructions. In flagrant disregard of the House instruction, the conferees decide not to add any more money to VA medical care, and, after changing just a few commas, semicolons, and adding a little language, sent the same bill back here today in total derogation of the House's instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I have said before this is a bad bill. The President has said it is a bad bill. The House said it was a bad bill when it sent it back to conference. Since the conference report has not changed to reflect the House instructions, maybe the House needs to tell the conferees again. The President has given us his position on the bill, and that is the statement that I have received on the statement of administration policy that says this:

The President will veto this bill, if presented to him in its current form. 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 doors on college for thousands of young people, and leave veterans seeking medical care with fewer treatment options.

The President's statement also says:

In addition, the administration would like to work with the Congress to address the other concerns that were outlined in the conference letter of November 6, 1995.

The President finally says:

Clearly, this bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear. The President urges Congress to send him an appropriations bill for these important priorities that truly serves the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not serve the American people, and I urge support for the motion to recommit and to vote against the conference report.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG], a member of the committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, what we have before us today is the same conference report as before, but a decidedly different budgetary playing field.

Since the last time we were here, President Clinton has signed the Defense bill, which, for the time being, takes off the table the honey pot of money the administration was seeking

to redirect toward spending on social programs.

Indeed, the choice before us today seems more clear today than ever before.

Either President Clinton signs this bill, or all of the programs under its jurisdiction will most likely be funded at the levels contained in the last continuing resolution.

This bill is really the last, best chance we have to increase spending on environmental protection; to increase spending on affordable housing; to increase spending on space exploration and scientific research compared to current funding levels.

The numbers are indisputable. Every major program in this conference report gets an increase. NSF up 0.63 percent; FEMA up 1.74 percent; NASA up 1.92 percent; VA medical care up 2.47 percent; EPA up 11.46 percent; and HUD up 12.44 percent.

So I urge my colleagues, think long and hard about that before you vote.

Now Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to address the veterans medical care issue.

There has been a lot of debate about the conference committee's actions following this latest motion to recommit. And I think it is time we start separating the facts from all the political theater.

When the conference report was last brought to the floor, the minority moved that it be sent back to conference to add more money for veterans' medical care.

At the time, I doubt that even the sponsors of the motion to recommit believed that it would prevail.

After all, motions to recommit are procedural votes that are, with few exceptions, largely symbolic in nature.

Certainly, this motion to recommit did not have the same significance as, say the Stokes-Boehlert motion we considered earlier this fall.

But I think that many Members saw this vote as an opportunity to demonstrate their concern for the Nation's veterans. Who knows, maybe some Members voted to recommit the VA-HUD bill just out of habit.

Either way, the motion passed.

But I think it is clear that this was not an organized attempt to put more money into veterans medical care. If it were, the sponsors surely would have offered a package of offsetting spending cuts to fund the increase. They did not.

So the conference committee treated the motion for what it really was—a feel-good vote.

I believe that every Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, shares a genuine concern for those Americans who have sacrificed their health and well-being in defense of our great Nation.

Indeed, in the bill before us today, we have treated veterans medical pro-

grams better than any other program under our jurisdiction.

The lesson here is that procedural votes, however politically appealing, have real consequences.

So I urge my colleagues, let us keep the process moving along. Vote for the conference report, and resist any further procedural potshots fired from the sidelines.

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, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, as Yogi Berra said, "It's déjà vu all over again." On December 7, the day on which the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor, we are bringing up a bill of special concern and interest to our veterans. This is exactly the same bill that was rejected by the House recently, because it slashed veterans health care some \$400 million below the administration's request, and some \$213 million below the choke-hold level that the House had passed. The same bill is back before us. Let us reject it again, because it is no better bill today than it was last week when we rejected it.

I remember my vote last time, and I know my colleague do. We voted for veterans, for their families, for their children. We told the majority that while we favored a balanced budget, we do not favor a budget that balances on the back of our veterans. We said that with their slashing of Medicare, their trashing of Medicaid, and their bashing of every other item in the social safety net, adequate health services for our Nation's veterans becomes even more vital.

We said then this bill is unacceptable. It is still unacceptable. It has not changed. It will cut funds for construction of two hospitals, including one needed to replace a hospital damaged in the L.A. earthquake of 1991. It will lead to firing of health care workers. It will lead to denial of health care for veterans. It includes the same punitive constructions on the budget of the Administrator and the Secretary of the Veterans Affairs Department.

A vote against this bill will simply inform the Committee on Appropriations conferees, who have disregarded the instruction of this House, that they cannot so lightly do it, and that when the House informs them they are to take care of the veterans, they should do so.

A vote against the bill that arbitrarily cuts 22 percent from EPA's general budget is also a good vote. It makes a total additional 25 percent cut in environmental enforcement. These cuts, totaling over \$1.6 billion, come on top of nearly \$1.3 billion in last year's rescission bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against this outrageous behavior by the Committee on Appropriations.

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

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference agreement for a second time. I again thank the gentleman from California, Chairman LEWIS, for yielding me this time. He deserves credit for doing a terrific job on a tough but very essential bill.

As I said last week on the House floor during consideration of this conference agreement, we have done the best we could, given our allocation. We have prioritized our Nation's needs. No one ever said it would be simple balancing our Federal budget, but I believe it has been done responsibly.

It is easy for those in the minority to say that we need more money. But the fact is, what we need to do is to live within our means. We have spent our allocation, and there is no more money left.

That is why I was surprised when this conference report was recommitted with instructions to add more money to veterans medical care. This program, unlike the majority of the other programs included in this bill, received nearly a \$400 million increase, an increase of \$400 million.

Yesterday in conference committee the question was asked of the minority, where should the increased funding for veterans medical care come from? No suggestions were given, and the reason no suggestions were given was because they know that in order to govern, to really balance the Federal budget, and to serve people's needs, we all have to make tough choices.

A delicate balance has been reached in this conference agreement, and taking funding from one program and giving it to another would disrupt this essential balance.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good conference report. We have done our job. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I did last week, I strongly oppose this mean spirited and draconian HUD-VA appropriations conference report for fiscal year 1996. Nothing has changed. It was a bad bill then and it is a bad bill today. It still victimizes people who are helpless—they have neither money nor power, which are commodities that seem to get attention these days. And it still slashes one-fifth of the budget for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

What this conference report still does, make no mistake, is place the

burden on cities and States, while the Federal Government takes a walk and abrogates its responsibilities. The Republicans call it devolution; I call it shirking our responsibility in favor of the wealthy at the expense of America's poor and working families.

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

□ 1315

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HUTCHINSON].

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, under this conference agreement, VA medical care is increased by \$400 million. Increased. A real increase of \$400 million at a time when the word "increase" is becoming a rarity. It comes at a time of declining veteran population and a decline in the utilization of VA hospitals.

In addition, 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. The VA-HUD appropriations agreement is fair to veterans' programs. In fact, the VA-HUD Act reflects cuts in virtually every agency program or account except VA's medical care account. This increase comes at a time in which the veterans' population will decrease by 2.5 million and the VA hospitals, it might surprise my colleagues to know, on any given day has between 23 percent and 50 percent of all beds in those VA hospitals lying vacant.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, the adoption of this agreement, is integral to our balanced budget plan. And what will a balanced budget mean to Arkansas' veterans, my home State? With a balanced Federal budget, according to a recent study, interest rates will drop 2.7 percent. For an Arkansas veteran that means, on the average mortgage, \$1,591 per year that they will save. That is for an Arkansas veteran. On a school loan, on an average 10-year student loan in Arkansas, they will save \$645 when we do this. They will save \$148 per household because of the decreased cost of local and State governments.

A balanced budget is good for veterans and this is a step toward that balanced budget, which we need.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican plan invests dollars and dignity in veterans' programs. It also makes a commitment to future veterans that America will be anchored on a sound, strong financial basis. This bill is pro veteran. I urge support for it.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. It is basically the first step of a two-step process which we are going

to see within this Congress. The first step is putting the EPA on a starvation diet. Squeeze down the amount of money they have to clean up Superfund sites. That is what this bill does.

Meanwhile, at the same time, in the Committee on Commerce, there is a Superfund gutting bill which does at least two things, but more. One, it puts a cap of only 125 more sites that can ever be cleaned up under Superfund. Ever. Only 125. There is at least 1,200 or 1,500 more sites in the country, but that is all it will be, 125.

Second, it gives polluter rebates. It is the Ed McMahon polluter's clearing-house sweepstakes. The Superfund bill in the Committee on Commerce says to polluters, congratulations, you may have already won millions of dollars in fabulous cash rebates. All you have to do is wait for Congress to pass that bill that is in Commerce right now, and soon our prize van will be on its way to your corporate headquarters with a rebate check in hand to pay you for cleaning up sites that you willfully or negligently polluted in the past, draining out all remaining money that is in Superfund.

So think of this as the one-two punch. Finishing off Superfund once and for all, drain the revenues here so that we cannot clean up any of the existing sites that are on the list, sorry, and then put a cap on any future sites in the next bill coming down the line.

Mr. Speaker, we must vote no here so that we can have the full debate we need on what the responsibility is of the Government of this country to clean up these neighborhood nightmares across the country.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time, and I commend him on handling a bill that I think is very important to the future of our veterans and the future of our Nation's space program and handling the bill extremely well.

This bill fully funds our manned space flight program and the shuttle account at the levels the President asked for. It also includes funding for the construction of a new veterans clinic in my district. The veterans in my district have been asking for a health care facility for 12 years. It is one of the largest areas in the Nation of veterans that does not have a medical health care facility, and we have some funding in this bill to provide them with some good quality outpatient medical care.

Mr. Speaker, as many know, prior to coming here I was a practicing physician, and this will meet about 80 to 90 percent of the health care needs of the veterans in my district. It is a good bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

What I think was disgraceful, Mr. Speaker, was a motion to recommit to add more money to a veterans account and then no attempt to find an offset for where those funds would be coming from. I had hundreds and hundreds of veterans support me in my campaign last year because they want the budget balanced. They know if we do not balance the budget, there will be no money for health care for veterans, there will be no money for the space program. There will be no money for anything. We will be broke.

Mr. Speaker, it is shameful to see people getting up and saying let us put more money into this and then not come up with a place to find the money. We need to get our priorities in order. We need to balance the books. We need to be responsible with the way we handle the people's money. This is the people's money.

I know what would happen if the minority were the majority. They would just borrow the money again. They would add more money to our Nation's debt.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of this committee has crafted a well-thought-out bill that meets the needs for the future of our Nation, for the future of our space program and for the future of our veterans. It is a good bill. I encourage all of my colleagues to support the bill and vote, yes.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS], a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a disaster. This conference report hits veterans where it hurts most. It cuts funding for new construction of veterans outpatient medical facilities. Many aged and ill veterans are forced to try to travel miles to get to a VA facility and this would decrease transportation assistance. Many are simply doing without desperately needed health care.

If that is not enough, this bill hurts another vulnerable population, families and children, who simply need a place to live. Decent housing, shelter, a roof over their heads. This bill cuts housing by 21 percent. What an indictment on our values. We wave the flag and proclaim our love for veterans, yet when their backs are turned, we stab them in the back by ignoring their health care needs. And where are our so-called family values? These are real lives, real people, real children, real families we are hurting.

I urge my colleagues to reject this conference report. It does not even deserve the dignity of a debate.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and the veterans throughout our Nation need to know the truth about this conference report. It is a good piece of legislation that deserves to be passed and signed into law. Why? Because without this legislation veterans will not get the health care they deserve. This bill provides the VA-Medical Care Account with \$400 million more than last year. It is the only account in the entire bill to receive an increase.

What will happen if this bill does not pass or is vetoed by the President? Should we have to fund all the accounts in the bill under a continuing resolution, those levels will not be nearly as high as the levels in this bill. That is true for veterans programs, housing programs, environmental programs, and disaster readiness. That is why it is essential that this bill be passed and signed by the President.

All of these programs are important, and this conference report reflects this fact by providing funding to improve housing for our poor, to eliminate drugs in our neighborhoods, to maintain essential environmental programs, and to provide good health to our veterans.

These are our Nation's priorities and this legislation provides funding for these priorities. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report to H.R. 2099. If you care about the veterans and other citizens in your district, you will know it is the right thing to do.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. NEUMANN], a member of the committee.

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. The freshman class came here about 10 months ago with a very strong responsibility to get this budget balanced in 7 years or less. When we look at the overall budget picture, we see Medicare spending going up from \$4,800 per person to now over \$7,100 per person in the system. We see Medicaid spending going up at a rate faster than the rate of inflation.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to allow these areas of the budget to increase, and at the same time get to a balanced budget over a 7-year period of time, someplace, somewhere the budget has to be brought under control. And much to the credit of our chairman, this is one of the places where the budget was, in fact, brought under control.

Our chairman has hit the number that he was given in order to bring the budget into balance over this 7-year period of time, and, clearly, he is to be commended for doing that. This area of spending in the HUD-VA budget and budget authority is down over \$9 billion from last year. This is truly a credit to the chairman of this committee and to all the people that have been actively involved in bringing this in line.

The American people have said it is time to get this budget balanced. Clearly, this bill we have on the table today is an important and significant step in the right direction.

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

SHIRLEY VOLKMER, WIFE OF REPRESENTATIVE HAROLD VOLKMER, PASSES AWAY

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I asked for this unanimous consent to speak out of order for a moment to inform the House that Shirley Volkmer, the wife of our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, HAROLD VOLKMER, passed away this morning in Arlington Hospital.

I would like to notify the Members that visitation will be held tomorrow, Friday, December 8, from 6 p.m. until 8 p.m. at the Murphy Funeral Home located at 4510 Wilson Boulevard in Arlington, VA. Visitation will be held from 2 p.m. until 5 p.m. Sunday, December 10, at the O'Donnell Funeral Home in Hannibal, MO.

Services for Shirley Volkmer are scheduled for 10 a.m. Monday, December 11, at the Holy Family Catholic Church in Hannibal, MO.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS], the ranking minority member of the Veterans' Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, today my Republican colleagues have a choice, a very clear choice. I believe they must choose between their commitment to veterans health care versus towing the party line.

Last week, 25 House Republicans showed independence and courage in saying no to their party and no to \$213 million in conference cuts to veterans health care. These 25 Republicans should be saluted for putting veterans above partisanship. Sadly, rather than saluting them, the House Republican leadership scolded them for supporting veterans.

Let me quote for my colleagues one House leader from today's Wall Street Journal. Referring to the 25 Republicans, the leader said this, and I quote, "I was madder than hell. They had forgotten the big picture and they were doing things on their own individual initiatives."

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day for this House when Republicans are criticized by their own leadership for showing their own individual initiatives to support veterans. The Journal article went on to say this: "The loss infuriated the leadership, which wants to show its political muscle and reverse the outcome without making high profile concessions on spending."

Mr. Speaker, when did showing political muscle become more important than helping veterans? I would suggest that showing political courage is far more important than showing political muscle.

I urge my 25 Republican colleagues, who cast a tough vote, a courageous vote in favor of veterans last week, to do so again today. How can anyone explain to veterans why in 1 week they

switched their vote on \$213 million in veterans health care? More important, by putting veterans above partisanship, we can ensure that our Nation's veterans receive the quality health care they so deeply deserve.

I urge my 25 Republican colleagues to vote today for the same motion to recommit that they voted for just a week ago. Our veterans have stood up for us. Now, on Pearl Harbor Day, it is time for us to stand up for them.

□ 1330

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

Taking just a moment, I was kind of curious about the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EDWARDS]. I presume, since the gentleman knows full well that his party is not willing to take additional funding out of HUD or out of EPA, I suppose the gentleman would want to take it out of NASA. We can take more out of NASA, if the gentleman would like, and put it back into veterans programs, but I am not sure that his district or his State would understand or appreciate that.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, may we have some understanding as to how much time each side has left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] has 15½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, what this legislation is about speaks to the priorities of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] and the Republican leadership, and those priorities are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of Americans are finding it increasingly difficult to locate affordable housing, should we be making major cuts in our housing programs which will result in higher rents for the working poor and increased homelessness? The answer is no.

At a time when people from one end of this country to the other are worried about the impact of pollution and pesticides in our air, our water, and in our food, should we be making devastating cuts in environmental protection? The answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when millions of our veterans, the people who put their lives on the line to defend this country, are today unable to receive the health care and the other benefits which they have been promised, should we be laying the groundwork in this legislation for a 7-year budget which makes devastating cuts to our veterans programs? The answer is no.

Mr. Speaker, this country must move forward toward a balanced budget, but

we should not do it on the backs of our veterans, the elderly, the children, the middle class, and the poor.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN].

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise really to speak in response to some of the things we have heard here, because listening, it is almost like some of our veterans across the country might think we do not care about them.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that our veterans know and understand that under the bill we are about to pass, spending on veterans benefits is being increased by \$400 million. It is the only category, as we looked at this whole thing, where we did in fact do increases. Only in Washington do we call a \$400 million increase for our veterans a cut.

Mr. Speaker, I just think it is very important that we reassure the veterans in this Congress, and the veterans across this country, that veterans benefits are not being cut. Veterans benefits under this bill are going up by \$400 million.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill. This bill wildly misses the mark. It misses the mark on fairness, because it misplaces our values and it is about misguided priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I am a strong supporter for the balanced budget and have voted for a coalition budget that balances the budget in a fair manner by the year 2002.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill will cut housing by 22 percent, it will not restore \$213 million in badly needed veterans benefits, and it misplaces our priorities in science, where it rewards a space station that is \$80 billion over budget and threatens our science in programs like the Galileo project that will hopefully be tremendously successful today in helping us discover what takes place on Jupiter.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to defeat this misguided, misplaced bill and to continue to work on efforts such as the coalition budget to balance this budget in a fair manner.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments in this debate about priorities. This bill is doing everything it can with the limited resources we have to prioritize those tax dollars to the people who need the money the most.

Mr. Speaker, it deals with housing in a way that holds people very accountable for the condition of those houses, but ensures that people who need to live in public housing, who need a lift up, will get that.

So, public housing is not cut, nor is it going to send anybody out into the streets. The money is spent to ensure that people who need to live in those houses have a decent place to live and ensures the accountability of those people who are on the boards of directors of public housing in the various communities.

Mr. Speaker, as far as veterans benefits are concerned, I will say two things. First, it is an increase of \$400 million. That is an actual increase. I am a veteran of Vietnam, wounded. I spent time in the system. As a former Marine Corps, wounded Vietnam veteran, and the list goes on and on, and there are a lot of Americans out there that are in that category, I have been through the system.

Mr. Speaker, I have been through naval hospitals. I have been through veterans hospitals. I continue to visit them as a Member of Congress and also as a wounded veteran who occasionally will need their services. This bill makes sure, and we are held accountable, this bill makes sure that veterans receive the benefits that they deserve.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the distinguished ranking minority member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, we are being asked to pass a bill which reduces veterans funding by \$900 million, and which cuts environmental protection funding by \$1.6 billion below the amount requested by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we ought to do that on any day. I certainly do not think we ought to do that on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor. That is not the message I want to send to veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to say that on the environmental side, while the committee has removed, after the House voted to instruct them to do so, while the committee has removed the 17 anti-environment riders, the polluter's dream list, from the bill, they have, nonetheless, retained some of those same provisions in the statement of the managers, which still puts pressure on EPA to follow those misguided suggestions. I do not think we ought to do that on December 7, or any time.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a number of charts displayed by our good friends on the Republican side of the aisle. I would simply make two points. If those charts compared agency-to-agency funding from one year to another, they would show that total VA funding is \$43 million below last year, and \$915 million below the President.

In a very simplified chart, if this line across the page is represented by the President's budget, veterans are cut by \$915 million. Or if I can use a comparative chart, the bill which came back from conference had \$1.5 billion more than what was contained in the House

bill, represented by this baseline. But, in fact, veterans got \$213 million less in funding, even though the bill was expanded by a billion and a half dollars. Now, that hardly sounds to me like veterans are being given high priority.

Mr. Speaker, we are being told on the Republican side of the aisle by my good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN], that, after all, we have a 2-percent increase in here for veterans. There is a nominal increase for veterans health care, but the fact is the inflation rate in health care is 10 percent a year.

Mr. Speaker, when we provide only a 2 percent adjustment, that means in real purchasing power there is a significant decline in what we are going to be able to provide for veterans. That is why 50,000 veterans will be denied treatment at VA facilities; nearly 20,000 inpatient visits will not occur; 430,000 outpatient visits will not be accommodated; and, 2,700 personnel-years will be lost.

Mr. Speaker, we are also told, "Gee whiz, you folks did not prepare any offsets." There are a number of offsets that the committee could provide. They know where they can find them. But let me suggest that we did ask the Committee on Appropriations to provide a different outcome, because we offered a motion in full committee where the allocations are made between the 13 various subcommittees. We offered a change in allocation from that adopted by the Republican majority which would have provided significant additional assets in this bill. I believe the number was around \$200 million additional in outlays.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, if we want to correct the problem, we ought to go back and provide a different 602 allocation. That is what we ought to do. What my Republican colleagues have done is to short-sheet this bill in order to enable the country to buy twice as many B-2 bombers as the Pentagon wants, and in order to enable the country to go down the road in spending \$70 billion on an aircraft that we do not need for another 15 years in the case of the F-22.

In order to finance those additional funding requests that the Republican majority has, we are being told we ought to cut education, squeeze veterans, squeeze health care, squeeze environmental protection. I do not think that is what this Congress ought to be all about.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, in closing, that in addition to the problem which we have in veterans, which can be corrected by the motion to recommend, we need to have a substantial increase in environmental funding, and this bill simply does not provide it.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], my classmate and colleague.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting in my office and I saw all these words flying back and forth, and I was reminded of an adage we have back in Wisconsin that actions speak louder than words. I was reminded that yesterday President Clinton vetoed the balanced budget bill. But to do it, he flew a pen from Texas, from the LBJ Library, up here to Capitol Hill, to Washington, to the White House, to veto the bill.

Mr. Speaker, if he is so interested in veterans on this historic day of December 7, I would have given President Clinton this pen and he could have vetoed the bill, and he could have saved all of that money and could have given it to the veterans.

□ 1345

We have got too much symbolism here. It is about time for some intellectual integrity. Our friends on the other side are throwing all this barnyard stuff over here. Let us do something for the veterans on December 7. Let us do something for the children of this country. Let us do something for the United States of America for which all those veterans fought, and let us have a balanced budget for the first time in 26 years and really do something for this country, rather than all this symbolism.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, let us, if we might, try to set the record straight on a couple of aspects of this bill that are pretty much irrefutable. This bill eliminates national service as we know it in this country, never to occur again. It eliminates community development financial institutions. It decimates the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to do what it has set out to do, whether it is Superfund cleanup or rewarding polluters, as this bill does, it is bad news for the EPA, for the environment and for Americans no matter where they may be. And it goes so far, it cuts the EPA by 20 percent.

Some critics are upset because some of us have raised the question about veterans and are arguing, well, veterans are concerned about a balanced budget. Every veteran I know is, but they are also concerned about knowing that they will have someplace safe to take care of them in their old age. We were not worried about offsets when we were sending them into World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. We should not be worried now except to say that we have an obligation to veterans that goes beyond just maintaining the funding.

We cut 60 percent in construction facilities alone and that adversely affects veterans no matter who they are or where they are. Finally the bill reduces funding for housing by 20 percent. It takes all of the things that many of us

have worked for on both sides of the aisle under the name of a balanced budget and eliminates them by saying, this is what we have to do.

Conscience tells me what we have to do is to reorder priorities. In doing that, we will find other ways to take care of the balanced budget, but not by decimating the EPA, by doing away with housing throughout this country and housing programs, and by severely hurting veterans who all across this Nation are looking for decent, adequate veterans care and a right to believe that this country and this Congress on December 7, Pearl Harbor day, have their best interests in mind. It is a bad bill. In fact, it is a disaster. I would urge its defeat.

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN].

Ms. BROWN of Florida. 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's 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's why Florida needs the Brevard County Hospital.

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's 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's 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. service men 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. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my position on H.R. 2099 has been consistent from the beginning. It simply does not have a sufficient enough allocation to address all the vital programs under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee. It is irresponsible to even consider sacrificing one critical program over another solely because the Republican leadership does not want to provide additional money for this bill overall.

There was an opportunity for us to do this, just 2 days ago, when the House full Committee on Appropriations met and increased the 602(b) allocation for other appropriations bills. However, the VA-HUD allocation was not considered as a part of these discussions. We are not even talking about making up the \$9 billion difference between the President's budget request and this conference report.

The President in good faith tried to negotiate a package that would have added an additional \$2 billion for VA HUD as well as support the remaining appropriations bills at a level that would retain some very important domestic programs. I think it is important for me, before closing, to say that I have just received, while here on the floor, a statement of administration policy. It is dated December 7, 1995. In the statement of administration policy we are told that the President will veto this bill if it is presented to him in the current form.

This is after the administration has been advised of the action taken by the

conferees yesterday in conference. I will not read other parts of the bill, of the statement except to say this: The President said, the bill provides less than the President requested for veterans medical care. The bill also includes significant restrictions on funding for the Secretary that appear targeted at impeding him from carrying out his duties as an advocate for veterans throughout the country. Finally, the bill does not provide necessary funding for VA hospital construction.

The President ends the statement by saying: Clearly, this bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear. The administration would like to work with the Congress to address the issues discussed above as well as the other concerns that were outlined in the conferees letter of November 6, 1995. The President urges Congress to send him an appropriations bill for these important priorities that truly serves the American people.

Obviously, this bill does not serve the American people.

Lastly, I would just make reference to a letter I received, dated December 7, 1995, from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. The Secretary says in his letter to me: "Dear Congressman STOKES, I was greatly pleased to see that the House voted yesterday"—this is referring back to the previous vote—"to recommit the fiscal year 1996 VA-HUD Independent Agencies Appropriations Act back to the conferees with instructions to provide an additional \$213 million for VA medical care."

It goes on further to say: "It is my great hope that the conferees will be able to agree on a figure that represents the sense of the House as evidenced by yesterday's vote."

Secretary Brown then says: "It is also my hope that the conferees will be able to address the issues of the punitive cuts in my office and three VA staff offices. These cuts were a reaction against what I consider were my honest efforts to be sure that the veterans community and the public were aware of the facts in the budget debate. I understand the conferees reacting against my outspoken advocacy for VA medical funding. But their action will result in adverse personnel actions through either furloughs or layoffs for many dedicated career civil servants who are performing essential services."

We have a chance today to try and give the conferees one additional chance to clean up this bad bill.

I think the House has spoken once before. This is a golden opportunity for us to once again tell the conferees of the House and Senate that this bill is intolerable, that the President is going to veto it. Congress has the first opportunity and the first responsibility to act before the President has to take the serious action that he has indicated. I urge Members to support the motion to recommit and vote against this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the letter from Secretary Brown to which I referred.

THE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,  
Washington, DC, November 30, 1995.

Hon. LOUIS STOKES,  
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN STOKES: I was greatly pleased to see that the House voted yesterday to recommit the FY 1996 VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act back to the conferees with instructions to provide an additional \$213 million for VA Medical Care. Your leadership in opposing the conference report was instrumental in the successful motion to recommit. I applaud your outstanding efforts.

You and I have talked often about the necessity for providing adequate funding to take care of the medical needs of our sick and disabled veterans. It is my great hope that the conferees will be able to agree on a figure that represents the sense of the House, as evidenced by yesterday's vote.

It is also my hope that the conferees will be able to address the issue of the punitive cuts in my office and three VA staff offices. These cuts were a reaction against what I consider were my honest efforts to be sure that the veterans community and the public were aware of the facts in the budget debate. I understand the conferees reacting against my outspoken advocacy for VA medical funding, but their action will result in adverse personnel actions, through either furloughs or layoffs, for many dedicated career civil servants who are performing essential services.

Once again, I want to thank you for your outstanding leadership and your dedication to our Nation's veterans.

Sincerely,

JESSE BROWN.

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, I first want to say too, that we very much appreciate our colleagues' patience with this process. It is not usual that we go back at a bill more than one time, and in this circumstance to have a bill recommitted by the House for a specific purpose is not the normal process. Because of that, we are taking up a good deal more of the House's time than would be normal.

I think it is important for the Members to know exactly what the circumstances were at the time of that recommitment motion. At that point in time, there is little doubt that there were those on the other side of the aisle, some on this side of the aisle, who thought the President did plan to veto the defense bill. My colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], has referred to his own belief that there were several billions of dollars in the defense bill that the President had not sought and, therefore, he might very well veto it.

The motion to recommit in part was in hopes with that veto that they

would get more money for this bill and there could be additional dollars put back in the veterans programs. The fact is that that veto did not take place. So we are dealing with a specific and limited number of dollars within this bill.

Just as important, I think it is critical for all of us to understand that we are on a pathway to attempting to balance our budget over a 7-year period. Between this year and the year 2002, we hope to get to a balanced budget. If we are to do that, we must recognize that there are only a few bills around that have sizable numbers of discretionary dollars.

This bill makes the single greatest contribution of all of our appropriations bills toward balancing that budget, a savings from the President's request of some \$9.2 billion. Between now and the time this bill gets to the President's desk, he can still come forward and participate in a serious way in this process, if indeed he has some other adjustments or priorities that he would make.

Please, have the President and his people come and talk to us. He has yet to suggest any change that would make this bill more satisfactory from his point of view. Between now and the time the Senate finishes its work, there is a narrow window of opportunity for him to do that. Otherwise, the President is playing politics with this bill rather than seriously seeking partnership by way of working with the legislative branch.

I want to tell my colleagues that there has only been one major disappointment this year in this process. My disappointment lies with the difference I see between the way the majority and the minority worked with each other in the House versus the other body. I was most impressed by the fact that the other body found itself in the same situation we are in, limited numbers of dollars because we are in a new reality.

We are attempting to reduce the rate of growth in spending and eventually balance the budget. Recognizing that in the other body, the Democrats and Republicans alike worked together in a very positive way within limited circumstances to try to accomplish a bill that met most of their needs. In the House, I am disappointed to say, we have not had that experience. I must say that one of my best friends on the other side of the aisle is my colleague and my ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES]. I say to my colleague that it is a great disappointment to me that we have not been able to work together in a positive way in this new atmosphere.

I do understand his and his colleagues' great disappointment with the fact that we are not in a situation where Congress is going to continue to just take last year's spending, increased by inflation, and then add on

more. That has been the pattern for the 15 years I have served on the subcommittee. But indeed, in that new environment, I would have hoped we could have worked together in a positive way instead.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my distinguished chairman and my friend that I share with him the concerns that he has expressed in terms of the manner in which the process in the House has not been the same as it was in the past. As the gentleman knows, when I chaired the same subcommittee which he now chairs, I attempted at all times to involve the gentleman in the process and did so in a way where he was never caught in the dark as I have been caught in terms of this particular bill. I have not been included in the same way I included the gentleman. I just want to say to the gentleman I hope that he could have handled the matter a little differently.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I really did not intend to discuss this on the floor, but the reality is that this year we have given the gentleman information ahead of time in printed form. We have informed him well ahead of time. In the past this Member had these issues discussed the night before the bill went

forward with no material to take home, no material to discuss. Indeed, we believe we have been radically more open than it was in the past.

If I could continue with my comments, I am not sure, I must say, while I have expressed my disappointment, and I hope that my colleague and I will discuss this further in private, I do not know where my colleague would take the additional funds that he suggests that he would like to give back to the veterans by way of this recommittal motion.

□ 1400

I cannot believe that he is not appreciative of the reality that veterans' programs are increased in this bill. It is the only account that has an increase in this bill. Above and beyond that, every one of these other programs has been reduced. I do not think my colleague would want to take more money out of HUD. I cannot believe my colleague would be interested in taking more money out of EPA. I really do not believe my colleague wants to close down NASA.

The reality is that this is a balanced bill, as balanced as it can be within the constraints of the limitations of this new age.

Let me say that it is also important for the Members to know that I have not heard from one veterans' group that has not been satisfied with this bill. Indeed most recognized the re-

ality, that they have an increase in this bill while no other agency has an increase.

Further, I think it is important for our colleagues to know that should we decide in this body not to go forward with this legislation, then we are left with the continuing resolution and we are likely to have a continuing resolution for a very extended period. Under those circumstances every one of these accounts would be spending out at considerably less, perhaps as much as 25 percent less, than they would under this piece of legislation.

This is a very, very difficult bill. It is complex obviously, but, most importantly, Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to know that this is the first serious effort to take a gigantic step in the direction of balancing our budget, the largest single contribution towards balancing the budget and moving down that pathway toward 2001. This is a good bill. It recognizes our constraints, and at the same time it recognizes our critical responsibilities to the people who are served by the programs that come under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, and, Mr. Speaker, with that I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit, and I urge my colleagues in the final analysis to vote for the bill.

Mr. Speaker: I submit the following material for the RECORD.

Table with multiple columns of text, likely a list of bills or amendments, including numbers like 900, 901, 902, etc., and names of sponsors.

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

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE I</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS</b>						
<b>Veterans Benefits Administration</b>						
Compensation and pensions.....	17,626,892,000	17,649,972,000	17,649,972,000	17,649,972,000	17,649,972,000	+ 23,080,000
Readjustment benefits .....	1,286,600,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	1,345,300,000	+ 58,700,000
Service Members Occupational Conversion and Training .....				6,880,000		
<b>Subtotal .....</b>	<b>1,286,600,000</b>	<b>1,345,300,000</b>	<b>1,345,300,000</b>	<b>1,352,180,000</b>	<b>1,345,300,000</b>	<b>+ 58,700,000</b>
Veterans insurance and indemnities .....	24,760,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	24,890,000	+ 130,000
Guaranty and indemnity program account (indefinite) .....	507,095,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	504,122,000	-2,973,000
Negative subsidy for guaranteed loans .....		-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000	-185,500,000
Administrative expenses .....	65,226,000	78,085,000	65,226,000	65,226,000	65,226,000	
Loan guaranty program account (indefinite) .....	43,939,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	-20,989,000
Administrative expenses .....	59,371,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	52,138,000	-7,233,000
(By transfer) .....					(6,000,000)	(+ 6,000,000)
Direct loan program account (indefinite) .....	25,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	28,000	+ 3,000
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(1,000,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(-700,000)
Administrative expenses .....	1,020,000	459,000	459,000	459,000	459,000	-561,000
(Loan level) .....	(97,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(99,000)	(+ 2,000)
Education loan fund program account.....	1,061	1,093	1,000	1,000	1,000	-61
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(4,034)	(4,120)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(-34)
Administrative expenses .....	195,000	203,000	195,000	195,000	195,000	
Vocational rehabilitation loans program account.....	54,000	56,000	54,000	54,000	54,000	
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(1,964,000)	(2,022,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	(1,964,000)	
Administrative expenses .....	767,000	377,000	377,000	377,000	377,000	-390,000
Native American Veteran Housing Loan Program Account.....	218,000	455,000	205,000	205,000	205,000	-13,000
<b>Total, Veterans Benefits Administration .....</b>	<b>19,616,163,061</b>	<b>19,493,536,093</b>	<b>19,480,417,000</b>	<b>19,487,297,000</b>	<b>19,480,417,000</b>	<b>-135,746,061</b>
<b>Veterans Health Administration</b>						
Medical care .....	16,214,684,000	16,961,487,000	16,777,474,000	16,450,000,000	16,564,000,000	+ 349,316,000
(Transfer out) .....				(-5,700,000)	(-4,500,000)	(-4,500,000)
Legislative offsets .....			-170,000,000	-170,000,000		
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>16,214,684,000</b>	<b>16,961,487,000</b>	<b>16,607,474,000</b>	<b>16,280,000,000</b>	<b>16,564,000,000</b>	<b>+ 349,316,000</b>
Medical and prosthetic research.....	251,743,000	257,000,000	251,743,000	257,000,000	257,000,000	+ 5,257,000
Health professional scholarship program.....	10,386,000	10,386,000	10,386,000			-10,386,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	69,789,000	72,262,000	63,602,000	63,602,000	63,602,000	-6,187,000
(By transfer) .....				(5,700,000)	(4,500,000)	(+ 4,500,000)
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	500,000					-500,000
Transitional housing loan program:						
Loan program account (by transfer) .....	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	(7,000)	
Administrative expenses (by transfer) .....	(54,000)	(56,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	(54,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	(70,000)	
General post fund (transfer out).....	(-61,000)	(-63,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	(-61,000)	
<b>Total, Veterans Health Administration.....</b>	<b>16,547,102,000</b>	<b>17,301,135,000</b>	<b>16,933,205,000</b>	<b>16,600,602,000</b>	<b>16,884,602,000</b>	<b>+ 337,500,000</b>
<b>Departmental Administration</b>						
General operating expenses.....	890,193,000	915,643,000	821,487,000	872,000,000	848,143,000	-42,050,000
Offsetting receipts .....			(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(+ 32,000,000)
(Transfer out) .....					(-6,000,000)	(-6,000,000)
<b>Total, Program Level .....</b>	<b>(890,193,000)</b>	<b>(915,643,000)</b>	<b>(853,487,000)</b>	<b>(904,000,000)</b>	<b>(874,143,000)</b>	<b>(-16,050,000)</b>
National Cemetery System .....	72,604,000	75,308,000	72,604,000	72,604,000	72,604,000	
Office of Inspector General .....	31,815,000	33,500,000	30,900,000	30,900,000	30,900,000	-915,000
Construction, major projects.....	354,294,000	513,755,000	183,455,000	35,785,000	136,155,000	-218,139,000
(Transfer out) .....			(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)	(-7,000,000)
Construction, minor projects.....	152,934,000	229,145,000	152,934,000	190,000,000	190,000,000	+ 37,066,000
Parking revolving fund.....	16,300,000					-16,300,000
(By transfer) .....			(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(+ 7,000,000)
Grants for construction of state extended care facilities .....	47,397,000	43,740,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	47,397,000	
Grants for the construction of state veterans cemeteries .....	5,378,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-4,378,000
<b>Total, Departmental Administration .....</b>	<b>1,570,915,000</b>	<b>1,812,091,000</b>	<b>1,309,777,000</b>	<b>1,249,686,000</b>	<b>1,326,199,000</b>	<b>-244,716,000</b>
<b>Total, title I, Department of Veterans Affairs.....</b>	<b>37,734,180,061</b>	<b>38,606,762,093</b>	<b>37,723,399,000</b>	<b>37,337,585,000</b>	<b>37,691,218,000</b>	<b>-42,962,061</b>
(By transfer) .....	(61,000)	(63,000)	(7,061,000)	(12,761,000)	(17,561,000)	(+ 17,500,000)
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(3,135,034)	(2,495,120)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(2,437,000)	(-698,034)
<b>Consisting of:</b>						
Mandatory .....	(19,489,311,000)	(19,361,762,000)	(19,361,762,000)	(19,361,762,000)	(19,361,762,000)	(-127,549,000)
Discretionary .....	(18,244,869,061)	(19,245,000,093)	(18,361,637,000)	(17,975,823,000)	(18,329,456,000)	(+ 84,586,939)

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>TITLE II</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>						
<b>Selected Housing Programs</b>						
Housing certificates for families and individuals performance funds.....		6,509,955,000				
Public and Indian housing capital performance funds.....		4,884,000,000				
Annual contributions for assisted housing.....	11,083,000,000		10,182,359,000	5,594,358,000	10,155,795,000	-827,205,000
Prepayment authority.....					4,000,000	+ 4,000,000
Transfer from UDAG.....	(100,000,000)					(-100,000,000)
Severely distressed public housing.....	500,000,000			500,000,000	280,000,000	-220,000,000
Assistance for the renewal of expiring section 8 subsidy contracts.....	2,536,000,000			4,350,862,000		-2,536,000,000
Flexible subsidy fund.....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS.....		186,000,000				
Congregate services.....	25,000,000					-25,000,000
Rental housing assistance:						
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite.....	-38,000,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	-35,119,000	+ 2,881,000
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
Rescission of prepayment recaptures.....	-86,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-163,000,000	-87,000,000
Homeownership assistance.....	6,875,000					-6,875,000
Rescission of budget authority, indefinite.....	-184,000,000					+ 184,000,000
Public and Indian housing operation performance funds.....		3,220,000,000				
Payments for operation of low-income housing projects.....	2,900,000,000		2,500,000,000	2,800,000,000	2,800,000,000	-100,000,000
Drug elimination grants for low-income housing.....	290,000,000			290,000,000	290,000,000	
Affordable housing performance funds.....		3,339,000,000				
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,400,000,000		1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	1,400,000,000	
Homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere grants (HOPE grants).....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
National homeownership trust demonstration program.....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Youthbuild program.....	50,000,000					-50,000,000
Housing counseling assistance.....	50,000,000		12,000,000			-50,000,000
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	
(Limitation on guarantee loans).....	(22,388,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(36,900,000)	(+ 14,512,000)
Violent crime reduction program.....		3,000,000				
<b>Total, Selected housing programs (net).....</b>	<b>18,705,875,000</b>	<b>17,946,836,000</b>	<b>13,899,240,000</b>	<b>14,740,101,000</b>	<b>14,734,676,000</b>	<b>-3,971,199,000</b>
<b>Homeless Assistance</b>						
Homeless assistance fund.....		1,120,000,000				
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,120,000,000		676,000,000	760,000,000	823,000,000	-297,000,000
<b>Community Planning and Development</b>						
Community opportunity fund.....		4,850,000,000				
Community opportunity performance program account.....		21,000,000				
Administrative expenses.....		900,000				
Community development grants.....	4,600,000,000		4,600,000,000	4,600,000,000	4,600,000,000	
Section 108 loan guarantees:						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(2,054,000,000)		(1,000,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(1,500,000,000)	(-554,000,000)
Credit subsidy.....			10,500,000	15,750,000	31,750,000	+31,750,000
Administrative expenses.....			225,000	675,000	675,000	+ 675,000
<b>Policy Development and Research</b>						
Research and technology.....	42,000,000	42,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	34,000,000	-8,000,000
<b>Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity</b>						
Fair housing activities.....	33,375,000	45,000,000	30,000,000		30,000,000	-3,375,000
<b>Management and Administration</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	451,219,000	479,479,000	437,194,000	438,219,000	420,000,000	-31,219,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(495,355,000)	(527,782,000)	(505,745,000)	(532,782,000)	(532,782,000)	(+ 37,427,000)
(By transfer, GNMA).....	(8,824,000)	(9,101,000)	(8,824,000)	(9,101,000)	(9,101,000)	(+ 277,000)
(By transfer, Community Planning and Development).....		(900,000)	(225,000)	(675,000)	(675,000)	(+ 675,000)
<b>Total, Salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>(955,398,000)</b>	<b>(1,017,262,000)</b>	<b>(951,988,000)</b>	<b>(980,777,000)</b>	<b>(962,558,000)</b>	<b>(+ 7,160,000)</b>
Office of Inspector General.....	36,427,000	36,968,000	36,427,000	36,968,000	36,567,000	+ 140,000
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds).....	(10,961,000)	(11,283,000)	(10,961,000)	(11,283,000)	(11,283,000)	(+ 322,000)
<b>Total, Office of Inspector General.....</b>	<b>(47,388,000)</b>	<b>(48,251,000)</b>	<b>(47,388,000)</b>	<b>(48,251,000)</b>	<b>(47,850,000)</b>	<b>(+ 462,000)</b>
Office of federal housing enterprise oversight.....	15,451,000	14,895,000	14,895,000		14,895,000	-556,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-15,451,000	-14,895,000	-14,895,000		-14,895,000	+ 556,000

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Federal Housing Administration</b>						
<b>FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:</b>						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(100,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(+10,000,000,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(180,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(+20,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	308,846,000	341,595,000	308,846,000	341,595,000	341,595,000	+32,749,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-308,846,000	-341,595,000	-308,846,000	-341,595,000	-341,595,000	-32,749,000
<b>FHA - General and special risk program account:</b>						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(20,885,072,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(15,000,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(17,400,000,000)	(-3,485,072,000)
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(220,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(120,000,000)	(-100,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	197,470,000	197,470,000	197,470,000	202,470,000	202,470,000	+5,000,000
Program costs.....	188,395,000	188,395,000	69,620,000	100,000,000	85,000,000	-103,395,000
Subsidy - multifamily.....	-134,096,000	-37,996,000	-37,996,000	-37,996,000	-37,996,000	+96,100,000
Subsidy - single family.....	-81,673,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	-27,044,000	+54,629,000
Subsidy - Title I.....	-24,460,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	-23,777,000	+683,000
<b>Total, Federal Housing Administration.....</b>	<b>145,636,000</b>	<b>297,048,000</b>	<b>178,273,000</b>	<b>213,653,000</b>	<b>198,653,000</b>	<b>+53,017,000</b>
<b>Government National Mortgage Association</b>						
<b>Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:</b>						
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(142,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(110,000,000,000)	(-32,000,000,000)
Administrative expenses.....	8,824,000	9,101,000	8,824,000	9,101,000	9,101,000	+277,000
Offsetting receipts.....	-262,700,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-508,300,000	-245,600,000
<b>Administrative Provisions</b>						
Procurement savings.....	-3,538,000					+3,538,000
FHA mortgage insurance limits.....	-3,000,000					+3,000,000
GNMA REMICs.....	-180,000,000					+180,000,000
GNMA REMICs II.....	-30,600,000					+30,600,000
1-year extension of HECM's demonstration.....			-11,000,000	-11,000,000	-8,000,000	-8,000,000
FHA Assignment Reform.....					-1,078,000,000	-1,078,000,000
Non-judicial foreclosure.....	-10,000,000					+10,000,000
Multi-family property disposition - FHA fund.....				-40,000,000	-40,000,000	-40,000,000
Sec. 213 - demonstration.....					30,000,000	+30,000,000
Sec. 224 - FHA fund.....				34,000,000	34,000,000	+34,000,000
<b>Total, title II, Department of Housing and Urban Development (net).....</b>	<b>24,653,518,000</b>	<b>24,340,032,000</b>	<b>19,391,383,000</b>	<b>20,323,167,000</b>	<b>19,348,122,000</b>	<b>-5,305,396,000</b>
Appropriations.....	(24,941,518,000)	(24,538,151,000)	(19,589,502,000)	(20,521,286,000)	(19,546,241,000)	(-5,395,277,000)
Rescissions.....	(-288,000,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(+89,881,000)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite).....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(264,939,072,000)	(237,400,000,000)	(236,000,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(-26,039,072,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(515,140,000)	(549,066,000)	(525,755,000)	(553,841,000)	(553,841,000)	(+38,701,000)
<b>Consisting of:</b>						
Advance appropriation available.....	800,000,000					-800,000,000
Appropriations available from this bill.....	24,653,518,000	24,340,032,000	19,391,383,000	20,323,167,000	19,348,122,000	-5,305,396,000
<b>Total, title II.....</b>	<b>25,453,518,000</b>	<b>24,340,032,000</b>	<b>19,391,383,000</b>	<b>20,323,167,000</b>	<b>19,348,122,000</b>	<b>-6,105,396,000</b>
<b>TITLE III</b>						
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
<b>American Battle Monuments Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	20,265,000	
<b>Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	500,000					-500,000
<b>Community Development Financial Institutions</b>						
<b>Community development financial institutions fund program account.....</b>						
Loan subsidy.....	125,000,000	123,650,000				-125,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....		350,000				
<b>Consumer Product Safety Commission</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	42,509,000	44,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-2,509,000
<b>Corporation for National and Community Service</b>						
<b>National and community service programs operating expenses</b>						
Additional termination costs for national service.....	575,000,000	817,476,000		6,000,000	15,000,000	-560,000,000
Office of Inspector General.....	2,000,000	2,000,000		9,000,000		-2,000,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>577,000,000</b>	<b>819,476,000</b>		<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>15,000,000</b>	<b>-562,000,000</b>
<b>Court of Veterans Appeals</b>						
Salaries and expenses.....	9,429,000	9,820,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-429,000

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

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>Department of Defense - Civil</b>						
<b>Cemeterial Expenses, Army</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	12,017,000	14,134,000	11,296,000	11,946,000	11,946,000	-71,000
<b>Environmental Protection Agency</b>						
Research and development .....	350,000,000	426,661,000	384,052,000	500,000,000	525,000,000	-350,000,000
Science and Technology .....			1,881,614,000			+ 525,000,000
Environmental programs and compliance .....						-1,417,000,000
Abatement, control, and compliance .....	1,417,000,000	1,748,823,000				(-296,722,500)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(296,722,500)					
Program and research operations .....	922,000,000	1,017,298,000				-922,000,000
Program Administration and Management .....				1,870,000,000	1,550,300,000	+ 1,550,300,000
Office of Inspector General .....	28,542,000	33,050,000	28,542,000	27,700,000	28,500,000	-42,000
Transfer from Hazardous Substance Superfund .....	15,384,000	14,078,000	5,000,000	11,700,000	11,000,000	-4,384,000
Transfer from Leaking Underground Storage Tanks .....	669,000	710,000	426,000	600,000	500,000	-169,000
Subtotal, OIG .....	44,595,000	47,838,000	33,968,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	-4,595,000
Buildings and facilities .....	43,870,000	112,820,000	28,820,000	60,000,000	60,000,000	+ 16,130,000
Hazardous substance superfund .....	1,435,000,000	1,507,937,000	1,003,400,000	1,003,400,000	1,163,400,000	-271,600,000
Legislative proposals - reforms .....		55,000,000				
Transfer to OIG .....	-15,384,000	-14,078,000	-5,000,000	-11,700,000	-11,000,000	+ 4,384,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(308,000,000)					(-308,000,000)
Subtotal, Hazardous substance superfund .....	1,419,616,000	1,548,859,000	988,400,000	991,700,000	1,152,400,000	-287,216,000
Leaking underground storage tank trust fund .....	70,000,000	77,273,000	45,827,000	45,827,000	45,827,000	-24,173,000
Transfer to OIG .....	-669,000	-710,000	-426,000	-600,000	-500,000	+ 169,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(8,150,000)		(5,285,000)	(8,000,000)	(7,000,000)	(-1,150,000)
Subtotal, LUST .....	69,331,000	76,563,000	45,401,000	45,227,000	45,327,000	-24,004,000
Oil spill response .....	20,000,000	23,047,000	20,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	-5,000,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(8,420,000)		(8,420,000)	(8,000,000)	(8,000,000)	(-420,000)
Water infrastructure / State revolving fund .....	2,262,000,000	1,865,000,000	1,500,175,000			-2,262,000,000
Safe drinking water State revolving fund .....	700,000,000	500,000,000				-700,000,000
State and Tribal Assistance Grants .....				2,340,000,000	2,323,000,000	+ 2,323,000,000
Environmental services - user fees .....		-7,500,000				
Procurement savings .....	-7,525,000					+ 7,525,000
Total, EPA .....	7,240,887,000	7,359,409,000	4,892,430,000	5,661,927,000	5,711,027,000	-1,529,860,000
<b>Executive Office of the President</b>						
Office of Science and Technology Policy .....	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	4,981,000	
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality .....	997,000	2,188,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+ 3,000
Total .....	5,978,000	7,169,000	5,981,000	5,981,000	5,981,000	+ 3,000
<b>Federal Emergency Management Agency</b>						
Disaster relief .....	320,000,000	320,000,000	235,500,000		222,000,000	-98,000,000
Disaster assistance direct loan program account:						
State share loan .....	2,418,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	2,155,000	-263,000
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(175,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(25,000,000)	(-150,000,000)
Administrative expenses .....	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	95,000	
Salaries and expenses .....	162,000,000	172,331,000	162,000,000	168,900,000	168,900,000	+ 6,900,000
Office of the Inspector General .....	4,400,000	4,673,000	4,400,000	4,673,000	4,673,000	+273,000
Emergency management planning and assistance .....	215,960,000	210,122,000	203,044,000	203,044,000	203,044,000	-12,916,000
Emergency food and shelter program .....	130,000,000	130,000,000	100,000,000	114,173,000	100,000,000	-30,000,000
Administrative provision REP savings .....	-11,525,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-12,257,000	-732,000
Procurement savings .....	-1,441,000					+ 1,441,000
Equipment sales (sec. 519) .....		-30,000,000			-10,000,000	-10,000,000
National Flood Insurance:						
Salaries and expenses .....		(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(20,562,000)	(+ 20,562,000)
Flood mitigation .....		(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(70,464,000)	(+ 70,464,000)
Premium increase .....		-21,000,000				
Total, Federal Emergency Management Agency .....	821,907,000	776,119,000	694,937,000	480,783,000	678,610,000	-143,297,000
<b>General Services Administration</b>						
Consumer Information Center .....	2,004,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	2,061,000	+ 57,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(2,454,000)	(2,502,000)	(2,502,000)	(2,602,000)	(2,602,000)	(+ 148,000)
<b>Department of Health and Human Services</b>						
Office of Consumer Affairs .....	2,166,000	1,811,000	1,811,000			-2,166,000

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,  
AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</b>						
Human space flight .....	5,514,897,000	5,509,600,000	5,449,600,000	5,337,600,000	5,456,600,000	-58,297,000
Science, aeronautics and technology .....	5,901,200,000	6,006,900,000	5,588,000,000	5,960,700,000	5,845,900,000	-55,300,000
Rescission .....	-10,000,000					+10,000,000
National aeronautical facilities .....	400,000,000					-400,000,000
Mission support .....	2,554,587,000	2,726,200,000	2,618,200,000	2,484,200,000	2,502,200,000	-52,387,000
Office of Inspector General .....	16,000,000	17,300,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	
Administrative provision: Transfer authority .....					(50,000,000)	(+50,000,000)
<b>Total, NASA (net) .....</b>	<b>14,376,684,000</b>	<b>14,260,000,000</b>	<b>13,671,800,000</b>	<b>13,798,500,000</b>	<b>13,820,700,000</b>	<b>-555,984,000</b>
<b>National Credit Union Administration</b>						
Central liquidity facility:						
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	(600,000,000)	
(Limitation on administrative expenses, corporate funds) .....	(901,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(-341,000)
<b>National Science Foundation</b>						
Research and related activities .....	2,280,000,000	2,454,000,000	2,254,000,000	2,294,000,000	2,274,000,000	-6,000,000
Rescission .....	-35,000,000					+35,000,000
Major research equipment .....	126,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	70,000,000	-56,000,000
Academic research infrastructure .....	250,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	100,000,000	-150,000,000
Education and human resources .....	605,974,000	599,000,000	599,000,000	599,000,000	599,000,000	-6,974,000
Salaries and expenses .....	123,966,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	127,310,000	+3,344,000
Office of Inspector General .....	4,380,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	4,490,000	+110,000
National Science Foundation headquarters relocation .....	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	
<b>Total, NSF (net) .....</b>	<b>3,360,520,000</b>	<b>3,360,000,000</b>	<b>3,160,000,000</b>	<b>3,200,000,000</b>	<b>3,180,000,000</b>	<b>-180,520,000</b>
<b>Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation</b>						
Payment to the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation .....	38,667,000	55,000,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	38,667,000	
<b>Selective Service System</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	22,930,000	23,304,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	
<b>Department of Justice</b>						
<b>Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity</b>						
Fair Housing activities .....				30,000,000		
<b>Department of the Treasury</b>						
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise oversight .....				14,895,000		
Offsetting receipts .....				-14,895,000		
<b>Total, title III, independent agencies (net) .....</b>	<b>26,858,463,000</b>	<b>26,896,568,000</b>	<b>22,571,178,000</b>	<b>23,337,060,000</b>	<b>23,556,187,000</b>	<b>-3,102,276,000</b>
Appropriations .....	(26,710,988,000)	(26,896,568,000)	(22,571,178,000)	(23,337,060,000)	(23,556,187,000)	(-3,154,801,000)
Rescissions .....	(45,000,000)					(+45,000,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(623,746,500)	(2,502,000)	(16,207,000)	(18,602,000)	(17,602,000)	(-606,144,500)
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(775,000,000)	(716,026,000)	(716,026,000)	(716,026,000)	(716,026,000)	(-58,974,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds) .....	(901,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(560,000)	(-341,000)
<b>TITLE IV</b>						
<b>CORPORATIONS</b>						
<b>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation:</b>						
FSLIC Resolution Fund .....	827,000,000					-827,000,000
FDIC affordable housing program .....	15,000,000	15,000,000				-15,000,000
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>842,000,000</b>	<b>15,000,000</b>				<b>-842,000,000</b>
Resolution Trust Corporation: Office of Inspector General .....	32,000,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	11,400,000	-20,600,000
<b>Total, title IV, Corporations .....</b>	<b>874,000,000</b>	<b>26,400,000</b>	<b>11,400,000</b>	<b>11,400,000</b>	<b>11,400,000</b>	<b>-862,600,000</b>
<b>Grand total (net) .....</b>	<b>89,920,161,061</b>	<b>89,869,762,093</b>	<b>79,697,360,000</b>	<b>81,009,212,000</b>	<b>80,606,927,000</b>	<b>-9,313,234,061</b>
Appropriations .....	(90,260,686,061)	(90,067,881,093)	(79,895,479,000)	(81,207,331,000)	(80,805,046,000)	(-9,455,640,061)
Rescissions .....	(-333,000,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(-198,119,000)	(+134,881,000)
(By transfer) .....	(100,061,000)	(63,000)	(7,061,000)	(12,761,000)	(17,561,000)	(-82,500,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(623,746,500)	(2,502,000)	(16,207,000)	(18,602,000)	(17,602,000)	(-606,144,500)
(Limitation on annual contract authority, indefinite) .....	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	(-2,000,000)	
(Limitation on direct loans) .....	(1,200,523,034)	(1,075,421,120)	(1,075,363,000)	(1,075,363,000)	(1,075,363,000)	(-125,160,034)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans) .....	(264,939,072,000)	(237,400,000,000)	(236,000,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(238,900,000,000)	(-26,039,072,000)
(Limitation on corporate funds) .....	(516,041,000)	(549,626,000)	(526,315,000)	(554,401,000)	(554,401,000)	(+38,360,000)

**H.R. 2099 - DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
<b>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</b>						
Total appropriations in this bill (net) .....	89,920,161,061	89,869,762,093	79,697,360,000	81,009,212,000	80,606,927,000	-9,313,234,061
Scorekeeping adjustments .....	-7,987,944,000				21,000,000	+8,008,944,000
<b>Total mandatory and discretionary .....</b>	<b>81,932,217,061</b>	<b>89,869,762,093</b>	<b>79,697,360,000</b>	<b>81,009,212,000</b>	<b>80,627,927,000</b>	<b>-1,304,290,061</b>
<b>Mandatory .....</b>	<b>20,316,311,000</b>	<b>19,361,762,000</b>	<b>19,361,762,000</b>	<b>19,361,762,000</b>	<b>19,361,762,000</b>	<b>-954,549,000</b>
<b>Discretionary:</b>						
Crime trust fund.....		3,000,000				
<b>General purposes:</b>						
<b>Defense (Function 050):</b>						
<b>Federal Emergency Management Agency:</b>						
Salaries and expenses .....	62,411,000	44,006,000	42,081,000	43,874,000	43,874,000	-18,537,000
Emergency management planning and assistance...	137,147,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	24,025,000	-113,122,000
Selective Service System.....	22,930,000	23,304,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	22,930,000	
<b>National Science Foundation:</b>						
Research and related activities .....		62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	62,600,000	+62,600,000
<b>Total, Defense .....</b>	<b>222,488,000</b>	<b>153,935,000</b>	<b>151,636,000</b>	<b>153,429,000</b>	<b>153,429,000</b>	<b>-69,059,000</b>
<b>Nondefense discretionary .....</b>	<b>61,393,418,061</b>	<b>70,351,065,093</b>	<b>60,183,962,000</b>	<b>61,494,021,000</b>	<b>61,112,736,000</b>	<b>-280,682,061</b>
<b>Total, General purposes.....</b>	<b>61,615,906,061</b>	<b>70,505,000,093</b>	<b>60,335,598,000</b>	<b>61,647,450,000</b>	<b>61,266,165,000</b>	<b>-349,741,061</b>
<b>Total, Discretionary .....</b>	<b>61,615,906,061</b>	<b>70,508,000,093</b>	<b>60,335,598,000</b>	<b>61,647,450,000</b>	<b>61,266,165,000</b>	<b>-349,741,061</b>

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in opposition to this conference report and to the rule governing its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, last year 1,200 neighborhood law offices provided legal services to 1.7 million clients. The majority of these people were women and children living in poverty.

The conference report before us today contains a two-part attack on the Legal Services Corporation, which last year provided about 60 percent of the funds used by neighborhood legal service organizations. The balance of legal services funds comes from private attorneys, foundations, local charities, and State and local governments.

This conference report continues the majority's assault on the weakest members of our society.

The first part of this attack is to reduce Federal funds for the Legal Services Corporation by \$122 million. This is a cut of 31 percent.

The second part of this attack is to restrict the type of legal services that the local legal services organizations can provide with their own non-Federal funds.

Let me illustrate the unfair consequences of this restriction by sharing with the House a letter I received yesterday from Marcia Cypen, executive director of Legal Services of Greater Miami. She points out that Legal Services of Miami now uses non-Federal funds to represent aliens. Under this conference report, Legal Services of Miami would have to choose between giving up all Federal funds or else stop representing those aliens who are applying for admission as a refugee or for asylum. Many of these aliens have work permits and are working, but they are too poor to get private legal assistance. They must come to Legal Services of Miami if they have been beaten by their husbands, illegally locked out by their landlords, or cheated by a merchant.

Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the majority to put restrictions on the use of Federal funds. But it is wrong for the majority to impose its ideological views on services provided by donations from private groups and State and local governments that believe it is important that all poor people have access to our legal system.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the rule and against this conference report.

LEGAL SERVICES  
OF GREATER MIAMI, INC.,  
Miami FL, December 5, 1995.

Congresswoman CARRIE P. MEEK,  
Cannon House Office Building, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MEEK: Thank you for requesting our program's input on HR 2076 which includes funding for the Legal Services Corporation in 1996.

A crucial failing of the bill is that it precludes representation of certain classes of aliens with non-LSC funds. The particular classes of aliens affected are listed on the attached page. On a practical level what this means is that we cannot, for example, use non-LSC funds to represent a Haitian woman who is beaten up by her husband, illegally locked out by her landlord, or cheated by a used car dealer if she has applied for political asylum and has a work permit but her political asylum application is still pending. Unfortunately, there are many aliens who remain in this limbo situation for several years.

Approximately five percent of our current non-immigration caseload consists of aliens who will no longer be eligible for legal services with non-LSC funds in 1996. This could be remedied if Section 504 (d)(2) (B) were amended to allow non-LSC funds to be used to represent aliens not eligible for representation with LSC funds.

In addition, HR 2076 precludes us from collecting any attorneys fees in 1996. This is inconsistent with the stated goal of reducing LSC's dependency on federal dollars. Our program has relied on income from attorneys fees to bolster our budget, and the lack of this income in 1996 will reduce our services even further.

We appreciate your concern on behalf of the poverty community of Dade County. Please let me know if you need additional information.

Sincerely,

MARCIA K. CYPEN,  
Executive Director.

#### MEMORANDUM

Date: December 5, 1995  
Subject: Ineligible aliens under proposed LSC restrictions  
From: Esther Olavarria Cruz  
To: Marcia Cypen

I have made two lists, which is necessary to better explain who cannot be represented under the proposed LSC restrictions:

List of aliens who can be represented by LSC under the proposed restrictions:

1. Lawful permanent residents.
2. Aliens who are the spouse, parent, or unmarried child under 21 of a U.S. citizen and have filed applications for permanent residence.
3. Asylees (Individuals granted asylum).
4. Refugees.
5. Individuals granted withholding of deportation (higher standard than asylum—very rare).
6. Individuals granted conditional entry before 4/1/80 (old refugee category—almost no aliens now in this category).
7. H-2A agricultural workers (limited to representation in employment contract matters only, such as wages, housing, transportation and other employment rights—very small category).

List of aliens who cannot be represented by LSC under the proposed restrictions:

1. Asylum applicants.
2. Parolees.
3. Special immigrant juveniles (undocumented children adjudicated state dependents because of abandonment, neglect or abuse).
4. Battered spouses of U.S. citizens (unless otherwise eligible under #2 above).
5. Battered spouses of permanent residents.
6. Aliens in exclusion or deportation proceedings.
7. Aliens with immediate U.S. citizen spouses, parents, or unmarried minor children who have not filed for permanent residence.
8. Relatives of permanent residents (unless otherwise eligible above).

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this conference report. The level of funding for VA medical care is \$213 million below the level approved by the House earlier this year, and is almost \$400 million less than the President requested.

The chairman of the subcommittee said they couldn't find any more money for the veterans. But where did

they find over \$800 million for the EPA? Why is spending for housing programs almost \$1 billion more than the House-approved level?

Members need to understand that the VA can't be opening new clinics when we don't give them the funds to do so. Yet that is what this conference report does.

I believe that the bill falls short. It ignores the instruction that a majority of House Members voted for last week. It's wrong. We can find the money to do the right thing for veterans. The President is going to veto this bill anyway, and he should. We should not vote for a bill that doesn't honor our commitment to veterans.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the VA-HUD appropriations conference report.

Unfortunately, the conferees wasted their opportunity to improve this bill and once again present us with legislation that makes dangerous and unnecessary cuts to environmental and housing programs that protect American families and communities.

For example, the bill cuts environmental program funds by 21 percent, crippling the EPA's ability to enforce laws which help ensure the safety of the water we drink and the air we breathe.

The bill also cuts housing program funding by 21 percent, including cuts to many vital public housing programs and homeless services.

The cuts in public housing operating and modernization funds, will significantly hamper the ability for housing providers to deliver safe housing for American families.

Furthermore, by reducing the number of newly available section 8 housing vouchers, the bill increases the potential for increased homelessness among the thousands of families and children who are waiting for housing assistance.

I urge my colleagues to reject this bill and the potential pain and suffering it will inflict on many American families. Vote "no" on the conference report.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank my colleague from California [Mr. LEWIS] the Chairman of the VA/HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, for his work on this bill under difficult circumstances. His diligence and hard work are to be commended.

As a veteran myself, I am particularly sensitive to the importance of keeping our promises to our veterans.

Shortly before the House of Representatives was to consider the conference report on the VA/HUD and related agencies bill, I learned the Clinton administration, in a "statement of administration policy," had failed to mention the lack of a VA replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base as a reason for a potential Presidential veto. Earlier in the month, the administration had pledged its support to the hospital in a letter from Office of Management and Budget Director Alice Rivlin to the chairman of the House of Appropriations Committee, ROBERT LIVINGSTON.

In light of this apparent reversal of administration policy, I feel that I have no choice but to support the fiscal year 96 VA/HUD Appropriations Bill. It contains \$25 million for a new

state-of-the-art VA outpatient clinic at Travis Air Force Base, in addition to a \$400 million increase in the VA medical accounts. This is especially important since every other account in the bill, except those pertaining to veterans, was significantly reduced.

The Travis outpatient facility will meet the immediate health care needs of most Solano County and northern California veterans. I feel a moral obligation to do what is right for my fellow vets and to support any measure that will have a positive impact upon the region.

I was dismayed that the conference committee provided only \$25 million for the outpatient clinic at Travis. I had worked to secure additional funding in light of the Veterans Administration's recommendation of \$39.5 million in funding for the outpatient clinic.

With a projected 85,000 annual outpatient visits, the new facility will meet the needs of most veterans who require ambulatory care. However, I still believe there is the urgent need to attend to the acute medical needs of northern California's veterans.

The very survival of the outpatient facility was placed in jeopardy due to a November 29 stalling tactic that sent the conference report back to committee. I was told by VA Chairman Lewis that the motion could have jeopardized the clinic if the committee had been forced to reallocate funds among competing accounts.

Further delay in enacting the VA/HUD appropriations bill could force the legislation to be integrated into a full-year continuing resolution. Under that scenario, virtually all programs, including veterans' medical care and construction projects, will receive less than under the conference agreement. This would leave the veterans of northern California at a severe disadvantage. Those individuals who could delay or defeat this appropriations bill would be putting their political whims before the needs of our veterans.

By no means should my support for this bill signal that I am abandoning the long-term goal of building a replacement hospital at Travis Air Force Base.

It has become clear to me that full funding for the proposed replacement hospital is not possible this year. I cannot ignore present fiscal realities. Rather than contribute to budget gridlock, I must do what is best for northern California veterans and support this bill.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

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. I certainly am, 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. With 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 198, nays 219, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 843]

YEAS—198

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Nadler
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Neal
Andrews	Gordon	Oberstar
Baessler	Green	Obey
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Olver
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Ortiz
Barrett (WI)	Hall (TX)	Orton
Becerra	Hamilton	Owens
Berman	Harman	Pallone
Bishop	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bonior	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Borski	Hilleary	Payne (VA)
Boucher	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Brewster	Hinchev	Peterson (MN)
Browder	Holden	Pickett
Brown (CA)	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Poshard
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Rahall
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Rangel
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Clayton	Johnston	Rivers
Clement	Jones	Roemer
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rose
Coleman	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Condit	Kennelly	Sanders
Conyers	Kildee	Sawyer
Costello	Kleczka	Schumer
Coyne	Klink	Scott
Cramer	LaFalce	Serrano
Danner	Lantos	Sisisky
DeLauro	Levin	Skaggs
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Deutsch	Lincoln	Slaughter
Dicks	Lipinski	Spratt
Dingell	LoBlondo	Stark
Dixon	Lofgren	Stenholm
Doggett	Lowey	Stockman
Dooley	Luther	Stokes
Doyle	Maloney	Studds
Durbin	Manton	Stupak
Edwards	Markey	Tanner
Engel	Martinez	Tate
Ensign	Mascara	Taylor (MS)
Eshoo	Matsui	Tejeda
Evans	McCarthy	Thompson
Farr	McDermott	Thornton
Fattah	McHale	Thurman
Fazio	McKinney	Torres
Fields (LA)	McNulty	Torricelli
Filner	Meehan	Towns
Flake	Meek	Traficant
Foglietta	Menendez	Velazquez
Ford	Mfume	Vento
Fox	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Frank (MA)	Minge	Wamp
Franks (CT)	Mink	Ward
Frost	Moakley	Waters
Funderburk	Mollohan	Watt (NC)
Furse	Montgomery	Waxman
Gejdenson	Moran	Whitfield
Gephardt	Murtha	Williams

Wilson  
Wyden

Woolsey  
Wyden

Wynn  
Yates

NAYS—219

Allard	Franks (NJ)	Molinar
Archer	Frelinghuysen	Moorhead
Armey	Frisa	Myers
Bachus	Gallely	Myrick
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Nethercutt
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Neumann
Ballenger	Geren	Ney
Barr	Gilchrest	Norwood
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Nussle
Bartlett	Gilman	Oxley
Barton	Goodlatte	Packard
Bass	Goodling	Parker
Bateman	Goss	Paxon
Bellenson	Graham	Petri
Bereuter	Greenwood	Pombo
Bilbray	Gunderson	Porter
Billirakis	Gutknecht	Portman
Bliley	Hancock	Pryce
Blute	Hansen	Quillen
Boehlert	Hastert	Quinn
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bonilla	Hayes	Ramstad
Bono	Hayworth	Regula
Brownback	Hefley	Riggs
Bryant (TN)	Heineman	Roberts
Bunn	Herger	Rogers
Bunning	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Burr	Hoekstra	Roth
Burton	Hoke	Roukema
Buyer	Horn	Royce
Callahan	Hostettler	Salmon
Calvert	Houghton	Sanford
Camp	Hunter	Saxton
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Castle	Hyde	Schiff
Chabot	Inglis	Seastrand
Chambliss	Johnson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg
Christensen	Kasich	Shaw
Chrysler	Kelly	Shays
Clinger	Kim	Shuster
Coble	King	Skeen
Coburn	Kingston	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Combest	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Cooley	Kolbe	Smith (WA)
Cox	LaHood	Solomon
Crane	Largent	Souder
Crapo	Latham	Spence
Creameans	LaTourette	Stearns
Cubin	Laughlin	Stump
Cunningham	Lazio	Talent
Davis	Leach	Tauzin
Deal	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Thomas
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Thornberry
Dickey	Linder	Tiahrt
Doolittle	Livingston	Torkildsen
Dornan	Longley	Upton
Dreier	Lucas	Vucanovich
Duncan	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Dunn	Martini	Walker
Ehlers	McCollum	Walsh
Ehrlich	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Emerson	McDade	Weldon (FL)
English	McHugh	Weldon (PA)
Everett	McInnis	Weller
Ewing	McIntosh	White
Fawell	McKeon	Wicker
Fields (TX)	Metcalfe	Wolf
Flanagan	Meyers	Young (FL)
Foley	Mica	Zeliff
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Bentsen	Fowler	Scarborough
Bevill	Istook	Schroeder
Chapman	Morella	Tucker
de la Garza	Pelosi	Volkmer
DeFazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Young (AK)

□ 1421

Messrs. PAYNE of New Jersey, VENTO, HOYER, OBERSTAR, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, BRYANT of Texas, and CONYERS changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant the provisions of clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

(Roll No. 844)

YEAS—227

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Archer	Frisa	Myrick
Army	Gallely	Nethercutt
Bachus	Ganske	Neumann
Baker (CA)	Gekas	Ney
Baker (LA)	Geren	Norwood
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Nussle
Barcia	Gillmor	Orton
Barr	Gilman	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Goodlatte	Packard
Bartlett	Goodling	Parker
Barton	Goss	Paxon
Bass	Graham	Petri
Bateman	Greenwood	Pombo
Bentsen	Gunderson	Pomeroy
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Porter
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Portman
Bilirakis	Hancock	Pryce
Bliley	Hansen	Quillen
Blute	Harman	Quinn
Boehlert	Hastert	Radanovich
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Bonilla	Hayes	Regula
Bono	Hayworth	Riggs
Brown (CA)	Hefley	Roberts
Brownback	Helmenan	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hilleary	Roth
Bunning	Hobson	Royce
Burr	Hoekstra	Salmon
Burton	Hoke	Sanford
Callahan	Horn	Saxton
Calvert	Hostettler	Scarborough
Camp	Houghton	Schaefer
Canady	Hunter	Schiff
Chabot	Hutchinson	Seastrand
Chambliss	Hyde	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Inglis	Shaw
Christensen	Kelly	Shuster
Chrysler	Kim	Skeen
Clinger	King	Smith (MI)
Coble	Kingston	Smith (NJ)
Collins (GA)	Klug	Smith (TX)
Combest	Knollenberg	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Kolbe	Solomon
Cox	LaHood	Souder
Cramer	Largent	Spence
Crane	Latham	Stearns
Crapo	LaTourette	Stenholm
Creameans	Laughlin	Stockman
Cubin	Lazio	Stump
Cunningham	Leach	Talent
Danner	Lewis (CA)	Tate
Davis	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Deal	Lightfoot	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Lincoln	Thomas
Deutsch	Linder	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Livingston	Tiahrt
Dickey	LoBiondo	Torkildsen
Doolittle	Longley	Upton
Dornan	Lucas	Vucanovich
Dreier	Manzullo	Waldholtz
Duncan	McCollum	Walker
Dunn	McCrery	Walsh
Ehlers	McDade	Wamp
Ehrlich	McHugh	Watts (OK)
Emerson	McInnis	Weldon (FL)
English	McIntosh	Weldon (PA)
Everett	McKeon	Weller
Ewing	Metcalfe	White
Fawell	Meyers	Wicker
Fields (TX)	Mica	Wolf
Flanagan	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Foley	Mollohan	Zeliff
Forbes	Moorhead	Zimmer
Fox	Murtha	

NAYS—190

Abercrombie	Gordon	Ortiz
Ackerman	Green	Owens
Andrews	Gutierrez	Pallone
Baesler	Hall (OH)	Pastor
Baldacci	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Barrett (WI)	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Beerra	Hefner	Peterson (FL)
Bellenson	Hilliard	Peterson (MN)
Berman	Hinchev	Pickett
Bishop	Holden	Poshard
Bonior	Hoyer	Rahall
Borski	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Boucher	Jacobs	Reed
Brewster	Jefferson	Richardson
Browder	Johnson (CT)	Rivers
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Roemer
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E. B.	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Roukema
Cardin	Jones	Roybal-Allard
Castle	Kanjorski	Rush
Clay	Kaptur	Sabo
Clayton	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Clement	Kennedy (RI)	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kennelly	Schumer
Coburn	Kildee	Scott
Coleman	Kleczka	Sensenbrenner
Collins (IL)	Klink	Serrano
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Shays
Condit	Lantos	Sisisky
Conyers	Levin	Skaggs
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Skelton
Coyne	Lipinski	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lofgren	Spratt
Dellums	Porter	Stark
Dicks	Luther	Stokes
Dingell	Maloney	Studds
Dixon	Manton	Stupak
Doggett	Markey	Tanner
Dooley	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	Martini	Tejeda
Durbin	Mascaro	Thompson
Edwards	Matsui	Thornton
Engel	McCarthy	Thurman
Ensign	McDermott	Torres
Eshoo	McHale	Torricelli
Evans	McKinney	Towns
Farr	McNulty	Traficant
Fattah	Meehan	Velazquez
Fazio	Meek	Vento
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Visclosky
Filner	Mfume	Ward
Flake	Miller (CA)	Waters
Foglietta	Minge	Watt (NC)
Ford	Mink	Waxman
Frank (MA)	Moakley	Whitfield
Franks (CT)	Molinari	Williams
Franks (NJ)	Montgomery	Wilson
Frost	Moran	Wise
Funderburk	Morella	Woolsey
Furse	Nadler	Wyden
Gedjenson	Neal	Wynn
Gephardt	Oberstar	Yates
Gibbons	Obey	
Gonzalez	Olver	

NOT VOTING—15

Bevill	Fowler	Ros-Lehtinen
Buyer	Istook	Schroeder
Chapman	Johnson, Sam	Tucker
de la Garza	Kasich	Volkmer
DeFazio	Pelosi	Young (AK)

□ 1439

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Ros-Lehtinen for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

Mr. BROWDER and Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

So the conference report 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. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, due to a death in the family, I was not present for rollcall

votes Nos. 842, 843, and 844. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 842, "no" on rollcall No. 843, and "yes" on rollcall No. 844.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall vote No. 844 on December 7, 1995, Pearl Harbor day, and consequently missed the vote on the conference report for VA-HUD appropriations. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment Number 63:  
Page 51, strike out all after line 20, over to and including line 3 on page 52 and insert:

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service in carrying out the orderly terminations of programs, activities, and initiatives under the National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 103-82), \$6,000,000: Provided, That such amount shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation and the Corporation's Office of Inspector General.

Page 53, strike out all after line 9, over to and including line 7 on page 60 and insert:

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT

For program administration and management activities, including necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for GS-18; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed \$75,000 per project; and not to exceed \$6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; \$1,670,000,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 1997.

Page 60, after line 8 insert:

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Page 60, line 13, strike out [\$28,542,000] and insert: \$27,700,000.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEWIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. COMBEST). The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:  
AMENDMENT NUMBERED 63

Mr. LEWIS of California moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

For necessary expenses for the Corporation for National and Community Service in carrying out the orderly termination of programs, activities, and initiatives under the

National and Community Service Act of 1990, as amended (Public Law 103-82), \$15,000,000: *Provided*, That such amount shall be utilized to resolve all responsibilities and obligations in connection with said Corporation and the Corporation's Office of Inspector General.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the motion in disagreement that is before us involves a disagreement between the other body and the House relative to the funding of that program which is known as AmeriCorps. The actual amendment involved here increases the amount from \$6 to \$15 million, and provides a foundation whereby we will be moving toward termination of that program.

Essentially it is a reflection of the will of the House, which has voted on other occasions essentially to terminate the funding for AmeriCorps, and that is what the motion of disagreement is all about.

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 really no point in spending much time on this amendment reported in disagreement. The issue here has little to do with the positions of the House or the Senate regarding the funding level for the Corporation for National and Community Service. The House bill would terminate the corporation and allow the use of funds previously appropriated to accomplish the orderly shutdown. The Senate bill appropriates \$6 million to carry out the orderly termination of the corporation's activities. Obviously, the difference between the two bills is not great. The motion offered by the gentleman from California would provide \$15 million for the corporation's termination costs.

Technically, this motion violates the rules of the House, and under normal circumstances that would be the reason it is reported in disagreement. However, since the Republican managers of the bill chose to get waivers of the rules in about a hundred other instances where they violated the rules, I don't think that is the real reason.

It would appear that the underlying reason the managers of the bill reported this amendment in disagreement is to allow an avenue for action if a further understanding on the prospects for administration approval of this bill can be reached. Given the administration's recent policy statement on this bill, it seems to me the gulf of differences is too large to be bridged without a sizable increase in the allocation for the bill, rendering this action futile.

Mr. Speaker, I would just note the reason that I take this position is because in the statement of administration policy, which was received from the President's office, they make reference to the conference report including no funds for the President's successful National Service Program. It says if such funding were eliminated, the bill would cost nearly 50,000 young Americans the opportunity to help their community, through AmeriCorps, to address vital local needs, such as health care, crime prevention, and education, while earning a monetary award to help them pursue additional education or training.

□ 1445

Then it states emphatically the President will not sign any version of this appropriations bill that does not restore funds for this vital program.

So, with these observations, Mr. Speaker, I see no need for lengthy debate on this matter, and would advise Members that I do not intend to seek a recorded vote on the motion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], that there is no reason to have extended discussion on this motion in disagreement. I think it is important to say, however, that one of the reasons the motion is in this form is because we wanted to make a technical change that would allow the other body, under the rules of the other body, if it so chose, to amend this motion in disagreement further.

Mr. Speaker, if between now and that time the administration is serious about wanting to rearrange or make adjustments in this bill that will lead to agreement between the legislative branch and the executive branch that would cause the President to sign this bill, there is that option. It is a very narrow window. It seems to be closing very rapidly.

Mr. Speaker, should the President's people inform the President of this opportunity, it could very well be that we could have a final bill that is signable and thereby service these agencies in a fashion that makes sense. If the President chooses not to do this, it is likely to lead to a long-term continuing resolution that will cause all of these agencies to be funded at something like 25 percent below the 1995 year.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, the motion in disagreement is in the form that it is in. I would urge the Members to support my position on the motion.

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

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMBEST). Pursuant to House Resolution 291, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of yielding to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], to announce the schedule for the next week and the remainder of this season.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. I am more than happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this vote marks the end of the legislative business for the week. On Monday, December 11, the House will meet in pro forma session. There will be no legislative business that day.

On Tuesday, December 12, the House will meet at 10 o'clock a.m. and recess immediately to receive Prime Minister Peres of Israel in a joint meeting of the House and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the House will reconvene at 1 p.m. for morning hour and 2:30 p.m. for legislative business. We will first consider two bills on the Corrections Day Calendar: H.R. 1787, a bill to repeal the saccharin notice requirement; and H.R. 325, the commuter option bill.

After consideration of the correction of corrections day bills, we will take up a number of bills under suspension of the rules. I will not read through the bills now, but a list will be distributed to Members' offices. We will then turn to H.R. 2621, legislation concerning disinvestment of Federal trust funds.

Members should be advised that we do not expect recorded votes until 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, December 12.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week, we expect to consider the following bills, all of which will be subject to rules: H.R. 2666, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996; the conference report for H.R. 1977, the Interior Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996; the conference report for H.R. 2546, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1996; the conference report for S. 1026, the Department of Defense authorization bill; H.R. 1020, the Integrated Nuclear Spent Fuel Management Act; the conference report for S.

652, the Telecommunications Competition and Deregulation Act of 1995; and, H.R. 1745, the Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995.

Also, it is possible that legislation pertaining to the deployment of troops in Bosnia would be considered next week.

As Members know, the continuing resolution expires Friday, December 15. I am hopeful that progress will be made in ongoing budget negotiations that would result in legislation that will balance the budget in 7 years; permanently increase the public debt limit; and, fund those areas of government for which appropriations bills have not yet been approved.

However, given these unusual circumstances, it is impossible to inform Members with any accuracy when the House will adjourn next week.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman further to inquire if it is possible to give the Members any more certainty when the Bosnia resolution would be considered. I know that every Member would want to be present for that debate and that vote.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would again yield, I thank the gentleman for his inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot be more precise. I know that that would not happen on Tuesday. It could not happen before Wednesday, I am sure, out of consideration for the Members. Other than that, I really cannot give the gentleman any more precise information.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, Wednesday and Thursday are the most likely dates?

Mr. ARMEY. Most likely.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would respond further, I know that we have a need for a third CR. Everybody is aware of the fact that it seems we have six appropriation bills that have not yet made it to the President for signature or veto.

Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman give us some understanding as to when it will be possible to extend this CR to a time when all of us could conclude it would be realistic, many assuming it might be sometime in mid-January?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I am more than happy to yield on that.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is aware that even today, after informing the press, the President's negotiations team is going to present to the budget negotiation meetings their recommendation for a 7-year balanced budget with OMB scoring. We would obviously want to give that all the consideration it is due.

Of course, seeing that the President is moving in the direction of a 7-year balanced budget, we remain hopeful and optimistic that during the course

of this weekend and next week that we will come to a conclusion of these budget negotiations. At that time, of course, as we have racked up the work, we will address the question and the need for a continuing resolution to handle that discretionary spending for bills not yet approved by the President.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the general budget debate is going to continue for a while, and there are many, many issues in disagreement, but the fundamental need to keep the government functioning now is, I think, something that grows more important to more Members as we get closer to the holidays.

I have heard from both sides of the aisle, and on the other side of the Capitol as well, that there is no stomach for sending Federal employees on another unnecessary furlough around the holidays, when we are not going to be able to resolve the fundamental budget issue anyway.

Mr. Speaker, is there any hope that we could have at least a short-term extension of the CR to allow the Republican majority to catch up with the schedule on the appropriation bills?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I would join my colleague from California in regretting the President's earlier decision to shut down the Government and unnecessarily furlough workers. I can only assure the gentleman from California we will present the President with an opportunity to maintain continuing operation of the Federal Government and to avoid that.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the gentleman from California would join me in hoping that given that opportunity that the President will most certainly be presented with, that he would opt this time to not shut down the Government as he did last time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there is certainly no question, when we have not sent six of the appropriations bills to him by the December 7 date, well beyond the normal October 1 fiscal year date, it is kind of difficult to blame the President.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by asking this: Many of us will be traveling back to our districts for the Christmas holidays. Given the complexity of airline reservations as we get close to the holidays, the difficulty in rescheduling, is there any way the gentleman could give the Members any kind of certainty as to what time we would be allowed, assuming we do not have a resolution of this budget impasse, to return to our districts, to our families, so that we would not once again be in the position of having canceled flights and an inability to get new accommodations for travel?

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would again yield, I too share

the gentleman's concern about the spending bills not yet completed, particularly Health and Human Services, the biggest discretionary spending bill of all, which is, as the gentleman knows, being held up by a Democrat minority filibuster in the other body. Perhaps we could get that broken out.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, until we can get more serious discussions about the budget in the budget conference with the President and his team, it is very hard for me to predict what will be the outcome, having even yet to this point, today, recognizing of course that the press has been briefed, but I, as a member of that conference, have not yet seen a serious proposal from the White House. So, as we await that kind of work, we will continue to be hopeful that some of us may be home for Christmas.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I think at this point, having exhausted any potential questions and certainly not having received any answers, I would be more than happy to yield back my time.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

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

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

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, December 11, 1995.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 12, 1995, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING HIS EXCELLENCE, SHIMON PERES, ACTING PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Tuesday, December 12, 1995, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in joint meeting His Excellency Shimon Peres, Prime Minister of Israel.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be the consent of the House that the Dallas Cowboys be recognized as America's favorite football team.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### QUESTIONS REGARDING END-OF-SESSION SCHEDULE

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the majority leader has not left the floor, I would certainly like to ask that he come back and answer a question that I had in the minute that has been given to me.

Mr. Speaker, if he will not, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to try and not use the word "bitter," but I certainly object to the cavalier fashion with which the majority leader just left the floor talking about the Dallas Cowboys, when there were serious questions asked and no answer was received with respect to what is going to happen with this ostensible Christmas holiday that is coming up.

Mr. Speaker, I want to know, not just for my convenience or inconvenience with respect to travel. I think the people of this country are entitled to know whether the majority of this House has come to a conclusion as to whether or not there is going to be a holiday; as to whether or not there is going to be a shutdown of the Government; and, whether they can give us a date as to whether we are going home.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think we need to end today's business of the legislative week with the majority leader cracking jokes about the Dallas Cowboys, as if there is no serious business being done on this floor.

□ 1500

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 641, RYAN WHITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 641) to reauthorize the Ryan White CARE Act of 1990, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and without objection, appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Commerce, for consideration of the Senate bill and the House amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BLILEY, BILIRAKIS, COBURN, WAXMAN, and STUDDS.

There was no objection.

#### FEDERAL REPORTS ELIMINATION AND SUNSET ACT OF 1995

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 790) to provide for the modification or elimination of Federal reporting requirements, with Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments to the House amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments to the House amendment, as follows:

Senate amendments to House amendment: Page 3, of the House engrossed amendment, in the table of contents, strike out "Sec. 2021. Reports eliminated." and insert "Sec. 2021. Reports modified."

Page 18, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out lines 6 and 7.

Page 18, line 8, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(2)" and insert "(1)".

Page 18, line 9, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)".

Page 39, line 6, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "reports" and insert "report".

Page 39, line 7, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all after "936(b))" down to and including "Code," in line 8.

Page 43, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out line 19 and all that follows over to and including line 2 on page 45.

Page 49, line 21, of the House engrossed amendment, strike out "ELIMINATED" and insert "MODIFIED".

Mr. EHRlich (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments to the House amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRlich] for a brief explanation of the Senate amendment.

Mr. EHRlich. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. In drafting this expansive and important piece of legislation it was discovered that four inadvertent drafting errors existed. Senator JOHN MCCAIN offered the amended version in the Senate yesterday and it passed with no objection. Both the House and Senate majority and the minority have concurred with these technical changes prior to Senator MCCAIN offering his version on the Senate floor yesterday. I urge Members of this body to join me in support of this bill so that it can be sent to the President and this redtape burden can be lifted from the executive branch. I hope that this fully explains the gentleman's inquiry.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REFERRAL OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT, TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message on the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

There was no objection.

#### SUPPORT THE RICKY RAY BILL

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, this morning, more than 200 high school students gathered on the Capital steps to rally in support of "justice for all." They urge our passage of H.R. 1023, the Ricky Pay Hemophilia Relief Fund Act. This is a justice bill, designed to meet Government's share of the responsibility for a terrible medical tragedy that occurred in the early 1980's, when 8,000 people with hemophilia became infected with the virus that causes AIDS through the use of contaminated blood products. A review of the record shows that the Government failed to respond to the early warning signs of blood-borne AIDS and missed opportunities to protect hemophiliacs. The students have chosen to lobby on behalf of this legislation in part because most of them today are at the age that Ricky Ray—a constituent of mine—would have been if he had lived.

Tragically, Ricky Ray, and too many like him, succumbed to AIDS in December of 1992, at the age of only 15. Please join more than 160 of our colleagues and cosponsor this bill. It's the right thing to do.

#### 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.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2621, PROTECTING FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-388) on the resolution (H. Res. 293) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2621) to enforce the public debt and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VACATING OF SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate my request to speak for 5 minutes today.

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

There was no objection.

ON THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, many times during the vigorous debate on the House floor, much of what is spoken of is sometimes confusing and traveling in murky waters as the American people try to understand the direction that this Congress is taking. Interestingly enough, as we heard last evening, the President vetoing H.R. 2491, many might have thought that here we go again with an attempt at being an obstructionist and not pursuing the needs of the American people.

But I think there needs to be a little explanation as to how we got to this day, for many of us stayed here the weekend before Thanksgiving to make a commitment to the American people. That was that we would get a budget and, yes, we would agree on a 7-year budget. But as Democrats and the President pressed forward, we made certain points that must be reemphasized. We said we would do so, protecting Medicare, Medicaid, student loans, food stamps, not hurt the environment, raise taxes, not raise taxes on millions of working men and women and their families by slashing the earned income tax credit, and thereby providing a huge tax cut for beneficiaries making over \$200,000. That, Mr. Speaker, was in the continuing resolution, no doubt. The language was as clear as black and white.

Now we come to a point where we are making accusations about the President's veto. He made it clear. We will work with you on a 7-year budget. But we understand the needs of Americans, education, Medicare reform, but handling and responding to the needs of

Americans with health care, Medicaid, the environment. How many Americans have sent the Republicans here to dismantle the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act?

This is reflected in the VA-HUD bill that we saw today passed, even though it cuts VA facilities, veterans facilities by 62 percent. It cuts housing programs by 21 percent. It cuts the Environmental Protection Act by 21 percent. It cuts Superfund cleanups which in fact in my home communities in the 18th Congressional District, two neighborhoods now are facing the need to have environmental cleanup. That is cut by some 19 percent. Funds for elderly and disabled housing are each cut by 40 percent.

But the real irony, Mr. Speaker, is that just 8 days or so ago, this VA-HUD bill was recommitted to the conference committee with instructions to restore dollars for veterans health. In the shadow of Bosnia and on this famous day, December 7, 1995, reflecting on December 7, 1941, here we go again in rejecting the service that veterans have done. Just 8 days ago we recommitted it, but today we have the same Members who voted last time to recommit change their votes because they are more concerned with being in step with the majority than being in step with the American people.

Then in my own district of Houston, we find in the VA-HUD bill extraneous material dealing with public housing. Let me set the record clear. For this project, Allen Parkway Village, I am for providing housing, public housing for the 13,000 who are on the waiting list in Houston. I am for providing housing for seniors, working parents, affordable housing and, yes, public housing for those who need it. I am particularly for getting a master plan that will include the Houston Housing Authority, the city of Houston, the residents and all parties that have been involved.

A master plan sets the direction of how we should be able to compete and how we should be able to structure a housing development that will respond to all the needs of the people. Yes, I am for preservation that would preserve the concepts and the architectural design of an entity that has been noted as having historic value. But we have an extraneous language in the VA-HUD bill that does not relate to bringing people together in Houston. It relates to tearing us apart.

I am going to stand my ground, and that ground is to work with all the parties to ensure that we do have good housing in Houston in the Allen Parkway Village. It is for the elderly. We have it for those needing public housing. We have it for working families. We have a concept, a campus style concept that provides educational training, recreational services, job training so that those citizens in public housing

can get out of public housing and become independent and move into other styles of housing.

It is important, Mr. Speaker, that just as the President has asked and the Democrats have committed to, we must work together on the budget, protecting the environment, protecting those who need Medicare and Medicaid, protecting those who need educational loans. And, yes, when we talk about public housing, we must work together because those of us who work together will get the right job done for all of America.

BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I am here to talk about the tragedy of American troops being sent to Bosnia and the fact that the President has made a decision without consulting with the American people and without consulting with Congress.

□ 1515

We are here for a purpose in the People's House. We were elected to represent the people. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution gives the Congress the authority and the power to raise funds for armies and for the Navy. The President, like he did with the Mexican bailout, has simply gone around the Congress and tried to circumvent us in this action.

It is obvious from the polls taken around the country, and it is obvious from the people who call into our office every day, that there is very little support for the President's action, yet he has gone ahead without the support of the people and without the support of the Congress, and I think there is a tragedy in the making.

Personality I lived 6 years of my life in the Balkans. I was a United States Ambassador to Romania, which borders Yugoslavia. I traveled over into Yugoslavia, and the terrain in that area is mountainous. Winter is coming in the Balkans at this time. We have got tanks over there that are going to be messed up in the mush and the slog of winter. There are millions of land mines that have been planted by the Bosnia Serbs, and Croats, and Moslems.

And the President said he is sending American troops over there to keep the peace, and that we are going to impose and we are going to bring about a peace, and we are going to stop the genocide of these people. Well, if we go everywhere in the world simply because people were fighting and killing each other, we could be in Sudan, we could be in Northern Ireland, we could be in Afghanistan, we could be all over the world. This is an absurdity.

In 1386 they had a famous battle, the Battle of the Blackbirds in the former Serbia and Yugoslavia, and that is when the Serbs lost, and the Ottoman Turks came in, and they won, and many of the people converted or were forced to convert to Islam. Today the Serbs, who are Orthodox Christians, are still upset and they are still seeking revenge, and they are still fighting against those who became Moslems. So you see you have an ethnic strife that has been going on for 600 years, and we are supposed to send troops over there for 1 year, let them stand in place, get killed by land mines, get killed by radical Arab terrorists who are in the area, and then we exit after 1 year supposedly, and we will have established peace that has not been there for 600 years. Come on, Mr. President, give me a break, get real.

The cost in lives to America is something that we ought to be very careful about, and the cost in dollars. First of all, the President said he was only going to send 20,000 troops. That is what he told the American people. Now it is up to 37,000 troops. First he said it is only going to cost us \$2 billion. Now it is up to \$4 billion.

I mean we are up here to balance the budget, we are here to reduce the deficit, we are here to cut costs, and the President is getting money for a Mexican bailout, \$25 billion out of a slush fund. Now he wants to send \$4 billion, probably much more, to Bosnia, a place that is an artificial creation, it is not a member of NATO. We have NATO set up to defend members of NATO against the Soviet threat. What happened to the Soviet threat? So he said we have got to save NATO by going to Bosnia.

Are you ready for this? The President backed last week the Foreign Minister of Spain, Spain is not even part of the military aspect of NATO, he backed the Foreign Minister, Javier Solana, to be the new NATO military commander. Well, this is an anti-NATO guy who is a member of the Socialist Worker's Party, tried to establish communism in Spain, one of Fidel Castro's best friends. Now he is the head of NATO. We want to go save NATO under the NATO military command of Javier Solana. Give me a break.

The President apparently has pollsters who have told him, "What you've got to do is establish some leadership credentials, so go over there, and look presidential, act like command in chief, and the people will reward you for it." Not only that, they told him something, and if this is the way he is operating, and this is truly what is behind this, this is a very cynical way to manipulate the American people and to perhaps bring about the loss of lives and a lot of dollars. They said, you know, "It doesn't matter if the American people are opposed to this action, it does not matter if Congress is opposed to it. You put the troops in the

field, and they will be forced to do the loyal thing and say they support the American troops."

That is the box he is putting us in, and I think he is making a tragic mistake, and I wish he would reconsider.

#### FOCUSING ON A POSITIVE FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I wanted to thank the President of the United States. We had the great fortune of going to the White House the other evening for the Congressional Ball, and my mother, Frances Foley, was in town. I was able to take her to that great honor, and it was an evening of celebration, it was an evening of sharing the great bounty of this Nation in the people's home, the White House, and, yes, as a Republican, it was a great honor to be in the company of President Clinton and his wife.

The spirit that was alive in the house, the White House, that evening, was one that should be evident on this floor, one that should be evident in the debate about our budget for the Nation's future. He signed the veto message the other day, and the pen failed to write, and while many are making a joke about it, it does symbolize one thing: Our well is dry here in the Nation's Treasury. We are running on empty financially. It is time to step up to the plate and face the very important responsibility of Congress with the help of the President in balancing the budget with legitimate numbers, with legitimate dialog, with legitimate protections for our Nation's resources, but doing it in an honest and honorable and peaceful fashion, so that all Americans, regardless of party, can be proud of the actions of this Congress, that they have, in fact, done the people's work and they have done it professionally and respectfully.

I want to discuss another issue because from time to time Members of the House talk about public education as if it is a disaster, and they make unkind statements to public education. The teaching profession, teaching our children, is one of the most noble professions in our Nation.

There are problems in schools. There are problems on campuses. But they are not all related to schools and public education. They are related to a lot of external factors in our Nation.

I think about one of my counties, Palm Beach County, and I think of all the great things our school systems are doing. My father is a principal of an alternative school, a school of last resort for children with behavioral problems, drug addictions, truancy problems. He tells us often about the successful graduations of children that were otherwise thought of as not having a po-

tential for passing anything, never mind high school, but they graduate; stories about young girls who become naval officers, who are the top of the naval class, who a few years earlier were counted out as derelicts, druggies, incompetent youth. The School of the Arts in Palm Beach County, allowing kids to express God-given talents in arts, and music, and dance, and theater, things that are not traditional, but they are learning something that they have a skill and an expertise in. Junior ROTC programs teaching children military leadership. They are enrolling dozens of people in my school community, and they are succeeding in educating our young people. The science, the math, the police academies that spring up around our communities that are successfully graduating children with an educational opportunity that allows them to go out, and get a job and become meaningful, taxpaying, productive citizens.

Palm Beach Garden High School; I visited the film school. We did interviews. They had tremendous technological equipment, learning to be little broadcasters. Someday they may be on the evening news.

These are things that are working in our school system that we need to magnify, talk about in a positive way, show that public education is working, show that teachers who are sacrificing in a job dealing with difficult students are doing so because they love this country, they love children, and they want to see the future of those children succeed.

Future Farmers of America programs, 4-H Clubs, all things that are working in public education that we all too often in Congress just say things are bad in public education, but it is time to stand up for the programs that work. It is time to talk about the one thing that we can make certain when we talk about the future direction of America is that children have a positive education, that they learn, that they are inspired, that they are told different things, learn to work on computers, learn to talk about children who may not go to college, but in fact may work at McDonald's, may in fact become a store manager and a store owner, may work at Publix as a bag boy and rise to be a manager of that store; that it is within each of us that we can excel, that we can excel and be supportive of this great country of ours.

We have got to focus in this Congress about the very good things in our Nation and not always be talking about negativity, and disastrous consequences and evil, mean-spirited politics, because this Nation is the greatest Nation on Earth. God's gift to us has been one of being able to enunciate those positive things on this floor.

So let us respect teachers, let us respect public education, let us respect

private schools, but education is everybody's future, it is our Nation's salvation, it is the elimination in the future of crime and dependency in our Nation.

So, I urge my colleagues to focus in the next year ahead, as we enter 1996, on positive education, positive future for our Nation, positive leadership for our children.

#### KEEP MEDICAID INTACT

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, today was National Medicaid Day, and myself, and Senator LAUTENBERG, and a number of other Members of Congress, participated in an event on the front lawn of the Capitol where we stressed the fact that the Medicaid changes that have been proposed by the Republican leadership will have a severely negative impact on the low-income people, be they seniors, children, the disabled, who now benefit from the Medicaid Program, which is the Federal program that guarantees health care for low-income people.

I was very pleased to see that yesterday when the President signed his veto and sent his veto message to Congress in reaction to the Republican leadership budget that he stressed the extreme impact, if you will, and the unacceptable changes in the Medicaid program that were set forth in that Republican budget. I am hopeful that during the negotiations that are taking place now over the budget where the President and the congressional leadership, particularly the Republican leadership, seek to come together on a compromise budget bill, that the bill will successfully keep Medicaid intact and guarantee health care coverage for those people that are currently covered by the Medicaid Program.

What I think is most important during these negotiations is that the Medicaid guarantee, the guarantee that has been around here now for 30 years, that low-income people have health care coverage, that those same eligible people be eligible in guaranteed health care under whatever comes out of these budget negotiations.

There has been a lot of talk about flexibility on the Republican side, and specifically today a number of Republican Governors came down to the capital and stressed that they would like to have flexibility in the Medicaid Program and how it is administered, and I agree with that concept of flexibility. But the flexibility should not go so far that they can declare certain people ineligible for Medicaid and, therefore, have no health insurance, or set the standards and the coverage for the Medicaid Program so low or so slim, so to speak, that the type of coverage

that is now provided where certain services, certain health care services, are provided, would not be provided or the quality of care would be diminished.

So I am hopeful that we will not only see in these negotiations a Medicaid Program that guarantees coverage for those who are not eligible for Medicaid, but also that certain minimum standards be put in place as to what a health care coverage or what a policy would include for low-income people, and lastly that sufficient funding be put back into the budget bill for the Medicaid Program so that we do not see a decline in quality for the program.

□ 1530

The President mentioned in his veto message five concerns that he had about the Republican budget when it dealt with Medicaid. I would like to go through those briefly.

First, he said that the Republican budget cuts Federal Medicaid payments to States by \$163 billion over 7 years, a 28 percent cut by the year 2002 below what the Congressional Budget Office estimates is necessary for Medicaid spending. So the concern here is that if you cut Medicaid by 20 percent over what we estimate we need for those who are currently eligible for Medicaid, that by the year 2002 States with the lesser funds would have to eliminate that many people from the Medicaid Program.

Second, the President mentioned that the Republican bill converts Medicaid into a block grant with drastically less spending, eliminating guaranteed coverage to millions of Americans and perhaps forcing States to drop coverage for millions of the most vulnerable citizens, including children and the disabled. This is really the key during the budget negotiations. We do not want to eliminate what we call the entitlement status of Medicaid, so that certain people are not eligible because States decide that they do not have enough money and will not cover them.

Third, the President said that the Republican budget purports to guarantee coverage to certain groups but does not define a minimum level of benefits. There again, it is not only important that a eligible Medicaid recipients continue to be eligible, but that whatever package is put together of coverage for them, that those same minimum level of services be included for a national standard so that individual States can change it.

Fourth, the President said that the Republican budget purports to protect certain vulnerable populations with set-asides, but would cover less than half of the estimated needs of senior citizens and people with disabilities in the year 2002. The best example of this are those particularly vulnerable seniors who are low income, who now have their Medicare part B coverage paid,

but would not necessarily have it under this proposal. As I said again, Mr. Speaker, we will be talking about this a lot more. It is most important that Medicaid be guaranteed for those low-income people.

#### PRESIDENT CLINTON'S VETO OF THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT PURELY A PUBLIC RELATIONS STUNT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LEWIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the President vetoed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. I am not surprised, but I am disappointed. I want to talk about why I believe the President vetoed what I think was a very good budget for this country. It was a bad veto for all of us. First of all, it was purely a public relations stunt, as full of irony as hypocrisy. The President had the pen Lyndon Johnson used to sign Great Society into law flown into Washington, DC, from Texas.

After his speech, the President quickly left the room before he had to answer questions about his balanced budget, but there were plenty of questions Mr. Clinton should have answered for the American people. The President criticized the House-Senate plan to save Medicare for the long term, but has failed to offer his own. Perhaps worse, 1994's Clinton health care plan contained major spending reductions in the growth of Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why it was OK for the President to control spending on Medicare but not for the Republicans to do the same. He also should have spoken further about the Great Society programs Lyndon Johnson used that pen for. For instance, most Americans consider LBJ's war on poverty a terrible failure. Today, one child in three is illegitimate, drug use is up, education scores are down, and generations of families have depended on welfare instead of work. We have the highest crime rate in the world, and many of our inner cities are devastated.

Is the President endorsing LBJ's war on poverty that has cost \$5 trillion and left this country's poor in worse shape than before? One more question, Mr. Speaker. When Bill Clinton was running for President, he promised to balance the budget in 5 years. In his first State of the Union address he promised to use economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office. Now he not only refuses to offer a real 7-year balanced budget plan, but he uses economic figures cooked up by his own economists so he does not have to make tough choices. Then he stands on the sidelines and demagogues honest efforts to balance the budget. Why does the President consistently say one thing and do another?

I realize that this may sound more than a little partisan, but frankly, I am upset about a veto of the first balanced budget we have had in more than a generation, our first and perhaps last chance to stop robbing our children and grandchildren.

My daughter, 13 years old, my son, 24 years old, what kind of future are they going to have unless we get realistic about balancing the budget? I call on the President to do just that. The President's LBJ pen did not work at first. After trying a new inkwell he was finally able to sign his name. If there was any justice, the ink would have been red.

#### THE REAL ISSUES REGARDING AMERICA'S ROLE IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Bosnia is very much on the mind of every Member of this Chamber. Bosnia is not a partisan matter. Our policy in Bosnia, in my judgment, has been the error of two administrations, one of one party and one of another party. The embargo was put on by one, said that it would be lifted by another, but that still has not been done.

The result is that the Bosnians, who were aggressed against, attacked, have not had the weapons to defend themselves when they wanted to defend themselves. Now we say in the Dayton agreement that we will make sure the Bosnians are finally armed. The embargo still exists. It needs to come off. Of course, it never should have been put on.

Mr. Speaker, the issue in this debate is not who is an internationalist and who is an isolationist. I would like to think the issue is who is a realist.

The issue is also one of the power of the Congress and the power of the President. Under the Constitution, Presidents may wage war. It is Congress that declares war.

As we know from studying the Constitution in elementary school, high school, college and university, there are approximately 200 conflicts, large and small, that we have been in since 1789 when the First Congress met in New York. In only five of those did Congress declare war, but it certainly gave support to a number of others through appropriations and through authorization.

But that power of the President to wage war is not a mandate to be Super Cop to the world at either the whim or the policy of the President. The question is: "Where is our vital interest?"

Usually the vital interest has been, in most of those 200 engagements, where the lives of citizens of the United States have been involved. Citizens of the United States are not being held

captive in Bosnia and the lives of American citizens have not been involved.

We hear Members of the administration saying, "This is not going to be another Vietnam," even though one of the top negotiators at Dayton had a slip of the tongue in talking to a few of us and mentioned Vietnam in the place of where he meant Bosnia. Whether that is significant I leave to the psychoanalysts.

Our troops are on the ground to separate the warring parties, who now are tired, presumably, and want peace after 500 years of acrimony, war, and conflict based on ethnicity as well as on religion. What happens when those supposedly tired warring parties decide they do not want peace anymore and the American forces are in the middle, presumably trying to separate them? The American forces thankfully do have the power to respond, and to respond promptly.

But I worry when a President, any President, Republican or Democrat—and this is a not a new thought with me—does something in foreign affairs in an election year. We all agree that handling foreign affairs is, frankly, a lot easier than dealing with domestic policy and all the different factions there.

The lives of American military men and women are too valuable to be an election year photo opportunity. The President does not have the power to deploy troops anywhere on either whim or long-thought-out policy. It is the Congress that must face up to the issue as to whether the President has the right to deploy troops in the former Yugoslavia, primarily in Bosnia. I would suggest that the President does not have the right. He has not shown us that there is a vital interest in Bosnia for America.

Certainly there is a humanitarian interest. There are dozens of humanitarian interests where people are being butchered by their neighbors in the same country, be it in Africa, be it in parts of Europe, be it in Asia. We cannot be, as I said earlier, Super Cop to the world. Congress needs to face up to this issue and not duck it as it has been ducking it for the last 2 weeks.

#### BLATANT POLITICAL DOCUMENTS SENT FROM THE WHITE HOUSE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue regarding a letter that President Clinton and Vice President GORE sent to a number of Federal employees. I was at a hearing last week on the space program and we were receiving testimony from the administrator, Mr. Dan Gold-

en, and one of the members at that hearing brought up the subject of a letter that had been sent to NASA employees in his district that he found particularly offensive. I was very concerned about this particular issue, so I asked for a copy of this letter.

Honestly, Mr. Speaker, when I saw this letter, I thought it was a hoax. I thought the President and the Vice President of the United States of America could never be so foolish as to send out to Federal civil service employees an openly and blatantly political document such as this, which is obviously in violation of statute. I had one of my staff call over to the White House to find out for sure, because I thought it was obviously a hoax, as to whether or not the White House had authorized this letter. I was very, very shocked to find out that this, indeed, did come out of the office of the President and was authorized by the Vice President's office.

The letter is entitled "An open letter to Federal employees, from President Clinton and Vice President Gore." It begins with a comment about how proud they are of the work force, and then it goes on to say some nice things about the very good work that our Federal employees do, but then it goes on to talk about the possibility of another Federal shutdown.

It says in the fourth paragraph: "You all know that the law under which most of the government is operating expires on December 15, and the debate that led to the November shutdown is not over," a very true and accurate statement. I agree with it.

Then it goes on to say: "We can't promise you that your jobs and your lives won't be interrupted again. Too much is at stake for America. If you are held hostage again, we know you would not want us to forfeit the Nation's future as ransom."

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an outrage that the President and the Vice President of the United States would send out such a blatantly political document to Federal employees. The Congress of the United States sent to the President of the United States a continuing resolution to keep the Government open, and the President of the United States decided to veto that continuing resolution, and in him doing so, vetoing that legislation, he shut the Government down. It was quite apparent to me when I heard that he did not talk to the Speaker or the majority leader of the other body on their trip to Israel at all that he was very intent on not negotiating with our side and letting the government shut down.

Indeed, that was the real story behind that lack of dialog on that trip to Israel, the fact that the President of the United States wanted to go ahead and shut the Government down, and then these two gentlemen have the nerve to turn around and send out such

a politically blatant document to Federal employees. I am calling on the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, the honorable and distinguished gentleman from Florida, Mr. JOHN MICA, to hold hearings on this subject, because I have since discovered this is not the first time that this has happened. No other President in United States history has ever exploited the Federal work force for political advantage like this President has.

I have in my hands a document that came out of the White House, encouraging all Cabinet Members to solicit political donations from Federal employees, so this President has done it before. He has used his political office of the Presidency of the United States for his political gain. He is doing that again in this letter. I think it is wrong. No Republican President could ever get away with doing anything like this. If a Republican tried something like this, the Washington press corps would be up in arms, there would be calls for investigations, there would be hearings being held.

I am rising today in this House to call upon the Subcommittee on Civil Service to hold hearings on what this President and the Vice President of the United States are doing, politicizing our civil service work force. I could tell you that I have civil service employees in my district who got this letter and they were outraged.

□ 1445

#### IMPRISONMENT IS NOT THE ANSWER

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

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for all of us, this is a holiday season—a time for reflection and renewal. This should most of all be a time to think about possibilities—the possibilities of doing the best we can.

The other day I read a truly grim report: More than a million Americans are in prison. Last year, the rate of growth in prison population was the biggest ever.

Here in the United States, we lock up the biggest percentage of the population of any country in the world. The chances of landing in prison are 8 to 10 times higher here than in other industrial countries. And yet this is a far more dangerous country than most: Violent crime is far worse here than in Canada or Britain or France or Germany. So, clearly, locking people up hasn't made us safer.

In Texas, there are 127,000 people in prison. That's nearly equal to the prison population of the whole United States less than 20 years ago. We also execute more criminals in Texas than

in any other State. And yet, I don't think anyone would say that we've turned the corner on crime.

These days, people look at prisons as a way of punishment, and the harsher the better.

Ironically, prisons were invented as a more humane way to treat criminals. Prisons were supposed to replace brutal punishments that left offenders scarred or maimed—punishments that the Constitution calls "cruel and unusual." The idea was to create a penitentiary. The word "penitentiary" was meant to describe a place where the miscreant would be isolated so that he could think about his offense and become penitent. The offender would spend a great deal of time alone, and be trained in a useful occupation. The idea was, in short, not just to punish, but to rehabilitate offenders.

These days, the 19th century idea of penitentiaries is mostly forgotten. And yet, the best run Federal prison today—the one that costs the least to run, the one where there is the least violence among inmates, and the one where the inmates are least likely to become repeat offenders—is run exactly along the lines of the 19th century idea of prison as a tool of reform and rehabilitation. In other words, we actually can compare a humane prison against a brutal one, and we can see the results: the humane prison is cheaper to run and gets effective results; the brutal prison is more costly and only poisons prisoners and communities alike.

Of course, not everyone can be rehabilitated. But in this season of hope and renewal, we ought to think about the growth of prisons, and ask ourselves why we are pouring more and more resources into a system that clearly does not work.

There was a time when people were jailed if they failed to pay their debts. It was a curious and self-defeating thing: a person obviously could not pay a debt while in jail, so debtors' prisons were a burden on everybody: the creditor didn't get paid, the prisoner couldn't pay, and the local government ended up saddled with jails full of honest folks whose only crime was to be in debt.

This got to be a real problem in the city of Edinburgh, Scotland in the year 1742. So the city's government did a wise thing: they commissioned an artist to write a musical piece, hoping that the resulting concert would raise some money to pay off the debts of some of the people who'd been imprisoned for debt.

The composer who got the job was George F. Handel, and in just 26 days he produced the gigantic oratorio, "The Messiah," and it was a great hit: the city raised a great deal of money, paid off the debts of a number of prisoners, and freed them.

Today, it's hard to imagine a city council smart enough to commission a

concert to raise money to free prisoners. But we should think about the lesson here: surely there is a better thing to do than make a failing system even worse.

After all, you can't quarrel with the results that the city fathers of Edinburgh got for their trouble: "The Messiah" was an instant success, and it freed prisoners and community alike of a terrible situation. What's more, "The Messiah" is the most performed choral work in history.

If you happen to hear "The Messiah" performed this year, remember it was written because a local government wanted to make some money and free some prisoners.

Maybe we can think about it, and come up with ways to free ourselves of the burden of a prison system which produces far more burdens than it does results. The least we can do in this season of hope and renewal is to ask ourselves why it makes sense to have more and harsher prisons, when the evidence is that prisons that try to rehabilitate prisoners, actually do get results, and are safer and cheaper to run.

Shouldn't we think about the possibilities?

#### WE SUPPORT OUR SONS AND DAUGHTERS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to address the issue of Bosnia and to outline the text of a resolution that was introduced yesterday by my colleague on the other side, PAUL MCHALE, and I, both members of the House Committee on National Security.

Mr. Speaker, I have consistently opposed the President's policy on Bosnia and I oppose it today. I voted for the motions to lift the arms embargo because I felt we were not leveling the playing field in that country. We could have prevented many of the atrocities that have occurred there over the past several years, the ones that President Clinton talked to the American people about just a week ago.

I supported the resolution in opposition to the President sending in ground troops. I think it is a grave mistake to put our young people in the midst of this turmoil, and in fact have stated so repeatedly and believe today that we are making a mistake.

However, Mr. Speaker, the President is the Commander in Chief, and has the ability to deploy our troops where he sees fit. Unfortunately, this President, despite votes taken in this body and the other body, overwhelmingly bipartisan, objecting to his policy, has already committed our troops to Bosnia. There is not much we can do about that, Mr. Speaker, and that is unfortunate.

However, Mr. Speaker, we can in fact do something now, and that is what my resolution and the resolution joined by my friend, Mr. MCHALE does. Our resolution acknowledges that this Congress has gone on record repeatedly against inserting ground troops. Our resolution also acknowledges that the President is the Commander in Chief and, as such, can send our troops and deploy them where he wants.

The resolution does state that we in this Congress overwhelmingly support the sons and daughters of America serving in our military who are going to be deployed to Bosnia. But furthermore and perhaps most significantly, what our resolution says is that now that this President has committed our troops, there will be no political second-guessing of the support necessary for them to complete their mission.

The reason why we make this statement, Mr. Speaker, is just a few short years ago when our troops were in Somalia, a request was made by the general in charge of those troops for backup support. We would later find out that that request was denied. When asked why it was denied, the Secretary of Defense at that time, Les Aspin, a friend of mine until he passed away a few short months ago, said that the political climate in Washington was not right to deploy more troops to that theater.

Mr. Speaker, we must never again allow a political decision to decide the fate of our troops. In Somalia, 18 young men and women were killed because we did not provide the adequate backup 1 month after a request was made for additional support. That must not happen in this case and will not happen, because my resolution says that whatever General Joulwan wants in the way of backup, whether it be personnel, whether it be heavy artillery, whether it be air support, or whatever that need is, that there be no political second-guessing from the White House. The DOD and the administration must immediately respond to the request determined by the general in charge of the theater who has been given the responsibility to protect the lives of our kids.

Mr. Speaker, this is the least that we can do to protect our young Americans who are being assigned by this President to go into a hostile area that most of us agree they should not be going to. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us.

We already have bipartisan support. The numbers are growing. We have been joined by Mr. KENNEDY on the other side, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM on our side, and by a number of other Members, and I would ask our colleagues to call my office today, or Mr. MCHALE's office, to sign up as cosponsors so that we can let this President know that while we disagree with him, he is going to give our troops the support that they need, they deserve and they war-

rant in terms of the operation in the Bosnian theater.

#### NATIONAL DEBT CONTINUES TO GROW

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 want to thank Lisa and Melinda for helping me bring out today's total of the debt. As of 3 o'clock this afternoon, the United States national debt is \$4,988,640,469,699.34. For the second day in a row, it is actually a decrease of \$125 million over yesterday.

Now, to reassure anyone who might think that we have suddenly reversed course in Washington, I want you to know that, unfortunately, that is not the case. In fact, the debt will fluctuate on a daily basis, but overall, during the current fiscal year, we can expect that the Federal debt will probably increase by another \$200 billion. In short, we will pass the \$5 trillion mark at some point in the next 6 or 7 months.

Having said that, again, I rise before this House, Mr. Speaker, to point out the incredible burden that this debt presents, not only to this generation, but to the generation represented by Lisa and Melinda and other generations that will follow us in the future. The \$5 trillion is almost 40 percent of every nickel and dime that the Federal Government will spend over the next 7 years.

Now, one of the reasons that I think it is important that this number be brought to our attention on a daily basis is that I think we have a hard time as a country realizing that this is not some abstract number that has no meaning to the way we live our lives.

During my campaign for office in 1994, I campaigned on a theme of payroll taxes. Specifically, I would talk in various troops around my district about the fact that if I went into a store in Maine and bought a pack of cigarettes, I would pay three taxes. If I bought a can of beer, I would pay four taxes. And we call those taxes on beer and cigarettes sin taxes, because they are taxes designed to discourage our behavior, behavior that we consider adverse to our health.

Well, yet, then what do we say when, if I created a job and I pay or manage 9 different taxes in the State of Maine and a number close to that in other States across the country, and those 9 taxes on a job total almost 25 or 30 percent of the total cost of hiring an employee, then what do we call that? Does it become a sin today to create a job or create economic opportunity for an individual?

I would suggest before this Chamber that there is a connection between an extremely high tax burden across the

country, again 9 taxes and almost 25 percent of gross cost at the minimum wage, not at a high wage, not at some \$100,000 salary level, but at a lousy \$4.25 an hour. In fact, the minimum wage today really is an appropriate term to describe the problem that men and women have when they find a job. The real issue today is take-home pay, not minimum wage. When you look at the difference between the two, it is staggering.

Now, I mentioned yesterday that I have been criticized by a columnist in a local paper back in my district that this was a waste of time.

Specifically, this editor had objected to the fact that I was faxing the debt total out to him and other editors throughout my district on a daily basis. In fact, he criticized me and he said, "Congressman LONGLEY should consider his own contribution to the national debt by his wasting of our tax dollars on faxes such as this, which cost paper, employee time, computer time, et cetera."

The editor went on to say, "I intend to let him know that we do not need to see a new fax each day or ever again. Thank you."

Now, the irony is that these several paragraphs were maybe less than 20 percent of a column describing the need of the local community to look ahead in planning the use of their downtown.

□ 1600

I point that out, and in some sense this is humorous but there is also a very serious point that needs to be made and this is fundamentally the problem that we must confront as a Congress and we must confront as a country, is that Washington has become so remote from day-to-day life in America, from what goes on in our town halls, and in our State governments, that we have ceased to realize that the debt is actually a tangible factor that affects the way we live our lives, and when the editor of a prominent local paper suggests, when talking about downtown improvements, that the city cannot afford to just keep chugging along not particularly worried about the future, it would not hurt to think again.

Again, this is the ultimate issue. This debt not only is a monument to an incredible level of spending but it represents the fact that Washington has gone beyond a high level of taxes, it has gone beyond a high level of spending, and it has actually spent far more than it has taken in and it is now threatening to leave a \$5 trillion stone around the necks of our children and our grandchildren and the future of this country.

In my opinion, with all due respect to this editor, there is no issue more important than once and for all coming to grips with this national tragedy.

**SUPPORT VOICED FOR PRESIDENTIAL VETO OF RECONCILIATION BILL**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I seek this time today to voice my support for the President's veto of the reconciliation measure that was returned to the House with a long message yesterday that was read into the RECORD.

In that message, of course, the President touched on, I think, the elemental points of equity, of fairness, of the Congress' responsibility to try to achieve laws that in fact provide for the needs of the people that we represent. That in doing so in terms of attempting to achieve a balance in the budget that we also balance the responsibilities and the sacrifices that are expected in a fair way to provide for our success as a Nation today and into the future.

In fact, of course, today as we look at the economy and the progress that has been made in this administration, it is, I think, encouraging, that since 1993 there are 6 million new jobs that have been created, the deficit on an annual basis is on a glidepath, that does not mean that we can stop in terms of our work, that in fact we must continue to deal with attempting to achieve savings.

There are, of course, today 150,000 fewer Federal employees than there were when the President took office. So we are making some success.

But the President pointed out in that deficit message specifically the type of inordinate cuts that are being proposed in Medicare. The President, of course, has been foremost in his responsibility and advocacy for health care reform. In fact I think the first 2 years one of the major shortcomings that occurred was the future, of course, of a health care reform proposal, an effort to rationalize the system.

Today I think the President, too, would not argue that his plan was the only plan in terms of health care reform but that it was necessary to rationalize that system to bring these costs into control and the services in a way that would inure to the benefit of the people that we represent.

So that similarly when the President points out the types of cuts in Medicare, I think he does it, in a sense, standing on the high ground because of the work that he has done. Similarly the significant cuts in Medicare. In fact, half the cuts in the budget proposed by this new Congress, this Republican Congress, have been in the area of Medicare and Medicaid cuts.

Furthermore, of course, the President indicated his opposition and concern to many other elements in terms of the welfare reform.

But one of the other areas that I thought needed special attention is the

issue dealing with the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. This area is a very important area. Obviously in trying to achieve a balanced budget, a fiscal budget, we also need to maintain an environmental balance.

I think what has been lost in the enthusiasm and the controversy that surrounds many of the policies with the environment has really been a lack of understanding and a recognition of what the consequence of many of these actions are.

It is as if, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved back to the 19th century era of the robber barons and we are trying to put into place policies that maybe were right, and I do not even think they were right in the 19th century, in the latter part of the 20th century.

The Arctic Plain, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, really represents an area that is a window on the Ice Age. Since the retreat of the great Ice Age, this area has been the home of the caribou calving ground of 160,000 herd caribou, the porcupine caribou herd today.

What is being proposed here is to take it out of that protected status that it has enjoyed, to permit it to be open to oil and gas exploration.

In order to understand the impact of this, this is not just any piece of land. It really is an arctic desert. It is an area that has very little water on it. The vegetative mat is about as deep as the podium that I am standing in front of today speaking and it has taken 20,000 years of accumulated growth for that organic mat to form over the polar ice area.

Of course, while the oil development and gas development may not occupy much of the surface, it would in essence, of course, have a profound impact on this 1.5 million-acre area. Incidentally, it is the only part of the arctic plain on the Beaufort Sea that is in fact not open to development today, and that is the irony, because there are so many areas of Alaska, so many areas of that plain that are already open to oil development. And so just feeding this, or letting the speculators bid on it, would not deliver us a great change in terms of our deficit but it would I think destroy forever a pristine area and create an environmental deficit.

As my colleagues tonight are noting, the Republican budget reconciliation bill decimates programs for people such as Medicaid and Medicare and replaces them with a new type of welfare—aid to dependent industries and special interests. This is especially evident where environment issues are concerned. Over and over again, the interests of the mining, timber, oil, and gas industries take precedence over public health and the rights of future generations to inherit a healthy planet are adversely affected by the provisions of the Republican reconciliation measure especially as it impacts the environment.

I'll make just a few points to illustrate my point. First, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is destroyed.

The bill permits oil and gas exploration supposedly to secure \$1.3 billion in Federal revenue and in my view the Treasury will never receive that much because the economic assumptions are faulty and the bill assumes a 50-50 split between the Federal Government and Alaska, even though Alaska can and probably will sue for 90 percent under the Alaska Statehood Act.

The best the Nation would get is enough oil to fuel the America's energy needs for 200 days—That's the most optimistic forecast. But most importantly the unique and fragile Arctic ecosystem would be destroyed. ANWR is home to more than 200 species of conspicuous and many more inconspicuous species of fauna and flora. The porcupine caribou herd uses the northern coastal plain for calving and post-calving activities. It is the biological heart of this arctic wilderness The Native American Gwich'in people who rely on the caribou for subsistence would of course be adversely affected. Public opinion opposes oil drilling in ANWR in fact 70 percent favor the preservation of this area. Furthermore, this new policy of using asset sales for deficit reduction sets a bad precedent. The loss of resources offsets potential gains in terms of dollars.

Second the mining provisions of this measure enshrine the rights of speculators in law at the expense of the U.S. taxpayer. The mining law of 1872 permits mining companies to acquire public land and mineral rights for a fraction of their value, this so-called reform remains blind to the mineral value of the land. The mining industry now buys mineral rich land for as little as \$5 per acre. And we should not be blackmailed in the reform process to give away the minerals to the mining interests. Within the past week, the Secretary of the Interior was forced to turn over 3 billion dollars' worth of copper and silver for under \$2,000 because of the 1872 Mining law.

Meaningful reform of this budget-busting 19th century mining law is needed today. The Republican budget fails to provide real reform. Federal mineral rights will be sold at their market value, which means the value of the surface land, not the minerals underneath. This would be like selling Fort Knox for the price of the parking lot and building. The American taxpayers are getting ripped off again under the Rubric of reform—some reform; Republican reform.

Third, other provisions in the Republican budget continue the special interest benefit under a mantra of budget balancing such as Park concessions change that gives incumbent concessionaires huge advantages over the competition. Grazing provisions that further reduce the already scandalously low fees paid by ranchers. Continuation of below cost timber sales—as the taxpayer pays the cost and loses in American legacy and congressional mandates the transfer of a Ward Valley, CA site for a low level radioactive waste dump with no public or scientific safeguards.

In conclusion, this budget bill regards land and conservation policy will revive the era of the great robber barons, who exploited and degraded America's natural resources during the nineteenth century and into the 20th century. Isn't it time to correct such policy for the 21st century. This Republican budget bill would destroy natural monuments like ANWR

and in essence build new monuments to greed and the special interests. This budget bill fails in terms of politics and public opinion, science, economics, and morality.

President Clinton was right to veto this budget reconciliation ("wreckonciliation") bill—we owe it to future generations to protect their rightful legacy and uphold this veto and more importantly balance the budget without creating a massive environmental deficit or a human deficit.

#### IN MEMORY OF GEN. MAX THURMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to remember the life and the contributions of a great American. Gen. Max Thurman had his final battle with leukemia end 1 week ago. His remains were laid to rest earlier today at Arlington National Cemetery.

During almost four decades of military service, Max Thurman found his duty offered him diverse challenges, from Vietnam, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command, ultimately to commander of our forces during Operation Just Cause in Panama, an operation for which he delayed his retirement from military service.

His devotion to duty was so intense that he earned several nicknames during the course of his military career. Indeed, one of those nicknames, I suppose, speaks volumes to those who served under his command, for they came to call him Maxatollah. But that devotion to duty, that intensity, that ability that Max Thurman brought to the U.S. Army served that fighting force well in a massive transition from a conscripted army to a volunteer force.

Max Thurman faced a challenge not only on the field of battle but among those who would make their livings trying to influence Americans on Madison Avenue, for it was Max Thurman who worked just as tirelessly in his recruiting command to fashion a message to young Americans, to reshape and rethink and rearticulate a call to duty. It was Max Thurman who worked with those from the civilian world to encapsulate a phrase that spoke not only to the promise of youth, not only to the promise of this great country, but to the promise of service in the U.S. Army, for it was Max Thurman who helped to coin the phrase "Be all that you can be."

Indeed, his reputation won him a certain celebrity. The story goes that once upon a time, in the airport, I believe, in Chicago, a lady approached him and simply said, "General, are you the 'Be all that you can be' man?"

And Max said, yes, he was that man. But he was far more. Those privileged to serve with him, both on the

field of battle and in other commands, talk of his reputation, of his intensity, of his dedication to service, of that commanding voice but, yes, also that distinctive walk that would reverberate in the Marshall Corridor in the Pentagon, as if this were a man born to command.

My personal recollections are different, for I did not know the Maxatollah, not in that sense. My father grew up with Max in the southern town of High Point, NC, and Max Thurman preceded me to North Carolina State University where he earned his degree in chemical engineering.

The Max Thurman I knew was a kind, decent and yes, dare I say gentleman, one always willing to stop and answer questions in a kindly fashion.

Yes, we heard his command voice in Panama, in Operation Just Cause, and yes, we mourn his passing and pass along our condolences to his brother, Lt. Gen. Roy Thurman, now retired, and to all those who served with him.

But it is safe to say that Max Thurman lived up to the slogan "Be all that you can be" because he was all he possibly could have been.

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY SPENDING PRACTICES QUESTIONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I think that you are well aware that I have come to the well on a number of occasions to address the House regarding my concerns about Government waste in general and how to root it out and eliminate it. But in particular I have focused attention on the Department of Energy and the extravagant travel practices of certain members of the Department, and the relationship of that travel to the transfer of money from certain accounts into other accounts as it relates to the overall mission of the Department of Energy.

In that context, I had occasion to get a telephone call from the Secretary of Energy some 3 or 4 weeks ago, asking to meet with me and to explain certain things, which I did. It was my impression, both from that conversation as well as from other developments that had occurred in the press, that perhaps a new leaf had been turned over in the Department of Energy, that the kind of profligate waste and abuse of travel moneys and of traveling and just a general sort of complete uncaring attitude toward the taxpayers' money had been overcome, and that really we had done some good work perhaps just by bringing attention to it in this House.

But it is my very sad duty today to report to you and to this House that I have had come across my desk a cable that was addressed to the State Department from U.S. Ambassador John

B. Ritch. He is the U.S. Chief of Mission to the United Nations in Vienna. It criticizes in very stark terms the ongoing waste of taxpayer dollars on travel by the Department of Energy, specifically the U.S. delegation to the International Atomic Energy Agency conference in Vienna this past September.

□ 1615

I want to read to you from the cable. It says, "Subject: Nonproliferation of delegates as well as weapons."

The size of the United States delegation to this year's IAEA general conference exceeded thermonuclear critical mass and threatened to vaporize our message of fiscal austerity to the United Nations. At least 38 Washington visitors, of whom only 19 were accredited to the conference, came to Vienna to participate in the 39th general conference in September. At a rate of \$188 per day for 8 days, per diem alone approached \$60,000. With an average air fare of \$900, air fare for the delegation came to \$35,000, bringing the total close to \$100,000. This figure does not include the visitors' salaries, nor does it cover the full cost of the United States delegation, which also included most of the already in-place staff. Counting the U.N. Vienna, our delegation came to about 50.

Ironically, the United States delegation spent much of the week fighting a proposal that would have increased our annual contribution to the technical assistance fund by \$125,000, roughly the same amount that it took to bring our visitors to Vienna. Predictably, most of the work to defend the United States position actually ended up being done by a few experts from Washington and U.N. VIE.

Let me remind you again, Mr. Speaker, this is written by our U.S. ambassador to the U.N. delegation in Vienna. This is an ambassador who is an appointee of President Clinton.

In the context of today's budget climate and Administration efforts to reinvent a more cost-effective government, this year's delegation represented a profligate cost. But, as indicated above, it was also an embarrassment. Several of our G-77 and other counterparts wondered aloud how our professed budgetary austerity squared with extravagant United States Government travel habits. By way of comparison, most other delegations, even from larger countries, included only one or two visitors from capitals. It is also true that a traveling Cabinet officer needs some accompanying support. But these points do not serve to justify more than three dozen visitors from Washington, particularly since the general conference is, in certain respects, one of the least substantive events on the IAEA calendar. We want to be clear on this point: U.N. VIE encourages substantive visits, but for substance, Washington officials should glean far more from a well-scheduled one-to-two-day visit during the normal IAEA work cycle.

The Ambassador said the size of the U.S. delegation to IAEA conference this past September threatened to vaporize our message of fiscal austerity for the United Nations.

Now, what brings me to the floor, besides wanting to bring to your attention, Mr. Speaker, this, I think, important piece of information, what really

brings me to the floor is that lost in all of the liberal rhetoric that we hear around here about massive budget cuts, about heartless and cold treatment, about callousness, is the fact that the Federal Government continues to waste billions and billions of dollars annually. It is precisely this type of waste and abuse that Americans want stopped.

This disclosure that comes on the heels of President Clinton's veto of the very first balanced budget to cross his desk ever, and the first balanced budget to come across any President's desk in 26 years, raises questions certainly about this administration's commitment to controlling Federal spending. The President is talking about reinventing Government. If this is the kind of Government that he has reinvented, if this is what he wants in terms of reinvention, then, doggone it, Mr. Speaker, we are getting nowhere on this.

I will wrap up by saying this: The President's veto of the budget package while he has this kind of profligate spending going on in his own agencies clearly shows the lie of what is going on at the political levels in this government.

Mr. Speaker, I am including for the RECORD the message just referenced, as follows:

IMMEDIATE—UNCLASSIFIED—DSSCS  
MESSAGE—11758 CHARACTERS  
VZCZCMSS4272  
ACTION=DOE  
CMS(-),EIA(-),NN42(-),PO(-) OIN  
IDD(-)  
INFO=  
DATEZYUW RUEHVEN3288 3191559-  
EEEE=RHEBDOE.  
ZNY EEEEE ZZH  
EZ02:  
O J51559Z NOV 95  
FM USMISSION USVIENNA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMME-  
DIATE 1929  
RUEHMT/AMCONSUL MONTREAL 0020  
RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME 1147  
RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS 2122  
RUEHGV/USMISSION GENEVA 3037  
RUCNDT/USMISSION USUN NEW YORK  
1126  
RUEHBS/USEU BRUSSELS  
BT  
UNCLAS E F T O SECTION 01 OF 02  
USVIENNA 003288  
\*\*\*\* SECTION BREAK \*\*\*\*  
SECTION 01 OF 02  
DEPT FOR PM—AMBASSADOR  
SIEVERING;  
FROM USMISSION UNVIE  
SENSITIVE  
NOFORN  
E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: IAEA, AORC, AFIN, US  
SUBJECT: NON-PROLIFERATION OF DEL-  
EGATES AS WELL AS WEAPONS  
EZ05:  
REF: USVIENNA 2856

1. This is an action request, see para 8.

SUMMARY

2. The size of the U.S. delegation to this year's IAEA general conference (REFTEL) exceeded thermonuclear critical mass and threatened to vaporize our message of fiscal

austerity to the UN. Against the twin backdrops of UN reform and reinventing government, UNVIE recommends that the Department issue strict guidance to limit the size of U.S. delegations to international conferences. As to the severity of the problem and how it might best be rectified, we are interested in the observations of other relevant U.S. missions. Ambassador would welcome a clear-cut instruction to administer the country clearance authority against a new and stricter standard. End summary.

COUNTING THE BEANS

3. At least 38 Washington visitors (of whom only 19 were accredited to the conference) came to Vienna to participate in the 39th IAEA general conference in September. At a rate of \$188 per day for 8 days, per diem alone approached \$60,000. With an average airfare (Delta roundtrip Washington-Vienna-Washington) of \$900, airfare for the delegation came to \$35,000, bringing the total close to \$100,000. This figure does not include the visitors' salaries. Nor does it cover the full cost of the U.S. delegation, which also included most of the already-in-place UNVIE staff. Counting UNVIE, our delegation came to about 50.

4. Ironically, the U.S. delegation spent much of the week fighting a proposal that would have increased our annual contribution to the technical assistance fund by \$125,000, roughly the same amount it took to bring our visitors to Vienna. (Predictably, most of the work to defend the U.S. position ended up being done by a few experts from Washington and UNVIE.)

GO FORTH AND REDUCE

5. In the context of today's budget climate and administration efforts to reinvent a more cost-effective Government, this year's delegation represented a profligate cost. But, as indicated above, it was also an embarrassment. Several of our G-77 and other counterparts wondered aloud how our professed budgetary austerity squared with extravagant USG travel habits. By way of comparison, most other delegations, even from larger countries, included only one or two visitors from capitals. (The only delegation even comparable to ours was the Japanese, which totalled 20, including Vienna-based personnel; Japan was shielded from comment, however, by an impeccable UN payment record.)

6. To be sure, some U.S. delegation members came to do work not directly related to the general conference, taking advantage of the presence of counterparts here—for example, for an NPT depositaries meeting and consultations on nuclear materials. It is also true that a traveling cabinet officer needs some accompanying support. But these points do not serve to justify more than three dozen visitors from Washington, particularly since the general conference is, in certain respects, one of the least substantive events in the IAEA calendar. We want to be clear on this point: UNVIE encourages substantive visits, but for substance, Washington officials would glean far more from a well-scheduled 1-2 day visit during the normal IAEA work cycle.

ACTION REQUEST  
UNCLAS E F T O SECTION 02 OF 02  
USVIENNA 003288  
DEPT FOR PM—AMBASSADOR  
SIEVERING;  
FROM USMISSION UNVIE  
NOFORN SENSITIVE  
E.O. 12958: N/A  
TAGS: IAEA, AORC, AFIN, US  
SUBJECT: NON-PROLIFERATION OF DEL-  
EGATES AS WELL AS WEAPONS

7. Ambassador requests that the Department draw up standards or guidelines which IO and relevant missions can use to limit significantly the size of U.S. delegations to international conferences. For its part, UNVIE—having beefed up its IAEA section to reflect U.S. national security priorities—is now positioned not only to cover the daily work of the Agency but also to handle, with very limited augmentation from Washington, the board of governors meetings and general conferences. Buttressed by instructions, we are prepared to use the country clearance process to help manage cost-effective USG participation in Vienna conferences. Ritch

BT  
#3288  
2482  
NNNN.

Amb. JOHN B. RITCH,  
Chief of Mission.

THE QUESTION OF THE BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have been coming to the floor in past days to discuss this whole question of the balanced budget. The previous speaker mentioned it again. It comes up on this floor with a regulatory that I think lets it amount almost to the point of prayerful incantation, Mr. Speaker. We hear over and over again phrases, like "This is for my children and my grandchildren." "We must have a balanced budget in order to give them an opportunity." "We have to have a balanced budget in 7 years."

Mr. Speaker, I will say yet again, and say for the record, that there is no proposal from the Republican majority to balance the budget in 7 years. There is no such thing as a balanced budget. On the contrary, what is happening is a proposal that is now before the President and the negotiators that is now before the President and the negotiators from the White House from the Republican majority which mortgages the Social Security trust fund to the tune of some \$636 billion, at least as of last January, and the conference report of the Republican majority in the House of Representatives, that does not include the interest.

The facts are, then, that we will be paying somewhere in excess of \$1 trillion. I take that back, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if we will be paying it. We will certainly owe it. But I have not seen any plan whatsoever or language in the budget proposal which indicates how we are going to pay the \$1 trillion back.

For those who maybe have tuned in to our proceedings here and have been kind enough to contact me and ask for a little more detail and for those who

may not know, of our colleagues, about this proposition that I am putting forward that there is no balanced budget, may not have heard it, let me reiterate where I get this proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Let me indicate to you that I have in my hand a copy of the concurrent resolution of the budget for fiscal year 1996. This was printed on June 26, 1995, and this comes from your Committee on the Budget. This is, in fact, the official conference report.

On page 3 of the conference report, Mr. Speaker, it lists the deficits, and I am quoting now from the document, "For purposes of enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:" The fiscal years 1996 through 2002 then follow: In the first year, the deficit is \$245,600,000,000. Deficits accrue each succeeding year until you reach the year 2002, the 7th year of this proposed balanced budget, in which the deficit amount is listed as \$108,400,000,000.

If we are talking about reducing deficits, that is one thing. President Clinton's budget did that. We reduced the deficit. We reduced the absolute number of the deficit, and the rate of the deficit has been going down and will have gone down for 3 years, something which I believe the record shows, Mr. Speaker, has not been done since Mr. Truman's administration in the late 1940's.

So I repeat, the budget document itself, so we know the premise that I am operating from, indicates that we will have deficits, deficits starting in the \$245 billion range this year and continuing on through to the year 2002, when supposedly we have a balanced budget.

Let me indicate what the public debt is. The public debt, and these are not my figures, Mr. Speaker, this is what is printed in the record of the conference report of the Republican majority here, the public debt is as follows: The appropriate levels of public debt are for the fiscal year 1996, \$5,210,700,000,000, \$5.2 trillion; in the year 2002, 7 years from now, when we supposedly have balanced the budget, the number has gone to \$6,688,600,000,000, almost \$6.7 trillion from \$5.2 trillion. I do not think it takes any great mathematician to realize that the public debt will have risen during the time we are supposedly balancing the budget by more than \$1 trillion.

Going on, again, quoting from the budget document itself, not figures I made up, section 103, Social Security, "social security revenues," Now I think anybody that is observing our proceedings today or listening in to our proceedings, they know what they mean by a balanced budget. It is how much of the revenues you have, how much money comes in and what your outlay is, how much money comes in and what your outlay is, how much

money goes out, and at the end of the year or at the end of a period of years, if you say you are going to balance the budget, that is what we mean by it, how much came in, how much went out.

Well, I have just read to you that there is a deficit. Obviously, we are spending more money than we are taking in. Where are we going to get the money? "Social security revenues, for purposes of this section, the Congressional Budget Act, the amount of revenues of the Federal Old Age and Survivors' Insurance trust fund and disability insurance trust fund are as follows: Social security revenues," Mr. Speaker, "fiscal year 1996, \$374,700,000,000," almost \$375 billion, and again other amounts accruing each year from 1997 on through the 7-year period to the year 2002.

How much do we get in revenues in 2002? \$498,600,000,000. Now, where that money comes from, Mr. Speaker, is from your paycheck and mine and from paychecks all across the country, under the so-called FICA position on your paychecks, FICA. That is your Social Security payment. And I will explicate about that a little bit more in my talk. It is \$375 billion in 1996, \$499 billion approximately in the year 2002.

What are the Social Security outlays? Okay, that is the income. What are the outlays? In 1996, \$299,400,000,000, approximately \$300 billion. In the year 2002, what is it? It is \$383,800,000,000, approximately \$384 billion.

Keep those figures in mind.

In other words, we have a surplus. If you look at the fiscal year 1996, this next year coming up, we are taking in \$375 billion in Social Security revenues. We are laying out \$300 billion. We have approximately \$74 billion to \$75 billion in surplus, what is called surplus.

We all know that there are going to be more people in the next century utilizing the Social Security trust fund for their benefits than there are now because the age of people getting the Social Security funds is increasing; that is to say, their life expectancy is increasing. There are going to be more people drawing on the Social Security fund with less people paying into it, and yet here we are drawing on the Social Security fund, borrowing from it. I think that is the polite word for it. Other people have used other words, like "embezzlement." I have quoted others in the other body who have used that word, embezzlement. I say we are mortgaging our future, our Social Security future, by taking from it. But that nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, is the surplus supposedly for this year.

Under the outlays for the year 1996, as I said, it was about \$300 billion. In the year 2002, the seventh year when we are supposedly balancing the budget, the Social Security trust fund will take in approximately \$499 billion. Al-

most a half a trillion dollars will come in. And what is the outlay? \$384 billion.

□ 1630

Now, let us say that we understand that there is liable to be an increase or decrease in these estimations, because that is what they are, estimations, but take a look at that number, What did I say was going to be the deficit in the year 2002? According to this budget document, it is going to be approximately \$108 billion. If we allow for a factor of \$2 or \$3 billion on either side, let us use that, say \$105 billion to \$110 billion. The \$108 is right in the middle. That is the figure being used. What is the Social Security surplus? Wonder of wonder, it comes to about \$111 billion, just about exactly what the deficit is, according to your own budget document. And what does that mean? It means that when the Republican majority says that they have a budget in surplus in the year 2002, what they really mean is they have magically worked the numbers so that the Social Security trust fund surplus becomes just slightly more than the amount of the deficit, so that you can claim there is actually a surplus in the budget.

It is entirely illusionary, it is entirely a matter of doing ballet with the books, it is an accounting trick, it is just moving numbers around on paper, and it bears no relationship to reality. Why? Because the reality is at that point, even if you succeeded, Mr. Speaker, in doing exactly what you propose in the budget, of being able to have deficits every year and offset them with the Social Security trust fund by borrowing against that trust fund, in the year 2002, unless I am sadly mistaken and have misread the budget document, there is no provision in here whatsoever as to how the money is to be paid back. No plan. No proposal. No acknowledgment. As a matter of fact, the Congressional Budget Office even indicates to me that it is implicit that it will be paid back, but there is no explicit recommendation in the entire budget conference report as to how you will pay back the \$630 or \$40 or \$50, or whatever the number comes out to be, \$630-plus billion, plus interest, that has to be paid back into that Social Security fund in order for it to be utilized.

If one and I obviously, Mr. Speaker, do not think you would believe for a moment that I am making any of this up, that I do not have the documents, but if one was to consider that that was merely my reading of the budget figures and that perhaps I was misunderstanding what the information was, let us refer then to the Congressional Budget Office itself.

Now, I understand that there has been a great deal of discussion in the press and I have witnessed it myself with the Speaker of the House in great umbrage indicating that the Congressional Budget Office is the resource

that we must refer to if we are going to make any pronouncements on the budget. So, Mr. Speaker, I take that, I am a humble serving Member of this body. I am in the minority. If the majority, the Speaker of the House of representatives, Mr. GINGRICH, says that we have to use the figures of the Congressional Budget Office and only those figures when we comment on the budget, I will accommodate him.

So I have before me the economic and budget outlook for the fiscal years 1996 to 2000 as of January 1995. The source, Congressional Budget Office. That is what I have in my hand, given to me from the Congressional Budget Office, the budget outlook through 2005 as a matter of fact. What does it show? It shows that in 1996, as of January 1995, we have a deficit starting in 1996 with the figure \$207 billion. It goes on to the year 2002, where the figure is \$322 billion. Then it shows the Social Security surplus starting at \$73 billion and ending up in the year 2002 at \$111 billion. Those are the figures from the Congressional Budget Office.

Attached to those figures is a letter written to the Honorable BYRON L. DORGAN, U.S. Senate, dated October 20, 1995, from the Congressional Budget Office, signed by June E. O'Neill, who, as you know, Mr. Speaker, is the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. Copies of this letter are sent to the Honorable PETE V. DOMENICI, the chairman of the Committee of the Budget in the Senate, and the Honorable J. JAMES EXON, the ranking minority member on the Committee on the Budget, an identical letter sent to the Honorable KENT CONRAD.

I wish to quote in part from it. "As specified," I am now quoting from the Congressional Budget Office letter to Senator DORGAN, "As specified in section 205(a), the Congressional Budget Office projections"; in other words, the budget document, Mr. Speaker, that I just quoted from, "was not arrived at randomly."

Randomly. I am not accusing the conference committee or its author in the Committee on the Budget here in the House of just coming up with intuitive projections, although the Speaker of the House indicated at one point, Mr. GINGRICH did, that he arrived at the 7-year period by intuition. I think that I would prefer to lay intuition aside for the moment and get right to the figures as provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

Once again, "As specified in section 205(a)," we are talking about the act which forms the foundation for the budget resolution, "the Congressional Budget Office provided projections." There is then a parentheses, "using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution and assuming the level of discretionary spending specified in that resolution."

In other words, the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Speaker, in this let-

ter, Ms. O'Neill, Director O'Neill, is indicating that the projections in the announcement she is about to make in this letter are based on the economic and technical figures that are in the budget resolution, and they assume the level of spending specified in the resolution that I have just quoted to you.

Going on, the projections of the deficit or surplus of the total budget, that is, the deficit or surplus resulting from all budgetary transactions of the Federal Government, including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts, are designated as off-budget transactions.

Now it comes out, this is how we perform the sleight of hand. This is the David Copperfield of budget tricks that takes place. You simply declare all the money that the people of this country have put into the Social Security trust fund as being off budget.

Do I not wish that I could take what I owe on my credit card and declare it off budget? I would not have to take that into account when I balance my budget at the end of the month or at the end of the year. I can just ignore all the money that is on that credit card, because I am declaring it off budget.

What happens as a result of that off budget transaction? Again, quoting from the letter from Director O'Neill: "As stated in the letter to chairman Domenici, the congressional Budget Office projected there will be a total budget surplus of \$10 billion in the year 2002." mark that, Mr. Speaker. A budget surplus in the year 2002.

We have triumphed. We have achieved a 7-year budget balance. In fact, we will even have a surplus of \$10 billion. Oh, happy day. Why has it not been done before? Why did the Democrats fight us all this time on it, when here it was, right before us, so easily accomplished, and we have the Speaker and everyone who supports the Speaker now ready to give us this wonderful present in 2002 of a \$10 billion surplus.

But, wait. That is not all. There is another sentence. And what does it say? "Excluding an estimated off budget surplus of \$115 billion in the year 2002 from the calculation, the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, would project an on-budget deficit of \$105 billion in 2002. If you wish further details on this projection, we would be pleased to provide them." A staff member and number is then left.

Yes, there is that little matter of the \$105 billion deficit. But, of course, we do not want to count that, because we were able to put that off budget somewhere. That does not really exist.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been in various legislative bodies for a long time. I have negotiated budgets. I have been a subcommittee chairman in which I received a figure, a spending figure, that I had to conduct my legislative affairs within, in higher education, in

Health and Human Services, in education itself, in lower education. I know what it is like to have to live within certain boundaries that have been set.

I have also served on the Committee on Ways and Means, a committee which decides what kind of spending can take place, what kind of appropriation is going to be allowed. I think I understand the process. I have served on a city council where we had to make those decisions. I have had responsibility in those areas.

That does not make me an expert, by any stretch of the imagination, but I think as a citizen in a free country, someone who has had the honor and privilege of serving in public office because people exercise their voting franchise and put their faith and trust in my judgment, that I took it seriously, that I tried to do my job as well as I could and understand it. I think I am a reasonably intelligent person who understands the English language and the implications of it.

I am here to tell you, Mr. Speaker, when I read those comments and when I see those numbers, there is no way that I could have gotten away with saying that we were balancing the budget, had I been proposing this in the Honolulu City Council or in the Hawaii State Legislature, nor could I propose it to my wife and family and get away with it, because they would understand immediately that there was no way for me to account for the debt that I had incurred and how I was going to pay it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us move to another Congressional Budget Office deficit projection, if that observation of mine is not sufficient, because I want to point out yet once again that this is what the Speaker has told us to do. Speaker GINGRICH has said as a matter of fact, I regret to say, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. GINGRICH has put it in quite threatening terms as recently as the last day or so. And this is his general proposition for the country at large, and I grant you, Mr. Speaker, that I am saying words to the effect. Mr. GINGRICH has said words to the effect, if you do not abide by the balanced budget proposition as put forward by the Congressional Budget Office, the stock market is going to crash, and the interest rates are going to go through the roof, or we will shut down the Government, and it will be all your fault.

Now, Speaker GINGRICH indicated he was going to bench himself previously. If this is being on the bench, I am not quite sure what being on the field would be. But, nonetheless, this is what he has done. He is the Speaker of the House, he won a majority of votes, and I think I would like to remind him that it is one thing to stand in the back and throw rocks when you are in the minority. I have been in the minority before. I have been in the minority even when I was in the majority. I understand what that is all about. It is easy

to criticize when you are not in a position of authority. But now he is the Speaker of the House, and the things he says and the actions that he takes are taken very seriously by the people of this country. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, I take them seriously.

So I stand here before you today, taking Mr. GINGRICH's admonitions to heart, and so I refer to another document here in the economic and budget outlook of the Congressional Budget Office indicating the Congressional Budget Office deficit projections by fiscal year. This is the updated version. This is updated as late as I know one exists.

Now, I understand the Congressional Budget Office is going to provide a further update next week, so the figures that I am going to cite to you, I do not cite them as if Moses has come down from the mountain and given them to me. The best source I have is what the Speaker says I should use, which is the Congressional Budget Office with the latest figures.

Here they are. Congressional Budget Office deficit projections, August 1995, and what do I find on this page? By the way, this is in billions of dollars. I find a section of the Congressional Budget Office projections which say what? "Off budget surplus." And what do I find under it? Social Security and the Postal Service. The Postal Service surplus is a minor amount. It is not a minor amount to the average family, I am sure, because we are talking about up to a billion dollars. But compared to the off budget surplus of Social Security, it is a minor amount.

□ 1645

The off-budget surplus. Is that not a beautiful phrase, the off-budget surplus? I can imagine how virtually anybody in this country would be delighted to have an off-budget surplus available to them when it comes time to pay their bills.

For 1996, it is \$63 billion, and goes on up to the year 2002 in which the projection is \$96 billion. Is that not nice to have that surplus available to us?

So we go on then from the Congressional Budget Office, and we get what is the base line budget projections, and there we see a word which has been used on the floor of this House over, and over, and over again, but not since we started talking about the balanced budget. We used to hear about how we had to reduce the deficit. That was a litany that was recited with the fervor of a rosary being recited. We had to have the deficit be reduced.

We do not hear that anymore, Mr. Speaker. Now we are balancing the budget. We have a new prayer, but this is an unanswered prayer, because this Congressional Budget Office base line budget projection for the fiscal year 1996 read in two ways, and it is really convenient.

I am so pleased Speaker GINGRICH asked us to use the Congressional Budget Office because they have this beautiful comparison here. On one line, the on-budget deficit. Unfortunately, our deficit cannot get off budget. There is no way to hide the deficit. We have to stay on the money, no pun intended, Mr. Speaker, on the money when it comes to the deficit, and the Congressional Budget Office understands that.

So the on-budget deficit is \$253 billion in 1996, as of August 1995, according to the Congressional Budget Office; and goes on, by the year 2002, to be a total of \$436 billion. And do not forget we are accumulating 253, 286, 301, 338, 373, 397 and 436. We add all those numbers up to get what the deficit is.

And what do we see as the off-budget surplus? We have an on-budget deficit in three figures, we have an off-budget surplus in the year 1996 of \$63 billion, in the year 2002, \$96 billion, and we have a series of numbers going on for every fiscal year up to the year 2002.

So what we have there, Mr. Speaker, it seems pretty clear, is that we have an ever increasing deficit. An ever increasing deficit under our budget, under the Speaker's proposal. An ever increasing deficit and we have Social Security funds in a trust fund, supposedly off-budget, that we are going to use to try to reduce that deficit. But that does not take into account, then, how we pay for the money that we have borrowed from Social Security to make up for what we are spending in a deficit fashion in the budget we have proposed before us.

Mr. Speaker, one does not have to be a Nobel prize winner to figure that one out. It means that we are going to keep on spending. In fact, I see members of the majority party come to the floor everyday and brag how they are spending more money on Medicare, more money on Medicaid, more money here and more money there. Charts come down on the floor, facts and figures are thrown forth, but I notice they never bring anything out of the budget document. I am the one quoting from the budget document. I am the one quoting from the Congressional Budget Office to the actual figures.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have some pie chart or something that has been drawn up in the basement down here on the floor. I am quoting the facts and figures as they are, and I am here night after night bringing this out with no refutation from anybody. I do not seek a contest on this. I am just saying that these are the facts and figures for the American public to figure out.

Now, let us take a look at what this means. I have cited a lot of numbers, and I am sure my colleagues that are tuned in, and others across the country who might be observing our proceedings, they are not sitting there with pen and pencil trying to copy down everything I am saying. I hope that they

believe that I am quoting accurately from the figures. Certainly the staff here at the House takes these documents afterwards to check for what they are going to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so I can assure everyone that these documents will be quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the sources will be there.

So what do these numbers mean? If we take my fundamental proposition that there is not a balanced budget proposal on the table; that, in fact, we are increasing the deficit; that, in fact, we are borrowing money from the Social Security trust fund with no plan to pay it back, what does it mean?

Well, there is a very interesting table that the Congressional Budget Office has provided, and it is as follows: What is the on-budget deficit? If the Speaker will recall, that is what I just recited. And the off-budget surplus, what does that mean in terms of being a percentage of the gross domestic product? That is, I think, a reasonable way for the average American, and certainly myself, I am an average American, I do not think, as I say, I have any special mathematical ability or any special insight into economics, but I think I understand a straightforward presentation, and these Congressional Budget Office tables are straightforward.

The on-budget deficit. How much we are in the red. Off-budget surplus. How much extra money we have. What is it as a percentage of our gross domestic product? That is to say the sum and substance, the sum total of all that we have produced. What are we worth? Well, it is very interesting that the budget, which supposedly is going to be balanced in 2002, starts out in 1996 as a percentage of the gross domestic product. It starts off at 3.5 percent. 3.5 percent of the gross domestic product is the on-budget deficit.

If we were really balancing this budget, Mr. Speaker, why is it that in the year 2002 the percentage of the gross domestic product, which is in deficit, is 4.4? I will repeat. How can we say that we have balanced the budget if, as a percentage of our gross domestic product, we move from 3.5 percent in 1996 to 4.4 percent of the gross domestic product in the year 2002? It cannot be done. It cannot be done.

There is no way we can twist the English language sufficiently to enable us to come on this floor and say that the deficit is less in 2002 than it is in 1996 if we have moved from 3.5 percent of the gross domestic product to 4.4 percent of the gross domestic product as representing the deficit of this Nation. That is the fact. At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the off-budget surplus stays approximately at 0.9 percent. The highest it goes is 1.0 percent in the year 2000 and again in the year 2002. In only 2 of the 7 years does the off-budget surplus reach the level of 1 percent of the gross domestic product.

Now, these are the facts and these are not facts that I have twisted and turned in order to make my case. The case came to me from reading the facts. I had no preconceptions on this. I do not sit on the Committee on the Budget. I had to do my homework on this. I had to read through these documents. I had to wade through all the piles of numbers and propositions, and decreased revenues stemming from downward revisions on income projections, and full percentage points lower than previous forecasts, and Federal debts held by public standing, and lower rates which translate into significant interest savings. I had to wade through that. It is my duty to wade through that.

When I looked at it, and when I read it, I kept thinking, can this be true? Can someone be coming down here and saying we are going to balance the Federal budget by 2002? We are going to balance the Federal budget in 7 years? We are going to save our children? We are going to save our grandchildren?

The Congressional Budget Office figures do not fudge anything. The Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH says, let us use honest numbers. Everything that I have read today, everything that I am speaking about on this floor comes from the Congressional Budget Office or from the conference document on the budget as presented to this Congress. Every single number. Nothing has been made up by me. I am not trying to put it in any particular order to try to make my case. The case, as I said, was made for me by reading the numbers and understanding what they meant finally.

They meant to me that we are engaged in an illusion. I will not use the word "fraud". I may have used it in the past, because that just has a pejorative connotation, and I do not care to get into that. There has been enough of that kind of discussion taking place. I wish the Speaker himself, Mr. GINGRICH, would take that to heart and come down here and start using some honest numbers that he admonished us with.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at what that means. Let us try to get some understanding, then, of what that means to the children; what that means to the taxpayers who have the children and the mothers and fathers who may be on Social Security. There is a phrase that has been utilized, Mr. Speaker, utilized on this floor and utilized in discussions, utilized in media discussion, and it is called backloading. It is called look-back provisions.

Now, these are our little catch phrases that are utilized, and I do not think, necessarily, they are explained, and I fault the media. I do not fault the political figures that are trying to dance around this case. I mean I do not fault them in the sense of trying to fig-

ure out a way to fool people, because that is what the object of this is. I fault, frankly, the journalists and those whose job it is to cover what we are doing from inquiring further.

Why are there not more probing questions? We could do with a few less celebrity journalists and entertainers disguised as journalists and get some people who will ask some serious questions of the people that are presenting these phrases about balanced budgets and lowering the deficit.

What is backloading? What is a look-back provision? I will tell the American people what it is. What it means is if over the next 7 years some of these figures fall down, if they do not hold up, what it means is in the 7th year we will look back, see how much we are off the mark that we set for ourselves, and then impose draconian cuts. At that point that will eviscerate even further, if that is possible, Medicare, Medicaid, nutrition programs for children and the helpless among us. How will we care for them?

That is what look-back means. That is what backloading means. Backloading is when we start out and we have a lower number than we really need because we do not want to scare people too much. After all, there is a Presidential election coming up. Our reelection is coming next year. Let us not frighten them too much, but let us load that up at the backside, 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999 on to 2002, so that when we get to 2002, then we can whack them.

By that time, a lot of people in here have said they are leaving office. There is all kinds of folks in here that have said I am for term limits. I am only going to be here three terms. I am going to come in, destroy the budget of the United States, I will take the social and economic stability of this Nation apart brick-by-brick, and then I am going to walk away and leave the mess for somebody else to clean up.

□ 1700

That is what is going to happen. That is what the implications of this budget are. It goes beyond the partisan argument among Democrats and Republicans. It comes down to what kind of Nation are we going to have? What kind of people are we? Do we care about one another? Do we have any feeling for one another? Is it literally a case, as in the Gilded Age, in which a financial pirate like Jim Fiske could say, "It is every man, drag out his own corpse."

Is this to be a war of each against all? Is that what this country is all about? That is one of the reasons that we have the difficulty in Bosnia, because we have a war of each against all. I come from Hawaii where we do not have that kind of ethic. Our diversity defines us rather than dividing us in Hawaii.

Mr. Speaker, we live on an island. I grant you, Mr. Speaker, not everybody

lives in the kind of situation that perhaps you and I do. Island people, we know our limitations. We know that because we are on an island, because we recognize that nature in the end rules, that we have to get along with one another. We have to find ways to accommodate one another; not to set one against another.

Mr. Speaker, that will be the inevitable result of this budget if we are not fair and honest and play fair and honest as we go into the budget. If we backload the budget to have the full impact come in a given year, we are not going to be able to do it without hurting people and hurting people deeply. That is not just opinion on my part. I think it is a reasonable projection that anybody who is being honest about it would make.

Let us try to get a little more detail on that. What exactly is going to take place? Does anybody believe that in the year 2002, the Government stops; that there are no payments to anybody anymore; that we have no obligations, social or economic, to one another? What happens in 2003 and on out? It is very interesting.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to just bring my own opinion to the floor. I will quote from what they call a myth, the balanced budget myth, from USA Today written November 6 of this year, just last month.

USA Today, Gannett Corp., they are no friends of mine. The Gannett Corp. in Hawaii, they would like to see me drop through one of those volcanic cracks on the Big Island and never come back. I am proud to say that those newspaper people in Hawaii, they have been against me all of my life. All of my political life they have opposed me. I know I am doing something right when I have the newspapers going against me in their editorial departments in my own hometown. Mr. Speaker, you know perfectly well that a person must have something useful to say.

I am not quoting an organization that has any favorable twists towards me. There is no question about that. So, what does their editorial say? Let me quote.

Each day, the debate over balancing the budget produces another dire warning. That cuts are too deep, say the Democrats. Taxes must fall, say the Republicans. But after they compromise and begin arguing over who won a few weeks from now, one truth will remain. Both sides will be lying, because neither is talking about a truly balanced budget at all.

"The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office," the documents that I have been quoting, as the Speaker admonished us to do, underscored that point recently. It pointed out that come 2002, when the balance will be "balanced" under the Republican plans, the Government will still be borrowing more than \$100 billion a year. This is done by writing IOU's to the

Treasury, to Social Security and other trust funds that Congress declares off budget." That is what I have been saying all along in the course of my remarks.

"The bill for this little game will not come due in the political life of President Clinton or much of today's Congress." That is just what I indicated. "But, the public will pay soon enough."

Here is what the editorial says, and I quote:

To understand, look ahead to 2005. That is just 10 years away, about the time it takes for an 11-year-old child to go from grade school through college.

Let us think about that, because we have heard over and over again from our friends here on the majority Republican side, "Think about the children. Think about the grandchildren." I hope it does not sound pejorative, Mr. Speaker, but there have been some crocodile tears shed on this floor about the kids and the grandkids.

So, I am just going to talk about 10 years from now, in the time an 11-year-old goes from grade school to college.

That year, 2005, that year, a critical balance tips. Increased costs for Social Security will begin to deplete Congress' cushion. Because the Social Security trust fund is a fiction, filled with nothing but Government promises to pay, Congress will gradually lose its fudge factor. By 2013, when the trust fund peaks, taxpayers will feel a hard bit. They will have to start doing what the trust fund was supposed to do: pay for the retirement of 75 million baby boomers. The budget will plummet into a sea of red ink with \$760 billion a year deficits by the year 2030. By then, the Government will have had to double the current 12.4 percent employer-employee payroll tax to cover Social Security obligations.

Again I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that is not some partisan rhetoric that I made up in order to try to embarrass Speaker GINGRICH, with his admonitions to us about having to balance the budget. That comes from an editorial from someone who is certainly not a friend of mine. But the fact still remains that they have hit upon what the real difficulties, and believe me that is a word that beggars the enormity of what is about to take place, the difficulties, the hardships, the pain that is going to be inflicted on this country as we apparently want to mutually agree to fool ourselves and, by extension, fool the American people into thinking that we are balancing the budget.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot in good conscience come down to this floor and go through this ritual recitation about a balanced budget and not acknowledge the facts as I have presented them.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that by borrowing from the trust funds, we are not really balancing the budget. By not being honest about what the deficits are, it simply means that we are going to have to raise taxes on the next generation, or else we are going to have to

make cuts that are unacceptable in a civilized society.

I suppose it would be possible to make the kind of cuts that would enable us to get into balance in 7 years if we decided that there were whole portions of our populace that were expendable, with whom we could dispense, that we have dispensable people.

Right now, Mr. GINGRICH is very fond of reciting individual instances where children who were on welfare have been killed or maimed or tortured or some horrifying element such as that coming into play, and cited it over and over again, and then associate that with programs that have failed, in his estimation.

Well, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider if we are going to go by the number Speaker GINGRICH raised with us, namely an intuitive one about 7 years, are we not then taking a chance, given the figures that I have outlined, of doing exactly that? Of having a society in which people, some people, will be considered less human than others; less deserving than others? In which providing for the general welfare of all of our people will be transposed into "some will get and some will not," and those without power will be left without the capacity to defend themselves?

The strong, the powerful, the wealthy, they can always take care of themselves. We all know the old joke about Democrats borrow and Republicans collect interest. Well, it has a certain cachet to it, and probably more than one person out there who is tuning in, including our own colleagues, will say, "Yes, that, is right."

Mr. Speaker, you may think that is the way we should put our budget together. I do not. I am down on this floor trying to exercise my franchise on this floor on behalf of those who cannot speak for themselves. That is why the 435 of us are here. This is a representative government. This is not a parliament.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. GINGRICH is not the prime minister. We do not have to follow blindly in the footsteps of anybody in this country, including the President of the United States, as he learns every single day, I am sure, more than once. Probably once an hour, once a minute, he probably feels it is like somebody is telling them that they do not have to pay attention to what he is saying or what he is requesting.

Mr. Speaker, it is our obligation as men and women freely elected by a free people to come onto this floor and defend the interests of those who cannot otherwise defend themselves. That is what this budget is about. It is not about an abstract document. The fact that I happen to be able to grab a piece of paper and budget figures on a piece of paper does not mean that that is the budget. The budget is people. This is the people's House. We represent the people. We have a certain time on

Earth given to us to justify our existence. That is the way I look at it.

I do not deserve anything. I am not entitled to anything. But I will tell my colleagues what I am entitled to under the Government of the United States, is consideration. Consideration, based on the Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence that formed the basis of our association with one another as a republic.

So, it is important for us to transpose and translate this document, this budget, into human terms and to consider the human dimension. If we do, I think we are going to look at it a little differently. I am perfectly content, Mr. Speaker, I have been a legislator all of my life. I understand that not everybody thinks as I do, and I understand that positions I may have held at one time I have changed over the years.

Mr. Speaker, I have changed them because I have learned more. Hopefully, I am not so set in my ways as to believe that revealed wisdom is somehow mine at a given point in my life and there is nothing else for me to learn. In this particular context, I think there is a lot for us to learn, and there is a lot for us to give to one another in terms of the knowledge that we have acquired.

If we want to reduce the deficit, and I do think that is important, and if at some point we want to balance the budget, and I do think that that is important, by all means let us do it in a sensible way. Very few people, Mr. Speaker, are able to buy their house on the day that they move into it. The bank advances them a sum of money on the basis that they will be able to balance their budget. That is to say, they will have sufficient funds to be able to make the series of payments necessary in order for them to pay off that house.

We do that as governments all the time. What we say, if we are on the city council or in the State government or in a village situation where we have a bond issue for sewers or for roads or for schools, we say that over a period of time we will pay for that, because not just the people of today, but the people of tomorrow, the young people as they grow older, will be using these facilities.

We have a budget that takes that into account and over 5, 10, 15, 20, and 30 years, we pay the principal and interest associated with those projects and those expenditures that we feel are in the general public's interest; in the common interest of the people in our communities.

We see this as being fair and equitable. That is all I am asking for, Mr. Speaker. So, I want to close perhaps by reiterating and summarizing as follows: If we truly want to have a budget that we can go before our families, our friends, our communities, go before those folks who depend upon us, and

speaking with them honestly about it; that will review the premises upon which this balanced budget is being proposed; that will deal with some honest number, recognizing that we cannot command the next Congress; that there are 2 Presidential elections over the next 7 years, then we have to try and set a basis, a foundation, for a budget that will enable us to be able to carry on the legacy, the heritage of freedom in this country, and to pass on to those who will have the responsibility after us, a responsible budget which has been arrived at in an honest fashion, and which preserves and protects not just Social Security and the other trust funds, but protects the basis upon which we are able to conduct the proper business of the people of this country.

That budget, fundamentally, in the end, Mr. Speaker, is people, and unless we translate this budget into people terms, we are doing a disservice to the very people who have given us the responsibility to be here today.

#### STATUS OF BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, let me point out that I am performing some special responsibilities tonight as what we call on this side of the aisle, the Theme Team leader. I hope to be joined by some of my colleagues in this special order lasting approximately 1 hour. This is time reserved by the Republican majority to talk about issues of the day.

However, having said that, I will also point out that we have ended legislative business for the week and I do not know if I will be joined by some of my colleagues, but it is my hope to talk a little bit about the budget situation.

Mr. Speaker, I think Americans are curious to know the status of these negotiations, since we are roughly 1 week away from the December 15 deadline for the short-term continuing resolution which has allowed us to keep, if you will, the doors of the Federal Government open and continue to pay our bills. A week from tomorrow, December 15, is when that continuing resolution expires; when the Federal Government runs out of funds.

□ 1715

So we have a little bit more than a week to reach a bipartisan agreement with the President and his administration and with our Democratic colleagues in the House over the terms of a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget using honest numbers as generated by the nonpartisan Congress-

sional Budget Office, a balanced budget over 7 years which does not resort to Washington budgeting. There is a little bit more than a week to reach an agreement to preserve the American dream for our children and our grandchildren rather than to leave them with the legacy of the American debt.

I would point out the obvious, which is that we Republicans, while being the new governing majority in the Congress for the first time in 40 years, lack the votes to override the President's veto. Therefore, we have to reach some sort of agreement with either the President and his administration or with enough of our Democratic colleagues to be able to override the President's veto, if the President continues to insist on balancing our plan, our balanced budget plan.

But at the beginning of my special order I wanted to talk just a little bit about the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct ruling yesterday on Speaker GINGRICH, particularly since it was the primary topic raised today during the opening of legislative business, the time that we normally reserve for what we call 1-minute speeches or 1-minute addresses to the House.

One of my Democratic colleagues after another came to the well, where I am now speaking from, to make or to reinforce accusations against the Speaker. It was clearly a smoke screen in my view to divert attention from what the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct really said in their ruling yesterday and also to divert attention away from the pressing business, the business of the American people, which is of course confronting this House, as I mentioned, and which we actually have just a little bit over a week's time to conclude. Again, the most pressing business, the most pressing issue confronting the House of Representatives is the American people's desire to have a balanced Federal budget.

So, first of all, let me just take a moment to clarify this Committee on Standards of Official Conduct rule on Speaker GINGRICH. I think my colleagues, particularly my newer colleagues who perhaps do not have the history of this institution, certainly, or perhaps are not aware of how the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has been really turned into a tool or a vehicle for political vendettas, I want to spend a moment to talk a little bit about the history of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. I also want to take a moment to clarify that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is the only standing committee of the House of Representatives that is truly bipartisan in nature. That is to say, an equal number of Republicans and Democrats are serving on that committee.

Yesterday the five Democrats and the five Republicans, again an equal

number, making this truly the only bipartisan committee of the House, because all other committees have a majority-minority representation. That is to say, there are more Republicans, since we are now the majority party in the Congress, on every other congressional committee than there are Democrats, except for the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. Yesterday those 5 Democrats and 5 Republicans serving on that committee voted unanimously, that is 10 to 0, to effectively dismiss 64 of the 65 charges leveled against the Speaker of the House.

To me that clearly points out that these charges are baseless, and not only that, that they are largely frivolous and political in nature. The Committee on Standards of Official Conduct gives us real reason to believe that these charges were part of a political vendetta orchestrated from the day that the Democrat Party lost control of the House, a vendetta orchestrated to discredit the Speaker by attacking him personally.

After 15 months and millions of taxpayer dollars and hours and hours of time spent investigating, the liberal Democratic minority, the liberal Democrats who constitute a majority of the minority party in the House of Representatives, those liberal Democrats who launched this unfounded smear campaign owe the House and the taxpayers an apology. These were frivolous charges that were made for political reasons and attempt to politicize and to misuse the ethics process.

This is not an isolated example. This continues a Democratic pattern of abuse of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. These phony charges against Speaker GINGRICH are really nothing new because in 1989, Democrats, in retaliation for then-Speaker Jim Wright's resignation, filed nearly 500 charges against Representative GINGRICH. Just like today, after a long and costly investigation, Representative GINGRICH was exonerated.

These attacks against Representative GINGRICH may be phony, as he himself has said, but they are a serious pattern of misuse and even abuse by a frustrated Democratic Party bent on politicizing the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. So, while we are working to try and change America, they are working to try and change the subject.

These charges were a coordinated effort, again by the most liberal element of the House Democratic Party, not to seek the truth or justice, but to stop us from balancing the budget, reforming welfare, providing tax relief for families, and sending power back to States and to families, just as we promised to do and just in fact as we have been doing since we became the majority party in Congress last January 4.

I also want to take a moment, because it really riles me to see that the

gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, has sort of become the point person for the Democratic minority in leveling these charges against the Speaker. It upsets me to see a Member of the House Democratic Party leadership really take the point in leveling these charges and leading the attack against the Speaker.

I worry sometimes that again some of our newer colleagues perhaps may not have an understanding of the recent history in this institution. I certainly worry that many of our constituents, the American people, do not realize that some of the people engaged in this orchestrated political vendetta against the Speaker are the very people who presided over the scandals that have rocked the House of Representatives in recent years.

It is very important to understand that the governing party, the majority party in the House of Representatives, has added responsibilities, a special duty to administer the House on a day-to-day basis. That means all the administrative and financial functions of the House of Representatives. Of course until last January, the party responsible for managing the House of Representatives was the Democratic Party. I very well remember, because of my personal experiences from my first go-around in Congress as a Member of the 102d Congress, I remember vividly the House Bank and Post Office scandals that occurred on the watch of the House Democratic Party leadership.

I remember when then-Speaker of the House, Tom Foley, speaking from this podium opposite me in the well of the House, took the report from the General Accounting Office. This was an audit of the House, the so-called House bank, which was really a membership cooperative and check-cashing office. I remember when Speaker Foley took the audit indicating over 8,000 bounced checks at the House bank, waved it in the air, standing down here at that podium right there, typically where the Democrats speak from. He waved that audit in the air, and he said: This is now a matter that is over and done with.

He submitted the GAO report for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Translation: We have not done anything wrong, and we will not do it again.

A small group of us, proverbial back benchers because we were junior members of the Republican Party, the minority party, which was to become known as the Gang of Seven, happened to be on the House floor. And that moment we came together and said: We are not going to let this pass unnoticed. We are going to challenge what appears to be a deliberate effort on the part of the House Democratic Party leadership to sweep this matter under the rug.

Well, the rest, as they say, was history, and to make a long story short,

we ultimately helped lead the fight compelling full disclosure of the names of those who had abused their membership privileges, their part of the perquisites of being a Member of the House of Representatives at the House bank over the opposition of the entrenched Democratic Party leadership, which was to include in that 102d Congress the gentleman from Michigan who now attacks the ethics of the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Later in that same Congress, of course, we had the post office scandal. I can recall, again, as a member of the Gang of Seven, standing upstairs in the House press gallery and telling a news conference of the national news media that there was prima facie evidence to suggest criminal wrongdoing at the House bank and post office. And I based that on my former experience as a law enforcement officer and police investigator. I can remember them laughing aloud, scoffing openly at the suggestion, the temerity on my part to suggest that there had actually been illegalities or criminal wrongdoing.

But if you come forward to the present day, we now know that there have been a number of indictments, criminal indictments and criminal convictions on the part of House officers and employees as well as Members of the House of Representatives in conjunction with those two scandals. The bank and post office scandals really gave new meaning to the term, the old joke, the check is in the mail.

Later, out of the House post office scandal, we had revelations of ghost employees, ghost employees on the payroll, on the official staffs at taxpayer expense of Members of Congress. Those are serious allegations. They were leveled against a former member of Congress from Illinois by the name of Dan Rostenkowski who was then chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means and very much a part of the House Democratic Party leadership.

I cannot recall any protest from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. I cannot remember Mr. BONIOR ever going on record. And this is the same gentleman now who constantly chases the TV cameras and anyone holding a microphone. I cannot remember that gentleman ever coming forward and condemning these ethical lapses and these deliberate abuses in the House of Representatives.

In fact, in the last Congress, in the last Congress, there were two votes, two votes to force the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to investigate the allegations against then-Representative Rostenkowski, both of which were defeated on pretty much a straight party-line vote, the Democratic majority outvoting the Republican minority. Where was Mr. BONIOR then?

Well, the answer of course is that he was part of the Democratic Party leadership. He was part of a concerted effort to control the damage, to cover up the true extent of the House bank and post office scandals and to thwart an official Committee on Standards of Official Conduct investigation of Representative Rostenkowski.

I might add that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] had 76 over-drafts at the House bank for which he was never held accountable by his colleagues in the House of Representatives. Remember, of course, that Representative BONIOR now insists that the House take action against the Speaker. He gloats that the decision to dismiss 64 out of the 65 charges against the Speaker of the House is some sort of great victory and that the appointment of an outside counsel to assist the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in investigating the 65th charge, which entails complicated tax issues, is somehow, again, a vindication of his position all along.

But I would love to ask Mr. BONIOR, where was your moral outrage, where was your indignation when this institution was consumed by the House bank and post office scandals? How did you vote on July 22, 1993, when the House defeated by a party-line vote of 242 to 184 the Michel resolution offered by then-Republican-leader Bob Michel to force immediate disclosure of House administration transcripts of the post office inquiry?

In fact, the two gentlemen from Florida who have been prompted, coming down to this floor talking about how we are going to force the House to demand an immediate accounting from the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, we want immediate disclosure of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct proceedings against the Speaker of the House, I dare say that those two gentlemen from Florida, Representative PETERSON, Representative JOHNSTON, both voted with the majority here back on July 22, 1993, to block immediate disclosure of the House administration transcripts of the post office inquiry.

Then later, March 2, 1994, again by another party-line vote of 238 to 186, the House of Representatives, under the control of the Democratic majority at the time, defeated a resolution by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] to immediately initiate a Post Office investigation by the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

So you can see, my colleagues, that there is clearly a double standard in this House of Representatives, clearly a very convenient short-term memory lapse by my Democratic colleagues with respect to the scandals which again rocked this institution under their watch.

□ 1730

Clearly there is no limit on hypocrisy with a capital H in this town. In fact it

reminds me, as I watched these she-nanigans, I am always reminded, I think, of the wonderful Woody Allen line: "No matter how cynical I get, I just can't seem to keep up," particularly when I watch the hypocrisy and the double standard on the other side of the aisle. So I wonder where is your moral outrage at what occurred then? How could you have been silent, and how could you have condoned and acquiesced to those scandals then but be so outraged today, and for that matter where is your outrage at the scandals that have rocked the current Presidential administration, the Clinton administration, which promised us the most ethical administration in the history of our country? Where is your outrage, Mr. BONIOR and others, over the Whitewater scandal and what appears to be with every passing day more and more evidence of a high-level coverup in the administration, a high-level damage control operation in the White House to prevent the American people from knowing the full truth and all the facts regarding the Whitewater scandal? And on, and on, and on.

There is almost a joke today that the Clinton administration cannot have a Cabinet meeting without all the Secretaries bringing along all their independent counsels and their lawyers.

So what is this all about? It is really an attempt, as I said earlier today during 1-minute, to divert attention from the major issues confronting this Congress, the important work, the important business, of the American people, and that is balancing the Federal budget, keeping our promises, doing the right thing for our children's future.

Now what happened yesterday? Mr. Speaker, yesterday, with one stroke of his pen, the President replaced the American dream with the American debt. Now the President of course has, having vetoed our 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget as certified by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the President vetoed our plan, arguably the most important bill to cross his desk since he became President of the United States, the President now has a responsibility to offer his own balanced budget, to tell us specifically what he does not like about our proposal, without any gimmicks and without any rosy economic scenarios.

But before we get into the President's proposal, because bear in mind it has now been 2 years and 11 months roughly that he has been President of the United States, and he has yet to send to this Congress, or to the last Congress, his plan for balancing the Federal budget. But, first of all, I think we have to ask why, why did the President do this? Why did the President veto the most important piece of legislation to cross his desk since he became President?

Well, why did the President veto a sound, reasonable, balanced budget? It

sort of begs the question does he really want a balanced budget or does he want to play politics with this whole issue of balancing the Federal budget as part of what I call the nonstop campaign? And at some point in time I really believe you got to put the politics aside and act on principle, and that time is now.

Why did the President veto welfare reform, because we had put our welfare reform proposal into the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 which he vetoed yesterday; why did he veto that? Does he really want, as he promised as a candidate for President of the United States, does he really want to end welfare as we know it? Why did he veto Medicare solvency? Does he really want to save Medicare? Is he completely ignorant of the report made by his own Cabinet Secretaries, the public trustees of the Medicare trust fund, that Medicare starts to go broke next year and will be completely bankrupt in 7 years? Why did the President veto Medicaid reform, the kind of Medicaid reforms that he lobbied for as the Governor of Arkansas? Why did he veto Medicaid reform that would give States, as he argued back when he was a Governor, more money, greater flexibility, and less bureaucratic red tape?

All questions then await an answer from the President now that he has vetoed our plan to balance the Federal budget.

The President has clearly, against the will of the American people, the President has clearly tried to ignore the will of the people and avoid balancing the budget.

So I have got a message to the President, to my colleagues, yesterday. I have three children. I, like many other proud dads, carry their photographs everywhere with me in my wallet. Actually I have a large photograph, but I left it over in my office in my office desk. I wanted to bring that over here and hold it up, but I want my colleagues to know that the President said—what the President said to my kids yesterday, 20 and 13. Those are our two boys, Ryan and Matt, and our little girl, Sarah Ann, who is 8½ going on 18. I want the President to know what he said to my kids yesterday. He said: If you want a brighter future, here is a veto. If you want to be able to live the American dream and not inherit the American debt, here is a veto.

I want to remind my colleagues that the Balanced Budget Act was not just a good bill, it is the only bill. There is only one credible plan in this town that would balance the budget using honest numbers while cutting taxes for working families, and that is the bill the President vetoed yesterday.

All we can gather from this action is that the President wants to take more of my children's money, because remember, our children are going to be spending for our excesses, they are

going to be paying high taxes to pay for our wasteful spending practices, and we really believe it is immoral on this side of the aisle in Congress to borrow from our children's future to pay for today's spending binges, but that seems to be the message from the President and his administration.

Now let me just point out that we have some pundits weighing in on this particular subject, some pundits who have looked at all this give and take, back and forth, between the Republican majority in the Congress and the President and his administration on the balanced budget, and I want to bring a couple of quotes to your attention.

I want to quote from the Washington Post a couple of days ago, December 5, in a column written by James Glassman, and he is a regular columnist now for the Washington Post, but he is a pretty knowledgeable guy about Capitol Hill because he used to be the editor of Roll Call newspaper, the weekly newspaper that is published on Capitol Hill, and here is what he wrote about the budget:

My own judgment is that the lack of a deal is Clinton's fault. To be fair, Clinton and Congress differ on how a small part of this spending will be financed. If the two sides are so close, why is there no deal? That is the big secret that we seem to be keeping from the American people, is that we are actually relatively close. In fact, the President has proposed to limit the growth of Medicare, the President has proposed to cut middle-class taxes. In fact, by the same reasoning that so many of our Democratic colleagues use here in the House of Representatives the President is proposing to limit the growth of Medicare to help finance a middle-class tax cut, but you will never hear that acknowledged by the Democratic minority in the House.

Anyway, back to Glassman's quote. He says: "If the two sides are so close, why is there no deal? I am not sure Clinton wants one right now. With shutdown two looming on December 15, next Friday, a week from tomorrow, he would rather portray the Republicans as extremist and obstructionist and himself as the savior of health care for seniors and the poor. The actual numbers, listen to this, the actual numbers from an objective, neutral, unbiased observer, the actual numbers prove this claim is malicious nonsense, malicious nonsense. The only question is how long it takes Americans to realize it."

That is James Glassman 2 days ago in the Washington Post.

Now listen to this, same day, December 5, a quote from Democratic Senator and Senate Budget Committee ranking minority member JAMES EXON in the Omaha World-Herald newspaper: "When you come down to the numbers, it has been impossible to get the Democrats to agree to any kind of plan. I am critical of my own party," says Senator EXON regarding Congressional Democrats. "I think we have to come up with a budget to be credible."

That is coming from one of the people inside the room, one of the leading budget negotiators, the ranking Democrat on the U.S. Senate Budget Committee, Senator JAMES EXON.

Now listen to the Boston Globe on Monday of this week speaking of Leon Panetta, former Congressman and Committee on the Budget chairman in the House of Representatives, and now chief of staff at the White House leading the White House negotiating team on the budget deliberations. Here is what the Boston Globe says:

"Panetta acknowledged last week that Democrats are bargaining from a position of some weakness." They quote Panetta as saying, "We should have been the ones who asked the toughest questions about costly government programs," he said. "I think we lost something when we didn't," and I raise that now because I want to speak about my former California colleague, Leon Panetta, in just a moment, because, as you will see, Leon Panetta has been all over the political landscape when it comes to the idea of a balanced-budget plan, a credible balanced-budget plan.

So again, colleagues, with one stroke of his pen yesterday President Clinton vetoed the first balanced budget in 25 years, 25 years. The only real balanced budget plan the President has ever touched, he vetoed, and he vetoed it with a flourish, with a lot of fanfare, as if that is going to give him additional political mileage. His explanation for not giving the American people a balanced budget was that our plan, again certified by the Congressional Budget Office as balancing the Federal budget in 7 years, our plan which increases spending from \$9 trillion over the past 7 years to \$12 trillion over the next 7 years, almost a \$3 trillion increase, that our plan was, to use the President's word, "extreme."

Well, let me tell you something. The American people know this. My constituents know this. There is nothing extreme and unacceptable, another term the President used, about lowering interest rates, giving American workers more take-home pay, saving Medicare from bankruptcy, ending welfare as we know it, and, yes, we are going to continue to remind the President of that campaign promise, increasing spending as I mentioned by almost \$3 trillion and giving more power to the States and communities. This is what the President vetoed, despite his rhetoric. He vetoed a sound, reasonable, balanced budget. He vetoed welfare reform that really does end welfare as we know it.

Now there is a certain rich irony in a new Republican majority in the Congress attempting to help a Democratic President make good on his fundamental campaign promises, because that is exactly what is occurring here. The President campaigned on a promise of ending welfare as we know it—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Would the gentleman suspend?

As stated on page 175 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair will remind the gentleman from California that it is not in order in debate to mention the name of a Senator—except as a sponsor of a measure or in quotations from Senate proceedings for the purpose of making legislative history—or to refer to a Senator or his vote on a proposition.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the Speaker's reminder. I was quoting the Senator, I believe, from a newspaper, so I do stand admonished, and, Mr. Speaker, let me ask how much time I have remaining, please.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has one-half hour remaining.

Mr. RIGGS. All right.

Mr. Speaker, with that reminder let me pick up where I left off. I was talking about the irony of a Republican majority helping a Democrat President make good on his fundamental promises, and if you go back to the 1992 Presidential campaign, you will recall that the President campaigned on a promise of ending welfare as we know it and a promise of reducing middle-class taxes. We want to do both. We do both in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, which he vetoed yesterday.

So I want to say again the President with one stroke of the pen yesterday vetoed tax cuts for families, and do not—I know the American people see through this smokescreen, this constant class warfare demagoguery that they hear daily on the floor of this Congress, and I think that is evidence of just how intellectually bankrupt the congressional Democratic Party has become at times. But I know the American people see through that, but I simply want to stand here today and tell you that three-quarters of the tax relief we provide in the Balanced Budget Act goes to families with dependent children. We think that is very important.

□ 1745

We think it is fundamentally important to give American families an economic dividend from the first balanced budget in 25 years. Yes, we do philosophically believe that the American people are entitled to keep more of their own hard-earned money, that they are in a better position to determine how to spend that money than the Federal Government and the Federal bureaucracy back here in Washington, so we give tax relief to families. We have especially helped middle-class families which have felt the burden, the twin whammy, the pinch, if you will, of rising taxes and stagnant or even declining wages in recent years, so our tax relief is targeted to middle-class and low-income families. And, in fact, our tax relief would completely

eliminate the Federal tax liability of 4.7 of the lowest-income families in America. That is what the President vetoed yesterday. He vetoed a \$2.5 trillion increase in Federal spending in the next 7 years over the last 7 years, as I mentioned earlier.

How much more money does the President want to spend? We will not know until we get a detailed proposal, a counter proposal, if you will, from the President. I will point out that when the President vetoed the Balanced Budget Act yesterday, he vetoed the American people, because in the largest public opinion survey ever taken, 7,200 registered voters with a margin of error of 1 percent on the issue of a balanced budget, the American people said yes to our plan to balance the budget. Fifty-seven percent of the American people surveyed embraced our plan after being given a few facts; a few facts, not the rhetoric, not the distortions, not the demagoguery; facts about how our plan treats programs like Medicare; student loans which increase from \$24 billion to \$36 billion, a \$12 billion increase over the next 7 years; Social Security, which has always been off the table, and I think that is one of our biggest accomplishments, balancing our budget while providing tax relief for American families and without touching Social Security.

In fact, I think as other Members have pointed out, we have to generate a budget surplus here in Washington by 2002 or sooner, so we can begin paying down and ultimately paying off the national debt, and repaying the money to the Social Security trust fund that we have borrowed over the years. In fact, I think our constituents and our colleagues need a reminder that \$1.5 trillion of the \$5 trillion national debt that we have today is money borrowed from the trust funds of the Federal Government, chiefly, Social Security, so we have to repay that money. The only way we can do that, obviously, is to balance the Federal budget and then generate a budget surplus year in and year out. I still get wide-eyed looks when I raise the idea of budget surplus from my constituents in my town meetings, but we are going to do that.

As I told one of my constituents at the beginning of this year, who asked me in a town meeting, "Congressman, will I ever see a balanced budget in my lifetime?" I said, "Yes, you will. You will see it this session of Congress, and you will see in your lifetime budget surpluses in Washington that go to pay down and pay off the national debt so our children do not inherit that debt."

So 57 percent of the American people embraced the plan after they learned the facts, 86 percent believed that the President and Congress should deal with the budget issue now. That is the language of the short-term congressional, the continuing resolution that

expires next Friday. We said "shall," not "maybe," not "if." We said, "We shall deal with the budget now."

Seventy-one percent of the people surveyed agreed that President Clinton should submit a 7-year balanced budget plan scored by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, as he himself once promised to do in a State of the Union address, standing at that podium right there behind me. My, what a difference an election makes, and the hypocrisy quotient begins to go up again.

Seventy-three percent of the people surveyed agreed that the President and Congress will not balance the budget unless they stick to the 7-year deadline. Again, that is from the largest public opinion survey ever taken in the history of our country. So I wanted to try and stress a couple of those points. I wanted to take a moment again just to look at what the President said yesterday when he vetoed the Balanced Budget Act, H.R. 2491, and I quote from a transcript of his veto message which was on the U.S. News wire yesterday: "The bill seeks to make extreme cuts and other unacceptable changes in Medicare and Medicaid."

I am here on the floor tonight to say to the President, to my colleagues, to my constituents, and to the American people that there are absolutely no extreme cuts in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Total Federal spending, as I have already mentioned, over the next 7 years when compared to the last 7 years actually increases \$2.5 trillion. Specifically, there are no extreme cuts, and I quote now from the President, there are no "extreme cuts and other unacceptable changes in Medicare and Medicaid."

A spending increase is not a cut, as the President himself said in 1993, when he also proposed slowing the rate of growth of Medicare: "Today Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation." The President recognized that was an unsustainable rate of growth in both of those programs. Then he went on to say, "We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not a Medicare or Medicaid cut," from a speech he gave to AARP, the American Association of Retired Persons, on October 5, 1993.

What has changed? If anything, Medicare and Medicaid are in worse condition, worse shape today than they were back on October 5, 1993. But what do we do in our bill? We increase Medicare spending 6 percent a year between this year, fiscal year 1995, and fiscal year 2002. Medicare spending in actual dollar numbers increases from \$178 to \$289 billion, a 62-percent increase.

Here is the real news to the American people. The difference between our proposal on Medicare part B premiums and the President's proposal is \$4 a month, \$4 a month in the year 2002. That is what the President calls an ex-

treme, unacceptable cut. Of course, the flip side of that is to make American workers, including minimum-wage workers, pay even more taxes so that Medicare part B recipients do not have to pay a slight increase in premiums.

Mr. Speaker, it just astounds me, again, the cynicism and hypocrisy that we see, and the evolution here of the President's position over the last couple of years. Medicare spending never differs more than 2 percent under the two plans, and in two of the next 7 years our Republican balanced budget actually spends more on medical care than the President's budget. Overall, the difference in total Medicare spending between the two plans is \$32 billion or 1.9 percent.

The other program the President singled out was Medicaid. Yes, we will no longer allow Medicaid to be an individual entitlement, a universal individual entitlement. We make it, instead, a block grant program to the States, at the request of the Governors. I pointed out earlier that the President, when he was the Governor of Arkansas, requested these same innovations. I would also like the American people and my Democratic colleagues to understand that we are working very closely with the Governors in developing our plans, and in developing the particulars of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

Why are we doing that? We now have 31 Republican Governors in America representing 71 percent of the American people. Are we not going to consult them? Are we going to leave them out of the equation? Are we not going to treat them as equal partners in developing the Balanced Budget Act? Of course not. We have been acting on their bequest here as we craft a plan for reforming Medicaid.

Instead, we have a Medigrant proposal which gives States more money, greater flexibility, less bureaucratic redtape, just as the President wanted when he was a Governor, and which increase Medicaid spending by 55 percent. There is nothing extreme and unacceptable about lowering interest rates, giving American workers more take-home pay, saving Medicare from bankruptcy, ending welfare as we know it, increasing spending, and giving more power to the American people. That is just what I said earlier. I want to repeat it for emphasis, because that is what the President vetoed yesterday.

I see I am joined by my very good friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California. I wanted to point out to her, she probably already knows this, but with our Medicare reforms, California, which is a high-cost, high-growth State, will get even more funding for Medicare recipients. Medicare recipients in California are going to realize and receive an increase of \$5,000 per beneficiary today to over \$8,000 per Medicare beneficiary in California in

the year 2002. Our plans to balance the Federal budget in 7 years anticipate that we will spend over \$50,000 per Medicare beneficiary in California over the next 7 years. That is what the President apparently feels is extreme and unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND].

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

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note, and the gentleman probably saw this article of November 29 of U.S.A. Today, it stated what life would be like in the year 2002 with a balanced budget. I was pleased to see that they agree with us. It means a larger economy, \$150 billion more in goods and services, lower interest rates, 30-year fixed-rate mortgages below 5 percent, lower inflation, higher incomes, no trade deficit, a stronger dollar; but they have a "but" here, and it says "cuts Federal spending."

I do not know if the gentleman from California hears from our constituents like I do, but that is why they sent us here. They know the Federal Government has to go on a diet. They want us to cut spending. They said also that there would be cuts, and they use that word cuts. They are talking about Medicare. We know that we are not cutting Medicare, as you just pointed out, we are going to increase the dollars there. We are slowing the rate of growth.

I find it interesting. Last night I had a phone call. I was working in my office quite late and did the answering of my phones. People are always amazed back home that I am answering the phone and working late hours. It was interesting, because the gentleman was concerned about balancing the budget and concerned about cutting Government. I pointed out to him, did he realize that we were increasing, under our budget, the Republican budget for the next 7 years, we were increasing spending from well over \$9.5 trillion to 12, and we are increasing it by \$2.5 trillion. When they are told this fact, people just stop dead in their tracks and say, "Why are you not doing a better job of cutting Government spending?"

Mr. RIGGS. They also say, I might point out, "Why are you not doing a better job of getting your message out?" on that point, and that is why we are doing the special order here tonight.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. That is why we are here, to try to get the message out to the hinterlands and California about what our plan is all about. I am doing my very best, as my colleagues are, to get our message out about how good our plan is for America.

I think it is important to share the information about the good old State of California. We have been hit very hard these last several years. We know

about the moving vans leaving California for other points, other States. We do not like that idea. We like people to stay in California.

I have two children, 23 and 25, and they are now at the beginning of their careers. They are looking for a place, and they want to stay in the good old Golden State of California. They are concerned about what this means in their life: Are they going to be able to get a job in California? Are they going to be able to buy that dream home that they are dreaming about with that special someone that they hope to marry? Will they be able to have their children here and have a good life for their family?

I just would like to stress that under our plan, all of this over the next 7 years, it would give each and every one of them, not only my children but other people's children, the hope that it is good to stay in California and things will turn in America.

I would just like to say that under the Republican balanced budget plan, the Federal spending for our home State will increase from \$177 billion in the fiscal year 1995 to \$215 billion in the year 2002, which is an increase, an increase. I am an old fourth grade school teacher, so when I see increase, that means a plus sign. I know it is very difficult for some people to understand the simple plus and minus, but we are going to increase it, increase spending in California with Federal dollars by 22 percent.

Over the past 7 years the Federal Government's spending in California was \$1.1 trillion. Under our Republican plan that unfortunately was vetoed by the President, total Federal spending in California would have been \$1.46 trillion, an increase of 31 percent. Again, we are talking about a plus, not a minus sign. Social Security payments to Californians would increase by \$15.9 billion over the next 7 years. Federal welfare spending would increase by \$40 billion in the State of California over the next 7 years; the Medicare payments also, \$9.2 billion over the next 7 years, and Medicaid payments, giving more control to the State, and yet we are going to increase those Federal dollars by \$3.4 billion over the next 7 years.

What I am saying is we are increasing dollars. We cannot be talking about cuts. We are slowing that rate of growth. We are trying to put the Federal Government on a diet and yet do the job by taking regulations, bureaucracies, out of the system.

As a former State legislator in the State of California, I know what it was like to be told that you had to have a mandate, you had to do it the Washington bureaucrat way, and they treated us so often as if we did not have any sense, common sense; we did not have integrity at the State level, we had no compassion at the State level. I think

what I saw, my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, be they Republican or Democrat, they were concerned about their constituents.

□ 1800

Mrs. SEASTRAND. So I just would like to give greater control to our States and the State of California and see that we have a better future for the State of California.

I would just like to add that a drop of 2 percent in interest rates with the balanced budget over the next 7 years would mean 97,000 new private sector jobs in California. I know the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is facing tough times in his district to the north of San Francisco on the coastline, and I am too on the central coast of California.

We have been hit very hard with defense closure. We are trying our very best to commercialize the spaceport at Vandenberg Air Force Base; we are trying to think of new ways for high-tech jobs.

But this means so much about what a balanced budget would mean to the State of California. It is going to reduce taxes of working families in California by \$23.8 billion over the next 7 years.

Let us look at a house in Santa Barbara. This might be unbelievable to some people across America, but in the county of Santa Barbara, the average home sells for \$225,000. Now, if they were to get a 30-year loan, we are talking about a savings, with a 2 percent drop in interest rates, a savings of \$111,000 over the life of that loan.

Now, I do not know about you, but again, it means something to my 23- and 25-year-old children when they are thinking of buying that home and starting their families.

In San Luis Obispo County, the other county in my district, the average home in 1995 was \$163,000. Well, again with that drop of 2-percent reduction in mortgage rates, if we have that balanced budget in 7 years, using those honest numbers, we are going to see that we are going to save those working families again, 23-, 25-year-olds that want to buy a home, they are going to save \$100,000. Now, that is not just a dollar here or there; this is real money.

It is interesting to note also, my son unfortunately had his car stolen, and he is now in the situation where he has to figure out how he is going to get a loan to buy another car and so on. A 4-year car loan, \$15,000. Well, if you have a 2-percent drop in interest rates, he can save \$900. Let me tell you, that is important to him.

My daughter is graduating, and she is looking to go on to a master's, and saying, Mom, I think I might do it on my own and look for some student loans. Well, again, a 10-year student loan, so important to my University of Santa

Barbara and my Cal Poly students in San Luis Obispo. If they apply and receive a 10-year loan of say \$11,000, they are going to save \$2,160 over the life of that loan.

So all in all, this means so much that we push on; and unfortunately, our Balanced Budget Act of 1995 was vetoed by the President, and I am just hoping that as we move forward, we can continue to work for a balanced budget in the 7 years, with honest numbers working with the Congressional Budget Office.

Folks at home understand how we play funny games here in Washington, DC, and they know about the numbers and how we can take a zero here and move things around. They want honest numbers. My calls over the last several weeks, well over 1,000 phone calls, saying, hang in there, hang in there for a balanced budget in 7 years; I know I am going to have to feel a little pain; do it across the board, and let us balance this budget for our children and grandchildren.

So I just appreciate the gentleman from California letting me join him this evening to try and explain and get our message out about what this balanced budget means to people not only in the State of California, not only to my children, not only to my 83-year-old mom who depends on Medicare, but what it means to the folks across America, those hard-working folks that want a better tomorrow.

Mr. RIGGS. Well, I very much appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. I want to stress a couple of points that the gentlewoman made.

First of all, I want to make sure everyone understands again that the principal form of tax relief that we want to give to families is a \$500 credit, child credit, and this is a tax credit, it is not a deduction, so it comes right off that bottom line on your tax return, your ultimate Federal tax liability, calculated after any other deductions.

The gentlewoman made a very good point, that the \$500-per-child tax credit means a \$1,000 tax break for a family of four, each and every year until those children become adults, and that is to say until they turn 18. Furthermore, the gentlewoman made an excellent point that with the reduction in interest rates to be brought about by our plan, and let us be clear about one thing and that is that interest rates have been steadily coming down since last, really since last November, and the election of the Republican majority of the Congress, but they have been coming down precipitously in recent weeks with the expectation of the markets that we are going to ultimately reach some sort of agreement regarding a 7-year plan to balance the Federal budget.

Those interest rate reductions mean, as the gentlewoman so well pointed out, that all Americans will benefit

from our balanced budget plan. All Americans will pay less in interest on their home loans, their home mortgages; student loans is another example, car loans, and right down the list. It just basically means that any borrowing will be less expensive; that we will be able to give the American people some immediate tax relief as well as give the economy a real shot in the arm.

There is nothing that will stimulate the economy and job creation in the private sector faster, of course, than bringing down interest rates and bringing down taxes, as we also propose to do, for businesses through a reduction in long-term capital gains.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. Of course.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting because so often we are told we have the tax cuts and we are giving them for the rich. I just want to point out my background. My daddy was a bus driver in the city of Chicago, a union man. My mom was a part-time office worker at the time, 1950's. I was a latchkey child and did not know it at the time. We have an unfortunate habit today of labeling everybody.

But I have worked hard, studied hard, and I am privileged to serve in this House. So I can really relate to those folks back there saying, oh, well, is this just one of those people who is looking out for the rich. I know what it is to sit around the kitchen table with my family looking to how we are going to pay for my college tuition and so on. I came from that background. So I am very concerned that we do give tax relief to the working families.

I would just like to point out that 75 percent of our family tax credits are going to go to families earning less than \$75,000. Now, in today's world, \$75,000, you are not rich at \$75,000; and being a teacher by profession, Mr. Speaker, today you can have two teachers in the family working and you are lucky if you can make \$75,000. But we are talking about \$50,000 to \$75,000 for perhaps two teachers in the household working full time.

The other point I wanted to make, 90 percent of the tax credit going to families, what we are proposing, would go to families earning less than \$100,000. So we want to take care of the working families, because they know best what they are going to do when they sit around that kitchen table and figure out their priorities every month, or every 2 weeks, as it was in our family instance.

It was one of those situations that they know how to deal with best. Are we going to buy that coat, or are we going to buy the kitchen or the dining room, or are we going to forget about that and buy those expensive gym shoes that we have to get? Those are the kinds of things that the common

folks in working America are concerned about.

So I wanted to point out that what I was supporting and what you are supporting is not for giving tax credits to the rich. We are talking about good old folks across America that are probably doing two jobs, three jobs, and trying to figure out how they are going to survive the next day.

Mr. RIGGS. Well, the gentlewoman makes again a very good point when she talks about most of the tax relief going to families in an income range of \$50,000 to \$75,000. She is describing middle-class families. Certainly, by the congressional districts that the gentlewoman from California [Mr. SEASTRAND] and I represent in California, \$50,000 to \$75,000 is very much middle class by the standards of our congressional district, and that again is where we target most of our tax relief. Those are the families who most need help again, most need relief from this pinch of rising taxes at the Federal, State, and local levels and stagnant or even declining wages in recent years.

I just want to point out that the President, after vetoing the balanced budget plan, has said he is now going to send us at long last, after 2 years and 11 months, he is going to send us his own specific balanced budget plan, but now he insists on using, despite his commitment in signing the short-term continuing resolution, despite his remarks 2 years ago in the State of the Union addressed about using the Congressional Budget Office as the honest referee in budget battles between the legislative branch of Government and the executive branch of Government, despite all of that, he wants to use his own Office of Management and Budget estimates, rosier economic projections, generated by the Office of Management and Budget in the White House.

Well, Mr. President and my colleagues, we know that is a nonstarter, we know that kind of proposal is dead on arrival here on Capitol Hill. We know that the President earlier gave us a vague outline of a balanced budget plan, 22 pages, and it was based on those same OMB estimates, and when we handed that to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office for scoring. This is his plan that had deficits in the range of \$200 billion well into the next century. When we gave that to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, they said, the plan in fact never balanced and would add almost an additional \$1 trillion on top of our national debt of \$5 trillion.

So again, I want to thank my colleague for joining me, and I want to close our special order and my remarks with a letter that I recently received from a friend and constituent back home, because I think it is so representative of the mail and the calls that so many of us have gotten in our office during the last few weeks as this

budget battle has heated up back here in Washington. It is from a gentleman by the name of David Rudig, Ukiah, CA in Mendocino County, which is one of the counties that I represent in northwest California. He writes:

Dear Frank, Just a short note to say "hey" and that all of us are keeping an eye on things in Washington. I called your office at the beginning of the government shutdown to express support for the Republican effort to pass a balanced budget and reductions in government spending. The man who answered the phone in your office was almost surprised to get the call.

My wife went the same day and changed her voter registration to Republican. When I asked why, she just said, "Because of the President." Ditto for my oldest daughter.

I took the liberty of sending you a picture of my grandson in this "package."

Right here is David's grandson, and there is a little note on it; it says:

"Hi, my name is Patrick," here is a note.

"Hi, my name is Patrick. Unless you change things in Washington, I will owe 82 percent of all of the money that I will ever earn to the Federal Government. Please help me." This is based on the Federal budget, the year he was born. So he says—

I took the liberty of sending you a picture of my grandson in this package. There is a quote on it. Please, if possible, put it on your desk and look at it each day. I got into this whole thing after he was born and I realized that unless I did something, I was not going to leave him a very good place to live in after I was gone. Our fight for this budget and the reinventing of government is about him and all of the other kids who do not realize that they owe 82 percent of everything that they ever earn to the Federal Government. That is, unless we change things.

He goes on to just include another little article from one of the local newspapers back home, headlined, "GOP Child Tax Credit Will Cost \$700 Million to Implement," and he notes the irony of this article which says, the IRS claims that it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars to let families keep more of their own hard-earned money.

So the message to David and to constituents back home is, be assured, we are going to hang in there, we are fighting the good fight, we are going to do what is right by our children; and with your support and with, frankly, the backing of the American people, we will prevail in this battle over the next week, or however long it takes, and we will convince the President to do the right thing and to sign into law a balanced 7-year budget.

I thank the Speaker for his indulgence, and I thank my colleague, Congresswoman SEASTRAND, for joining me for this special order.

□ 1815

#### MEDICAID

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the budget reconciliation is really about people. We heard the other side just talk about the letter they received from their constituent and their grandson. It is about people. The reconciliation is about how we treat people, how we will have certain sectors of our community to survive and how others indeed may suffer. It will talk about whether we will reward those who are the wealthiest in our society and what sacrifices all of us must make in order to have a balanced budget.

So the balanced budget is not about programs or not just to balance the budget for balance sake, but it is indeed to balance the budget for the financial security of this country, so it can respond to the future of this country as well as respond to the current responsibilities of this country.

The question really is, should we treat Americans fairly or should we treat those who have great influence with due deference? Do we treat those that are wealthy with new respect or should we treat everybody right? Should those who have influence and who have wealth have the lion's share of the \$245 billion worth of tax cuts or should some of those cuts also be shared by those who make \$28,000 or less?

Those are the questions I think that should be a part of this debate, rather than trying to rationalize a budget proposal that balances the budget on the backs of the poor, the elderly, students, and the disabled in our community.

We should not put poor families, particularly those who are elderly, children and the disabled, under great stress. We should make sure that they have opportunities for the future so they can be contributing members of the society as anyone else.

Medicaid emphasizes that perhaps better than anything else. If we look under Medicaid, we will see that poor families, the elderly, children, particularly the disabled indeed will pay great cost and make substantial sacrifice for the benefit of the wealthiest of those, to do what, to give wealthiest Americans a tax break.

When we understand that Medicaid really is often the only health care that some of our poorest elderly will have, because Medicare spends out very quickly, many of our elderly who need long-term health care will not be able to get that unless indeed they had Medicaid as a part of that.

The Republicans say that their plan does not cut Medicaid, that it only slows the growth by 5 percent. Well, when you examine that growth over a period of time, Medicaid costs have been going up about 10 percent, in part because a large number of people are eligible for Medicaid.

Now, I ask you, if you cut that by 5 percent, which of those eligible people

who now will become eligible do you say, I no longer serve? They say it is not a cut, it is just limiting the growth. Well, if you have 5 percent less than you would have before, but yet you are going to have 10- to 15-percent more people, tell me who then indeed will not be served? Who do you choose? How do we make choices between which American will be served and which American is not served?

If we must make sacrifices, and I contend that we must make sacrifices if indeed we are going to have a balanced budget, why should that sacrifice not be a balanced one? The one certainly the Republicans have put forth, particularly on Medicaid, is not that way.

Understand their program well, now. This will turn back this program to the States as a block grant. Why? They say because the States, they are closest to the people and they know best how to treat the citizens of that State.

I share with you, I am a former county commissioner and I think I treated my constituents, and persons I had responsibility for very well, chaired my board and know the responsibilities that I had as a Chair trying to match the funds of Medicaid. But I can tell you with no reservation whatsoever, I would not have been able to provide the kind of help that we need at the local level unless the Federal Government was there.

Further, I contend there is a responsibility of the American people that the Federal Government has in providing health care to those who are most vulnerable. Furthermore, the States are in no position financially to take this up.

People are worried in my State of North Carolina. I refer, Mr. Speaker, and enter into the RECORD a news article that is from the News Observer this week, which is a local paper in my district:

[From the News Observer]

#### MEDICAID CHANGES FRIGHTEN FAMILIES

(By John Wagner)

Before long, North Carolina lawmakers may have to decide whether the state can continue to care for families like Deborah Altice's the way it does now.

Since Altice's husband was disabled by an auto accident a decade ago, Medicaid—the state-run health program for the poor—has paid for his medicine and numerous back operations. It has covered doctor's bills for the Zebulon couple's 9-year-old son and 7-year-old daughter. And just last month, Medicaid paid for the delivery of Altice's baby boy.

"We'd be in a pretty desperate situation without it," Altice says of Medicaid. "We'd have bills coming in, and there'd be no way we could afford to pay them."

Altice and her family are among tens of thousands of poor, disabled and elderly North Carolinians who have benefited during the last decade from a dramatic expansion of the state's Medicaid program.

The number of residents eligible for assistance has tripled since 1985. And spending on the program has grown even more rapidly—

from about \$700 million a decade ago to a projected \$3.5 billion this year.

That's all about to change.

Under Congress' plan to balance the federal budget, North Carolina stands to lose more than a quarter of the Medicaid dollars it had expected to get from Washington by the year 2002. By one estimate, only six other states would lose a greater percentage of their federal funds.

President Clinton has pledged to fight Congress' cutbacks, but an alternative Medicaid plan being crafted by the White House curbs spending significantly as well.

As a result, North Carolina lawmakers are bracing for what many fear will be ugly fights at the General Assembly in coming years, with advocates for the poor, elderly and disabled all pitted against one another to maintain their share of the state's Medicaid spending.

"We're going to have to make some very difficult decisions," says state Sen. Roy Cooper, a Rocky Mount Democrat. "It will be a huge task, no doubt about it."

Cooper is one of a dozen lawmakers assigned to a study group on Medicaid that is scheduled to meet for the first time Tuesday.

The wide-ranging program they'll begin scrutinizing now serves more than 835,000 people—nearly one in seven North Carolina residents. Recipients range from poor families like Altice's to thousands of nursing-home residents to disabled folks like Dan Stanford, who benefits from a program that just started receiving Medicaid funding this year.

A Cary resident, Stanford, 26, is mentally retarded, autistic, deaf and legally blind. Medicaid pays for an around-the-clock assistant in his apartment to help him and a roommate with basic living skills such as getting dressed, making their beds and taking medication.

The cost to taxpayers for Stanford's help is about \$65,000 a year.

Stanford's parents say they're worried that the state will no longer be able to afford their son's services—services that they say have made his life more meaningful.

"We feel really helpless," says Dan's father, Bill Stanford. "We're not very optimistic about our chances."

Much of the tremendous growth in North Carolina's Medicaid spending has been fueled by actions state lawmakers have taken to extend coverage to new groups of people.

Before 1988, for example, Medicaid covered pregnant women only if they were on welfare or disabled. Today, all pregnant women in families with an income up to almost twice the poverty level are eligible for prenatal care and other assistance.

The federal government sets general guidelines for states' Medicaid programs and provides much of the funding—almost two-thirds of North Carolina's spending. But states have had significant latitude to determine who is covered and what benefits they receive.

Under the bill passed by Congress, federal spending on Medicaid would continue to grow each year—but not nearly enough to accommodate all the new people that state planners anticipate would qualify for benefits under existing criteria.

As a result, North Carolina officials predict that over the next seven years the state will be more than \$4 billion short of what it needs to pay the bills of all its Medicaid recipients. Other policy analysts think the gap could be even greater.

The blow to the state would be relatively soft at first, but grow increasingly painful over the next six years.

Some legislators, such as Cooper, say they are open to spending more state money to make up for the drop-off in federal funds. But given the magnitude of cutbacks being talked about in Washington, few people believe it will be realistic for the state to bridge the entire gap.

At this point, no one can say for sure how much money state lawmakers will have to work with, where they'll try to constrain spending—or who will be hurt most by their actions.

"What's certain is there's going to be less money, and something has to give," says Craig Souza, a lobbyist for the nursing-home industry.

As they look for ways to hold down spending, legislators will have relatively few strategies to pursue, none of them attractive.

Here are some options they are likely to consider:

Backtracking on expansions in eligibility that they approved in recent years.

Those decisions will be especially difficult because, in many cases, the wider coverage has produced measurable gains in health care. North Carolina's infant mortality rate was among the worst in the nation in 1988. But it has dropped considerably since lawmakers made it easier for low-income women to get prenatal care through Medicaid.

Also, North Carolina has only recently extended benefits to some groups that other states covered long ago. In 1994, for example, the legislature voted to offer Medicaid coverage to recipients of Supplemental Security Income, a federal program that provides monthly payments to low-income elderly, blind and disabled people. Most states have been doing that since the mid-1970s.

Lowering the state's payments to medical providers.

In many cases, that strategy poses risks. The state's nursing homes, for example, rely on Medicaid payments for 73 percent their revenue. Souza, the industry lobbyist, says most homes would be forced to cut staff if the state reduces the amount it gives them to care for Medicaid patients. And critics say most nursing homes already are understaffed.

Pushing more of the poor into managed-care programs, which limit their choice of doctors.

The state has had a small managed-care program since 1986. Analysts say expanding it would save some money. But the biggest factor behind the state's skyrocketing Medicaid spending has not been the rising cost of care, but the number of new people eligible for coverage. In fact, since 1988, the money spent, on average, per Medicaid patient has grown more slowly in North Carolina than in all but nine other states.

Meanwhile, the number of low-income people in need of medical help in the state continues to grow faster than in all but a few other states—and that's one reason why North Carolina would get hit so hard under Congress' plan.

For example, North Carolina's elderly population is expected to double by the year 2020. Today, many of the state's senior citizens eventually move to nursing home, and once their savings run out, Medicaid picks up a large part of the cost.

In the years ahead, state loanmakers will have an increasingly difficult task weighing that need against all the services that Medicaid provides to people like Deborah Altice and Dan Stanford.

"There will have to be some cuts," says Gov. Jim Hunt. "The worst thing I could do

is to give the impression that we can somehow make this all up. We can't. But we sure will look at every way we can to try to ease this burden and be fair to our people."

Mrs. CLAYTON. This article says, and I quote from that, Deborah Altice, the wife of a disabled husband who has both a 9-year-old son and 7-year-old daughter, and she says, "I don't know what I would do without Medicaid. I don't know. My husband's been now disabled for almost 10 years." And Medicaid has taken care of her husband's operation, provides for her 9-year-old son and her 7-year-old daughter. She says we would be devastated, indeed, if we did not have Medicaid.

This is about people, not really about numbers. We may sound pious up here, as if we have some theory that is going to save America, but at the sacrifice of people and particularly those who are the most vulnerable in our society.

Again if the Republican plan was passed as they had proposed, in my State alone by the year 2002 they would have lost one-fourth of the Medicaid dollars that they were expected to receive. Again, one might say, well, that is not a reduction. That is simply limiting the growth.

Well, I would have you understand how the growth has occurred in my State. Again referring to the same news article, the growth in my State, it has grown in terms of percentage, it has grown from 1991 to 1995 by some 14 percent in the eligibility.

Now you say you cut this by 5 percent, and this is not a cut. Excuse me? Who is not understanding the realities or the consequences of our action? Whether you meant that or not, what will happen to this family? It would mean, if not this family, perhaps another family would not have that opportunity for health care.

Again under the proposed plan which the President vetoed yesterday, we would have seen that families of nursing home patients would be put under great stress because they now must indeed find how do they make up that average cost of a nursing home, which costs some \$38,000 in America and about \$32,000 in my State. Working families in my State, those who must contend with raising their children, who again the Republicans pay great homage to.

I am a mother of four adult children, also a mother of three grandchildren, and want for them the very prosperity that I have been blessed to have. But I also want for those who are disabled the same thing I want for my children. Why should I want any less for my children than I would want for the Altice family, who happen to have a disabled husband who is not able to work and a 9-year-old son and a 7-year-old daughter?

Again, indeed if we put the stress that is imposed, we now must find that families of senior citizens would be put

at liability in securing the cost of a nursing home. A nursing home recipient who now receives on average about 72 percent of their care from Medicaid would find themselves at a decisive disadvantage.

Medicaid is an important program, a very, very important program. It provides the only health care for poor families. Some 36 million families, including women, children, the elderly and the disabled only know of their health care coming from Medicaid.

On the block grant to States, it says that we will make an entitlement to States but not an entitlement to those 36 million people. What is this Government about? "We the people" means what? To the State, to us, as I was in the local government? It really means that we should be about serving the people well, all of the people, not just some, all of the people.

The block grant will end that entitlement to those who are now eligible under that.

This is the wrong way to go. The Government needs to keep this entitlement. There are some programs the Government should, indeed only the Federal Government is in the position to make that kind of financial commitment. To turn this back to the States under some disguise of flexibility or trusting the State is doing the State a disservice.

I can tell you in North Carolina they will not be able to make up that gap. I have county commissioners now wondering will they have to raise their property taxes in order to make up that deficit that will surely occur if the plan indeed is anywhere like the plan that the President has just vetoed. I say the President should have vetoed it, because he understood the American family would be put at great disadvantage and insecurity financially if indeed that plan had gone forth.

Let me just share in terms of the costs of Medicaid. Where do those dollars go? We think of Medicaid, and I have said and I will say it again, that Medicaid is the only program that many poor and poor families will receive. In North Carolina, while poor families and their children account for almost two-thirds of the people eligible for Medicaid, they receive only about one-third of the State's Medicaid dollars. Care for the elderly and the disabled tends to be more expensive.

So indeed Medicaid is not only for the poor, it is for the elderly as well as for those who are disabled. To cut this program drastically or to put families of nursing home patients in distress or to block-grant this program is the wrong way.

Mr. Speaker, I started my remarks earlier to say that this debate was about people. It was about those we cared about, and it was about shared sacrifice.

I will end my remarks to say again, as we go into the next 5, 6, or 10 days, this debate, particularly around Medicaid, I urge my colleagues to consider the opportunity they have to make this program work.

Let me just further say, we ought to spend our money wisely even under Medicaid. There is a lot of demagogery that goes on on this floor about teenage pregnancy, a lot of demagogery about we cannot sustain a continuation of 10- and 12- and 15-year-old kids having children. I agree with that. We should. Demagogery is so easy, but actually coming to a solution or having a reasonable plan is far more difficult.

One way we could begin to think of this is using the Medicaid dollars to assist teenagers before they get pregnant and prevention of pregnancy, teaching them counseling and a variety of activities and techniques that are proven. If we enact it, we could use just a little of the Medicaid dollars and that could go a substantial way to reducing the Medicaid dollars we are now using.

One could use \$1,000 in prevention and possibly save \$10,000 in the care. Prevention and preventing pregnancy, unwanted pregnancy, particularly in teenagers, would mean not only that young teenager whose life is no longer productive, contributing to society, but also perhaps a troubled birth which would cause the Government to pay.

We pay for that teenager, mind you. Once she becomes pregnant, we will pay as much probably as \$10,000. Indeed, if that young teenager has a troubled pregnancy where the young baby is not safe or underweight, that could be in thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. It makes no sense. It is unwise.

We should use our money wisely and use our money fairly. This debate about Medicaid is about what priorities we will set as a governing body and as a Congress as we meet this debate. I urge my colleagues to go forth in this but go forth with this in a reasonable way.

#### BOSNIA AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, we are facing today debate on two big issues, the two B's, the two great B's, the budget and Bosnia. Since we have had some debate tonight on the budget, let me just spend a few minutes before I move on to the second B, Bosnia.

There has been a lot of misperception about what exactly is in the budget that Congress has passed. But let me give you the facts.

In 1995, we spend for Medicare \$178 billion. This will go up every year for the next 7 years, so that by the year 2002 we will spend \$290 billion for Medi-

care. This is an increase by anyone's calculations.

In the last 7 years, we have spent \$926 billion on Medicare. In the next 7 years, we will spend \$1.6 trillion. This is at twice the rate of inflation.

Just a couple of years ago, President Clinton, in speaking to the country about his health care plan at that time, said anything goes up at twice the rate of inflation is not a cut.

□ 1830

Let us look at some other areas. Medicaid, 1995, we have spent \$90 billion. This will increase every year for the next 7 years so that by the year 2002 we will be spending \$127 billion. In the last 7 years, for Medicaid, we have spent \$444 billion, and we propose increasing that to \$770 billion in the next 7 years. That is an increase of \$330 billion.

#### SHOULD WE SEND TROOPS TO BOSNIA?

But let me get to the second issue, the issue of Bosnia. Let me begin with the basic issue. Should we or should we not put United States troops into Bosnia? Let us look at the various arguments President Clinton has laid before the public and why I believe they are flawed.

I have given the President the benefit of the doubt. I have listened carefully to United States negotiators, Richard Holbrooke and General Clark, and have discussed this issue with several Congressmen who have just returned from Bosnia. I am indebted to Charles Krauthammer's testimony on Bosnia recently before the House Committee on National Security, and to Michael Glenon's article on foreign affairs a few years ago on the role of Congress and war. Despite Mr. Holbrooke's protestations, the deal calls for Bosnia and Herzegovina to be partitioned by a 2-mile wide demilitarized zone, a DMZ that NATO will patrol. There will be a Croat-Moslem coalition and a Serb republic with a weak central government for show.

The NATO troops can kill anyone who stands in the way of separation or is presumed to constitute a threat. Approximately 60,000 troops, one-third English, one-third French, and one-third United States troops, will be on the ground. As many as 37,000 United States troops may ultimately be involved, and American reservists will be part of the operation, including some from my home State of Iowa. Up to one-third of current NATO forces may be committed to this venture.

Let us examine the reasons that President Clinton, in his speech to the American people, gave for putting the lives of American troops into harm's way.

First, in comparing the current situation in Sarajevo to World War I, President Clinton said, "We must never go down the road of isolationism again." Now to argue that if we do not

put troops on the ground into Bosnia will lead to United States isolationism ignores the facts. The United States is robustly internationalist today as compared to the Smooth-Hawley days of protectionism. Look at United States involvement in GATT, United States involvement in NAFTA, the \$20 billion Mexico bailout or the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum. Indeed, many would argue that the United States has been too internationalist in areas such as the 1993 Somalia fiasco or Lebanon in 1982.

Was the United States not involved in Grenada in 1983, in Panama in 1989, and in the Persian Gulf in 1991? How can one talk about isolationism when we have troops in Haiti?

Second, President Clinton invoked the moral imperative; sending United States troops to Bosnia is "the right thing to do." It is true that for 3 years atrocities have been committed by both sides in a terrible civil war. Television has brought these horrors into our living rooms just as it brought the horrors of Vietnam into our homes 25 years ago. Our hearts go out to the victims, and compassion cries out for action. Yet, wise leadership calls for more than compassion in a world torn by strife in a dozen or more places around the Earth.

What is the difference between Bosnia and Rwanda, Bosnia and Liberia or the Sudan, Bosnia and Peru, Bosnia and Sri Lanka?

I was recently in Guatemala, where an insurrection has gone on for years. There are victims in all of these places that tug at our hearts. How do we decide where to put American troops at risk?

I believe that the American people support the use of troops overseas for very specific purposes only, to honor our treaties, to protect the lives of Americans overseas, to defend our country, and to protect our national security and interests.

This brings us to the third part of President Clinton's argument, "Generations of Americans have understood that Europe's freedom and stability is vital to our own national security. That is why we fought two wars in Europe." Basically, President Clinton is resurrecting the domino theory for the Balkans.

I ask, what evidence is there for the spread of this war? This civil war has been going on for 3 years, and there is no evidence for its spread. This is not 1914. The situation is totally different. There is no European interest in the Balkans other than the major powers staying out of a confrontation with each other.

Fourth, the President says, "As NATO's leader and the primary broker of the peace agreement, the United States must be an essential part of the mission." Inherent in the President's argument is the rationalization that

the United States has an obligation to assist its NATO allies whose troops are already on the ground. I think this is dubious reasoning.

In the first place, the United States has no NATO treaty commitments to policing a civil war in the Balkans.

Second, Gen. John Shalikashvili, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs, concedes that from a purely military standpoint the West European nations could undertake the Bosnian mission on their own.

Third, going forward with deployment could actually be worse to NATO than the damage of nondeployment. Krauthammer argues that deployment could result in one or two humiliations; first a humiliating retreat, as in the case of Somalia and Lebanon, in which our allies were left high and dry; or, second, we go in and then persist in a thankless, unwinnable, and costly operation that erodes the solidarity of the alliance.

More than 200 U.N. troops have already been killed in Bosnia. U.S. generals warn that there will be casualties. When U.S. body bags start coming home and television interviews American amputees, where will the support be in the United States for NATO?

The motives of the Bosnian accord are morally worthy. Who could not help but want to bring peace to those suffering war victims? Yet, as a political leader and as the Commander in Chief, the President has a responsibility not just to try to do good but also to have undertaken a mission that has a reasonable chance of success. By all reports, enforcing this agreement is going to be a tactical nightmare.

I recently spoke to a United States Senator who served in Vietnam and is just back from a fact-finding mission in Bosnia. He described the mountainous, forested terrain as some of the most difficult to fight in that he is seen. The difficult terrain will negate a lot of the technological advantage that our forces have. Our equipment will be too heavy for most of the roads and bridges. Winter weather conditions will complicate air superiority, and there are an estimated 6 million unmarked land mines.

This map of Bosnia illustrates several areas that are problematic. The red line represents the demilitarized zone. We have several areas here that are worrisome. We have an area, Gorazde, which is primarily Moslem. This is totally surrounded by Serb territory, and yet we have created a corridor in which there supposedly will be no Serbian arms.

Another problem area will be the narrow corridor up by Brcko.

Another area of great concern is the area surrounding Sarajevo controlled by the Serbs, none of whom are happy with this agreement.

The hair-trigger task of separating the warring parties is supposed to take

place in the first 30 days, before most of the main occupying force has arrived. Will the U.S. troops play local cop? I ask this question because during the occupation of Haiti a year ago American soldiers had to stand back and watch while thugs beat up local citizens. Will our troops in Bosnia be forced to watch atrocities just outside the DMZ line that they are guarding?

If the participants want peace, why do we need to send an armored division? The answer, of course, is that as Assistant Secretary of State Holbrooke has admitted that arms had to be twisted to get the agreement signed by the Bosnians and the Serbs. Recent news reports document that the parties to this agreement are not very happy with the territorial provisions, and as Mr. Krauthammer has said so forcefully, if you are unhappy with the imposed peace, there is nothing like blowing up 241 Marines or killing 18 U.S. Rangers to make your point. Killing Americans is a faster way to victory than killing your traditional enemy.

This brings us to the question: What role should Congress play in the Bosnia problem? Without getting into a long discussion of the constitutional law and the War Powers Act, it is clear that the Founding Fathers were fearful that the executive branch is most interested in war and most prone to it. This is why the Constitution invests the war powers with Congress.

Jefferson, in a letter to Madison, wrote, "We have already given an example of one effectual check to the dog of war by transferring the power of letting him loose from the executive to the legislative body, from those who are to spend to those who are to pay." One obvious advantage Congress brings to the decision whether to participate in these warlike endeavors is that Congress represents the diversity of opinion of the country.

President Lincoln knew the value of diverse opinion and legislative deliberation. He said, "In a certain sense and to a certain extent, the President is the representative of the people. He is elected by them, as well as Congress is. But can he, in the nature of things, know the wants of the people as well as 300 other men coming from all the various localities of the Nation? If so, where is the propriety of having a Congress?"

Mr. Speaker, the wiser course of action is not to put American troops on the ground. What we should do is lift the arms embargo.

The Secretary of State has said recently that we will arm the Bosnians, if necessary, but we hope it is not necessary. Well, Mr. Speaker, it probably will be necessary, and we will then be viewed as taking sides. We already are not viewed as neutral by the Bosnian Serbs, but we also do not have troops at risk right now.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, while our motives are good, I fear that putting

American troops on the ground in the middle of a civil war, where ethnic hatreds run deep, where the technical details of the plan are suspect, where a time-limited cease-fire is likely to resume into full-fledged war once our troops are gone and where there is no clear-cut U.S. interest is just plain wrong. My constituents have told me, "Stop don't do this. Do not send American troops on a mission they can't win, for reasons we don't understand."

□ 1845

Vietnam veteran James Smith recently wrote about his son, who was killed in Somalia:

As my sacrifice was wasted in Vietnam and my son's sacrifice was wasted in Somalia, will there be more wasted sacrifices in Bosnia? This old soldier is not convinced. I cannot support sending troops to Bosnia.

This Congressman has similar concerns. I beg the House leadership to give this Congress the right to vote on a resolution that would stop the deployment of U.S. troops now, and I beg the President to reconsider his decision. It is not too late.

Throughout this debate we will hear many arguments for the need to support our troops. Let me be clear that I share this commitment that every Member of this body has toward the young men and women who will risk their lives to defend our freedoms. This weekend I will be in Bosnia with a congressional delegation, and as a physician who is in the Army reserve medical corps, I will be especially interested in the military medical preparations.

If United States troops do end up in Bosnia, I want to know how to best support them. But let me also be clear, that on the basis of my current knowledge, I believe that we can support our troops best by not sending them to Bosnia. This mission is simply breathing space before the next round in fighting. Congress should do all it can to stop this action. At the end of the day, it is not that Americans cannot tolerate casualties. It is that Americans do not tolerate casualties for nothing.

With that, I would yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his good comments, and I look forward to joining the gentleman and some other of the Members in our trip to Bosnia to look at the situation firsthand this weekend. I think that it is so incredibly important to be able to see what our troops are going to be going through and to be able to visit with our troops in Frankfurt, not only to encourage our troops, but also to be meeting with the heads of State of the warring factions.

Mr. Speaker, I am of firm belief that the President in this case is not using the constitutional authority given to him and is abusing the power that was

given to him by the Constitution. I have asked over and over and over again to have constitutional scholars show me where the President has the authority to commit military troops to the mission that he has in Bosnia. I cannot find anyone who can show me, outside of case law, and very vague case law, not on point to what the President has declared to be our mission in Bosnia, which is, interestingly enough, not to keep the peace, because there has not been peace there since before the Roman Empire, when the Romans were trying to maintain peace in that area. But we will be enforcing the peace by the President's own words.

Now, you cannot enforce the peace without committing war to enforce peace. That is what war is. That is why we are arming our troops to go to Bosnia.

I have been very pleased to listen to Mr. DORNAN from California on many of his special order speeches as he compares the other commitments by the other NATO nations. I look forward to a colloquy with Mr. DORNAN on the other commitments by the other NATO nations, as well as getting into what the President's authority really is, because this President, I maintain, does not have the authority. He is maintaining his leadership by assertion, not by law, and certainly not by constitutional law.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to follow up on the gentlewoman's comments. There is precedent over the past 200 years for the President occasionally doing military exercises, that is, Presidents have sent forces against the Barbary pirates. There have been missions sent out with the various expansions of our country. There are quite a few examples. But it seems to me that there does come a time, and there is a line that needs to be drawn in the definition of what is a police action and what is a very, very significant military action.

When we are putting a division of forces on the ground in the middle of a civil war in the Balkans, when we are talking about 37,000 American troops involved, this is not a small operation. I believe it was clearly the intent of the Founding Fathers that in something of this magnitude, it was inherent in the Constitution, which gives Congress the right to declare war, the dominant position in terms of deciding whether we send American men and women overseas into harm's way.

With that, I will be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN], a Vietnam veteran, somebody who has spoken eloquently on the role of the military, who may desire to also further enlighten us on the relationship between Congress and the Executive, who has been through some of the vigorous dis-

cussions related to the War Powers Act and other things, but who also I think can significantly add to this discussion in terms of some of the technical details and what exactly we are getting into.

Mr. DORNAN. Dr. GANSKE, I appreciate your yielding to me. I enjoyed getting to know you at a dinner in your district and seeing that beautiful great turn-of-the-century house that you live in, and knowing that as a healer of people, you, like all of us here on both sides of the aisle, of every ideological persuasion, are terrified of how quickly this could take a bad turn, not even any worse than the streets of Mogadishu, 19 young men dead, and another 90 carrying wounds, some more severe than others, the rest of their life.

This is a wonderful opportunity, during the first massive change of leadership in the House in 40 years, since I was a 21-year-old pilot in the very first election of my life, this House has been controlled by one ideology and one party, and now we get a shift. We have the Nation's attention, watching the political process, with this majestic C-SPAN broadcast of this, the world's greatest deliberative body, with all due respect to that gorgeous building on the Thames, the mother of parliaments, and we have a chance to educate one another.

Now, if there was someone who fell down in the entrance way, and their lips started to turn blue and they had a heart attack, there is not much I could do except scream for you or Dr. WELDON or Dr. COBURN and say, "Come here, GREG, what do you do? I will hold people back."

But let me tell you what you just said. I was only educated about 48 hours ago. My pal JOHN MCCAIN during the Haiti invasion invoked Thomas Jefferson as you just did, starting with our third President in 1801, his very first few months in office, that we can go in some instances, because, look, Jefferson did it.

MCCAIN did it again, our friend JOHN MCCAIN, served here honorably for years, a fine Senator, a western Senator, just south of Idaho down there in Arizona, he said again on Brinkley this weekend, "Look what Jefferson did with the Barbary pirates."

That is not only bad history; it is so wrong it is frightening. A scholar with a published book on Presidential war power that anybody can get from the Library of Congress, this one is printed by the University of Kansas in Lawrence, Lewis Fisher, brings me over his book, this scholar from our Congressional Research Service, and gives me a paper that was dated last year, a year and a half ago, in response to Haiti, and MCCAIN and others saying well, Jefferson did this, and it turns out that our friend with his big medallion right up here, Thomas Jefferson, right above

the speaker, honored as one of our 23 lawmakers, Jefferson said, "I can't do anything that is offensive or attacking in nature. I can only respond to an attack on the United States and defend it."

That is pretty vital interest, an attack. He said, "I need help on the Barbary pirates."

The House of Representatives not only passed resolutions; they turned it into public law, and one of them was the very day before Jefferson was inaugurated, in those days, right up through Roosevelt's second term, was March 4, on March 3, 1801, when Haiti, by the way, it was then called Santa Dominique, was exploding in bloodshed, a result of the French reign of terror, had now come to Haiti, where the slaves killed every single European heritage person on the whole island of Hispaniola. That includes what is today called Santa Domingo, the Dominican Republic. While that turmoil is going on, Thomas Jefferson gets a law passed the day before he is sworn in that says in effect, go get the Barbary pirates. Nine more public laws, pushing him as it pushed the single term that he beat, John Adams, before.

So we have got to get this scholarship, and that is why I asked HELEN, who sat there with you as a freshman on this historic day. On the 53d anniversary of Pearl Harbor, today is the 54th, NEWT GINGRICH told you, Dr. GANSKE of Iowa and HELEN CHENOWETH of Idaho, to read the Federalist Papers.

It made me want to go back and read it. Steve Horn, who has joined us, near me in the Long Beach area of California, did not have to read it, he teaches it. He taught it as a professor for years. Wait until we look tonight briefly at the Federalist Papers again.

HELEN CHENOWETH, would you please read Alexander Hamilton, another father of our country, and see what he says about the limit on our Chief Executive, because kings in England, and queens, declared war at will, how we wanted to take power away from our Chief Executive.

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Thank you, Mr. DORNAN. I was very pleased to be able to read the Federalist Papers, and I turn to them often, because in Federalist No. 69, Alexander Hamilton did say this: "The President is to be the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. In this respect, his authority would be nominally the same with that of the king of Great Britain, but in substance much inferior to it. It would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces as first the general and admiral of the confederacy, while that of the British king extends to declaring war and to raising and regulating fleets and armies, all which by the Constitution under consideration would appertain to

the legislature," this body, Mr. DORNAN.

Further, Abraham Lincoln, in writing to his law partner in 1837, William Herndon, wrote this. It is very interesting. "The provisions of the Constitution giving the war making power to Congress was dictated as I understand it by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to frame the Constitution so that no one should hold the power of bringing that oppression upon us."

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. GANSKE, I find that that oppression is being brought upon us by a man who would deem to be king.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think this shows the essential wisdom of the Founding Fathers, because they understood that it is a lot easier to get involved in wars than it is to get out of wars. They did not want this power to be concentrated in the hands of one individual. Very specifically during the constitutional debates, they decided to vest that authority in the House of the people, in Congress, and over the years this has slipped, as has been mentioned.

I think, however, there were some very important lessons that all of us learned about 25 years ago, and that was that in order to sustain an overseas military operation or effort, you have to have the American people behind you. They have to be committed. It is like I said before, the American people, if they know that they are fighting for a cause that is justified by U.S. interests or fulfilling treaty commitments, can sustain casualties. We have shown that many times in our Nation's history, with some of the highest casualties ever.

The problem that we have with this current situation is that, quite frankly, the administration has not made the case to the American people that we have an overwhelming national interest in this area or that we have commitments, treaty, contractual commitments, that obligate us to this course of action, or that in the long run, after 6 months, 8 months, a year, when our forces are gone, that it will have made any difference 6 months or a year afterward.

□ 1900

Mr. DORNAN. Somalia.

Mr. GANSKE. Somalia.

Mr. DORNAN. And maybe Haiti next year.

Mr. GANSKE. I think we are seeing a backing away from the current Haiti administration from a commitment that they had made before.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield for a colloquy.

Mr. GANSKE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. I am not a lawyer, but I want to ask Professor HORN something, and before a lawyer would say, ah, *reductio ad absurdum*, sometimes, if you step back and carry something to the absurd, it really clarifies a point.

Suppose, hypothetically, using all the arguments we have heard out of the White House, and some very excellent support that they got over the last couple of days from some of my conservative friends who have thrown up their hands using this phony Vietnam line, you have to support the troops. We all support the troops. I am still wearing my old Ironsides first armored division patch here. Of course, we support the troops. God love them.

But here is my example. Suppose tomorrow President Clinton said, I cannot stand the pictures of any more of these little beautiful black babies dying in Rwanda. We have to go in there with force to protect the distribution of food. And, by the way, Somalia haunts me. I should not have been so weak over 19 deaths. This is a volunteer army, they are paid to take chances. By the way, we hear that. So I am going back into Somalia. And while we are at it, I think I am going to reinforce Haiti. It is starting to get squirrely there. Aristide is starting to disappoint me, Bill Clinton, so I am sending the 10th Mountain Division back into Haiti.

Now, what is the difference, except that he is doing it in five places instead of two? He wants to go back in and reinforce Haiti, send the troops to Bosnia by Christmas, and go to Somalia and Rwanda. And once one person from an Air Force aircraft was on the ground, a loadmaster putting in supplies for the first GI to arrive, we would hear the cry, support the troops.

Is his power, STEVE HORN, utterly unlimited, since there has not been a declared war since 1941 tomorrow, on the 8th? And the one before that was this very day in the Senate on April 7, 1917. Is that it? No more declared wars? Imperial presidency?

Mr. HORN. Well, it is clear the President does not have that power, and only a rogue and a scoundrel would let a President have that power. And that is why Congress has to stand up, debate this one way or the other, and either by a majority vote give the President the authority in a special circumstance or deny the President the authority.

As you suggest, Mr. DORNAN, the bit of support our troops and waving it and saying that supports my policy in X, Y, or Z, is a true refuge for scoundrels and a misuse of the Presidency. And, of course, if it goes too far, and they just run over the Congress, as some Presidents have in the last generation, then I think somebody needs to get out the impeachment resolutions and say, thus, you will not go farther.

It is very clear in the whole history of the United States that unless we are in a defensive mode, where we are attacked and must immediately respond, the President needs to consult the Congress. And as the gentleman suggested, the early precedents are quite clear. President Washington, who had commanded the revolutionary army, and knew, as the first President, that whatever he did was setting precedence for future Presidents, and Jefferson, as the gentleman will recall was his Secretary of State.

Mr. DORNAN. That is right.

Mr. HORN. And Adams, who was deeply involved in carrying on the federalist tradition after Washington, he, of course, was Vice President under Washington.

So when Washington wanted to deal with an Indian tribe situation, which was the case in his time, he went to Congress and Congress gave that authority. That also happened with Adams. And as the gentleman says, when Jefferson got in, he convened his cabinet and listened to the arguments. Some of them wanted to give him more, quote, inherent power. Now, that game has been played by a lot of 20th century Presidents who say I have inherent power to do thus and so because I am either Chief Executive, or, more romantically, I am Commander in Chief. Utter nonsense.

When President Truman tried to do that by seizing the steel mills in Youngstown Sheet and Tube versus Sawyer, even his own friends on the court said, no, you cannot do that, Mr. President. As the gentleman will recall, they had a resolution flowing through here in no time to draft strikers into the military at that time. Cooler heads prevailed in the Senate.

Interestingly enough the leader of that was Senator Taft of Ohio, who was very much disliked by labor at that time because he was the author of the Taft-Hartley Act. He said, wait a minute, you just cannot do that. That is improper conduct. Everybody cooled down, due to the Senate's cooling influences, and we went back to business as usual.

It is simply wrong for Presidents to claim inherent power. That is king John at Runnymede, and that is why the barons reigned him in somewhat. Not necessarily for the people of England, but certainly for the barons of England.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. HORN, for the younger people listening, I digress for something rather wonderful. When I got here, in 1977, the British had lent us one of the three surviving copies of the Magna Carta from June 1215 at Runnymede. That is about the time the Serbs started fighting the Ottoman Serbs. Well, a few years later. And it sat in the center of the rotunda from our bicentennial, when I had just won a primary in California, all the way

through that year, through our Republican caucuses. And then there were only 19 in my class, and 19 in HENRY HYDE's class before, and we were suffering unfairly. The American people were punishing the Hill for Richard Nixon, and not a single Congressman or Senator had a scintilla of guilt on what came to be called Watergate.

But it sat there through my whole first 6 years. And also, in the old House of Representatives, in Statuary Hall, was Thomas Jefferson's first original draft, where he had erased things so hard, like public property to turn into pursuit of happiness, that he wore out the page and glued in a little strip, like I used to do in grade school, and then rewrote on top of it. And when I would walk over to the Senate, I would pass Thomas Jefferson's original draft, in the center of the old House Chamber, and just run my hand across the top of the plastic case, and within seconds I am looking at the Magna Carta.

When they took it home, they left the gold reproduction that is still in the Rotunda. We are still learning things here about the abuse of power and about the quotes that Mrs. CHENOWETH was just reading to me over here, and we will get to them later, when my hour starts, about our forefathers. We throw that off so flippantly in school, the Founders, and then the Framers. And trying to be politically correct, I always try to throw in an Abigail Adams and the terrific wives that did not get the vote until 1920, but they were weighing in with their opinions, and they were all talking about King George III. Excellent Academy Award movie about him losing his marbles right in front of everybody's eyes. But this is not kingly power.

And, remember, that when all these great thinkers in the beginning of that age of enlightenment, at least there was enlightenment over here and a reign of terror in Paris, they said their concept of a Commander in Chief was George Washington; a self-term-limiting man, two terms, a man who knew his limitations, and who was such a towering person of character, not with the intellectual ability to muse about things like Benjamin Franklin or Thomas Jefferson, but a tall character that presided over the Continental Congress in uniform. He was not puffed up about his uniform. He told people this lends me a little aura of dignity to settle some of these disputes here.

That is who they were thinking of when they talked about Commander in Chief, not this person down there in the White House who thinks he is going to coast this entire year making our life miserable vetoing everything except defense bills. We got him locked on that because of Bosnia.

Mr. HORN. He let that become law without his signature.

Mr. DORNAN. That is right. He thinks he has an escape valve there

somehow, so he can whine to other people about things in there that he did not want.

By the way, and then I want to turn to one of my other colleagues, people say how can he be so cavalier about where the money is coming for this? Not just the men on the ground, and I know I am annoying people I am saying it so much, but I want it in people's heads that I am not an isolationist. I am not echoing Pat Buchanan. I do want to help in Europe, and we are in there with air strikes. That is called air power. Sea power in the Adriatic, more than everybody else in the world combined. Airlift, sealift, fuel, food. I have walked in the hospitals in Zagreb. We are ready for massive casualties. Intelligence is dotting the "I" all right. It is 99, 98 percent ours. And we have 500 men and women as a blocking action in Macedonia wearing those Blue Berets. We are involved at great cost.

Put yourself in Clinton's shoes. He did not want \$7 billion in that defense appropriations. He started out saying this will cost a billion. A week ago it was 2. Today it is 4. He still thinks he has \$3 billion to burn. There is \$7 billion in defense appropriations for this 1 year that started October 1 that he does not want there. If he burned up \$7 billion in this operation, he is back to where he wanted the defense appropriations bill anyway.

Mr. GANSKE. Reclaiming my time, if the gentleman would allow me, I think the thing that will be on most of our constituents' minds in just a few weeks, unless Congress asserts the authority that it should, and that takes courage from the Congress to do this, as the gentleman from California was saying, but unless Congress at least has a full debate, up or down, should we be there, should we provide funding or not, then we will be. And I think what will be on our constituents' minds 2 or 3 weeks from now are the men and women in a cold, windy, mountainous, dangerous place at Christmas.

And this is a long commitment that we are talking about. The French have recognized the reality of this situation. They have basically said we recognize this is not a short-term proposition. The disputed areas held by the Serbs all around Sarajevo is a situation where the Serbs do not want to leave. We, the French, understand that this could be a 10, 15, 20-year commitment.

Remember the history in this area. A dictator with an iron hand ruled this country for 50 years. Peace was maintained. One might think that in a 50-year period of enforced peace that the various ethnic factions could begin to put aside their traditional centuries-old hatreds. And yet, as soon as that discipline was gone, we were back to a civil war.

Mr. DORNAN. If the gentleman would yield for a second, can I show

him something about these hatreds that is very upsetting? And I called to California to ask 1 of my 10 grandchildren to watch, because you do not have to meet one of my grandchildren, named Kevin Griffin, to know what he looks like. Here is his picture in both Time and in Newsweek, and taken by different photographers, I might add.

Because these cameras will not zoom in this year, we will change that next year, I am going to pass these to Mrs. CHENOWETH. This is my grandson in San Juan Capistrano, Kevin Griffin, and he is a refugee, a Moslem refugee from Srebrenica that fled to Tuzla, where we will be. They look at our American GI's that arrived there the other day to a welcome, the 1st Armored Division, and they want to just touch the Americans.

Now, look at that blond haired, blue-eyed boy. And I am not giving any preferences, because I have Robert K. Dornan III, here in Virginia, who is one-quarter Croatian with huge brown eyes. He is going to get a great tan and has dark hair. I have grandkids of all sizes and shapes, and 5 females and 5 males and a fifth female on the way, number 10, I think. I am asking my son not to tell me. But, of course, the hatreds are there and they are so intermarried for 600 years that if I look at somebody and I say, well, this guy has red hair, what, is he Irish? And they say, oh, he is a Moslem. No, sorry, he is Croatian. No, that is right, he is Serbian. And they are all killing one another based on traditions that are pathetic.

I just got informed by our chief of everything here, Ron Lasch, that I had the misimpression that I have an hour coming up.

□ 1915

The gentleman took our second hour, and he has got about 15 minutes left, and then I can take a 5. The gentleman from California already had his 5, but HELEN can take a 5, and that is about it.

I do have something newsworthy and earthshaking. This morning I got a call from a friend in New York. They said the National Review magazine, dated Christmas Day, that goes in the mail because it is fortnightly, tomorrow has an article from an eyewitness at Dayton that will absolutely boggle your mind. It is called "Yalta in the Balkans."

He says there was a secret deal. This is starting to leak out now. I do not believe Mr. Warren Christopher, Secretary of State, knew. I think he was kept out of the loop by his number 2, Strobe Talbott, whose foreign policy has always been Soviets first, and now Russia first. He is fluent in Russian. Translated Khrushchev's memoirs when he was at Oxford with Clinton. He did the translating for this secret deal.

The deal is: Poland go to hell; and Hungary, and the Czech Republic, and Slovakia, you will not be in an expanded NATO.

Let me read some of this, because I think this is really hot, newsworthy stuff. I have taken it over to the Senators. My pal, BOB DOLE, is in turmoil over there, because he is trying to drive the policy to make sure we arm the victims who have had all of those atrocities committed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put it in the RECORD. I will end the opening paragraphs, one gusty one at the close, then we will talk about it. Peter W. Rodman, a former national security adviser to both presidents Bush and to President Reagan.

One of the better arguments for the Dayton Accords and the dispatching of U.S. troops to Bosnia was that putting the Bosnian conflict on ice would serve larger American strategic interests. One such interest was the future of the Western alliance. We are being browbeaten with this.

The prolongation of the Bosnia war and the squabbles among allies were poisonous to the Alliance itself, and the resulting incoherence of policy was poisonous to NATO's credibility. A second key strategic was the enlargement of NATO into Central Europe and the prolongation of this Bosnian war was complicating this."

During the climactic NATO bombing operations in September, starting in August, Boris Yeltsin gave a tempestuous news conference in which he conflated the two issues, blustering that an enlarged NATO would soon be dropping bombs on Russia's doorstep. The Dayton accords offer us a chance, in other words, to put all of this behind us and to refocus our European policy on larger concerns.

The next three paragraphs are priceless, but in the interest of time, I will put them in the RECORD. It says this:

As usual, the administration has its strategic priorities totally bass-backwards. This guy is writing tough street words. It is wrong to pay a price to Russia over Bosnia in the strategic coin of our larger interest in consolidating security in Central Europe. It is wrong to sacrifice NATO enlargement to the Russians over Bosnia or anything else.

The administration's repeated assurances to Congress, and to the allies, that Russia would not have a veto over NATO enlargement turned out to be empty. Perhaps is just another of the "terminological inexactitudes," that is the Clinton administration dialogue, that have become so familiar. A huge price will ultimately be paid for this.

There is no current threat to Central Europe. The newly liberated states of the region, however, have just recently awakened from a 60-year nightmare. Still find themselves situated between Germany and Russia, and know in their bones that their survival is not guaranteed by history. They consider themselves part of the West culturally, politically, and morally and, therefore, seek Western assurances that we feel a stake in their security and independence.

Seen in this light, NATO enlargement is not a new act, but a consolidation of the post-1989 status quo. They are free. This is Poland, Hungary, et al., sovereign countries exercising their free sovereign choice to associate with us. Either Russia accepts this, or does not.

Three more great paragraphs in the RECORD. Call your Congressman and ask for it.

Mr. Speaker, here is the punch line. By fear of antagonizing Russia, bad faith, whatever the short-term plot is for putting Bosnia on ice, in Central Europe we are seeing a strategic blunder of historic proportions.

Mr. Speaker, this is the hidden deal at Dayton, OH.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for inclusion in the RECORD.

[From the National Review, Dec. 25, 1995]

YALTA IN THE BALKANS

(By Peter W. Rodman)

WASHINGTON, DC.—One of the better arguments for the Dayton Accords and the dispatching of U.S. troops to Bosnia was that putting the Bosnia conflict on ice would serve larger American strategic interests. One such interest was the future of the Western alliance: the prolongation of the Bosnia war and the squabbles among the Allies were poisonous to the Alliance itself, and the resulting incoherence of Western policy was poisonous to NATO's credibility. A second key strategic interest was the enlargement of NATO into Central Europe, and prolongation of the Bosnia war was also complicating this (During the climactic NATO bombing operations in September, Boris Yeltsin gave a tempestuous news conference in which he conflated the two issues, blustering that an enlarged NATO would soon be dropping bombs on Russia's doorstep.) The Dayton Accords offer us a chance, in other words, to put all this behind us and to refocus our European policy on our larger concerns.

These arguments for Dayton still hold, but National Review has learned of a stunningly duplicitous turn in the Clinton Administration's policy toward Russia, Bosnia, and the Atlantic Alliance: The President and his associates are reported to have given Moscow secret assurances that, in return for its cooperation with the U.S. in Bosnia peacekeeping, NATO enlargement will be put "on the back burner" for the foreseeable future. The rationale was that, given this demonstration of Russia's readiness to be a partner in a new cooperative "European security architecture," the extension of NATO security guarantees to Central Europe would not be a priority any time soon. This account comes from official and authoritative sources, both Russian and American.

It has long been understood (indeed, admitted by some Administration officials) that concrete decisions on admitting new NATO members would be put off until after the Russian elections, especially the presidential election scheduled for June 1996—which meant, as a practical matter, until after the U.S. presidential election as well. Russian officials interpret the new assurances to mean that if Mr. Clinton is re-elected, nothing will happen on NATO enlargement in his second term either.

The story is accompanied by reports of other assurances to the Russians that their cooperation on Bosnia would put the United States in their debt and earn them greater American understanding on other issues, such as their reassertion of control in their "near abroad" (Central Asia and the Caucasus, including the oil-rich Caspian basin).

As usual, this Administration has its strategic priorities totally bass-ackwards. It is wrong to pay a price to Russia over Bosnia in the strategic coin of our larger interest in

consolidating security in Central Europe. It is wrong to sacrifice NATO enlargement to the Russians over Bosnia or over anything else. The Administration's repeated assurances to Congress and to the Allies that Russia would not have a veto over NATO enlargement turn out to be empty—perhaps just another of the "terminological inexactitudes" that have become so familiar. A huge price will ultimately be paid for this.

There is no current threat to Central Europe. The newly liberated states of the region, however, have just recently awakened from a 60-year nightmare, still find themselves situated between Germany and Russia, and know in their bones that their survival is not guaranteed by history. They consider themselves part of the West culturally, politically, and morally; they therefore seek Western assurances that we feel a stake in their security and independence. Seen in this light, NATO enlargement is not a new act, but a consolidation of the post-1989 status quo: they are free, sovereign countries exercising their free, sovereign choice to associate with us. Either Russia accepts this, or it does not.

Leaving the security status of Central Europe ambiguous only leaves open temptations to Russian irredentists. NATO membership for Central Europe is among other things a way of telling the Russians that their acceptance of the post-1989 status quo in Central Europe is the sine qua non of any relationship with us. If the Russians have a problem with this—which they clearly seem to have—then we are all facing a major problem five or ten years down the road as Russia regains its strength.

The Administration's rationale for delaying NATO enlargement has been twofold. One is the claim that it will be easier to achieve such enlargement if we go about it gradually. But the nationalist turn in Russian politics, expected to be given new impetus by the December elections for the Duma, tells us that it will not get any easier. Russia is only getting stronger and more assertive; every month, the risks and inhibitions on our side will only grow. The Administration's second rationale (at least, so I suspect) is what philosophy majors will remember as Zeno's Paradox: the idea that if you divide a distance into an infinite number of tiny increments, you never get to the destination. This may be the Administration's real calculation. In other words, it just doesn't want to enlarge NATO—for fear of antagonizing Moscow. The first rationale is bad judgment; the second is bad faith.

Whatever the short-term plaudits due to the Administration for putting the Bosnia conflict on ice, in Central Europe we are seeing a strategic blunder of historic proportions.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for a moment, I think the gentleman has pointed out, as I did in my initial statement, that possibly the worst thing that could happen from our getting more involved is that we now have increased the proximity to some significant interactions with the Russians.

The United States troops will be positions in this area right here, very close to the Russian troops that will be in this area. Mrs. CHENOWETH and I will be looking at this area this weekend. But, remember, General Clark informed us in a briefing that approximately one-third of NATO forces will be tied up in this endeavor.

Now, there is a great deal of unrest in Russia. What happens if later this year there is a significant turnover in power and then we have a problem not in the Balkans, but in the Baltics, and we have this type of commitment? I mean, it is a matter of weighing some real significant options.

Mr. Speaker, with that, I would yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting as we stop and think about the tests that we have been talking about, that the President, as Commander in Chief, simply has not passed. And one of those major tests is what I call the mother's test.

I guess my major claim to fame is the fact that I am a mother. I am a mother of a military man who would respond to the command of his Commander in Chief, because that is the way he has been raised. But my heart breaks to think of mothers across this Nation having to let their sons and daughters go because of a President who does not understand what his role is and the role of the military, his responsibility as Commander in Chief; because, since the beginning of civilization, mothers have been willing to send their sons off to war to protect the interests of the country or the tribe or the community, to preserve the peace and tranquility of their existence, to make sure that freedom and liberty will reign for their future generation. That silent mother's test.

But he has failed the mother's test. He has even failed the test of his own Secretary of State, who back in 1992 stated that we will commit troops only upon the following four criteria: No. 1, is he said if the mission is clearly defined; No. 2, would be if the people in this country are behind the mission; No. 3, is if there was a very clear and reasonable chance for success; and No. 4 is if there is a good, strong exit strategy. All four of those the President fails on.

And probably, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, the biggest failure is what will this do to the spirit of the military? The spirit of the military has been captured by a speech given by General MacArthur. I would like to quote just a paragraph from a great general who really understood warfare, understood how necessary it was for the general to take responsibility for his troops in the field.

On May 12, 1962, in his speech, "Duty, Honor, and Country," General MacArthur said, "And through all of this," he said this to the graduates at West Point, he said:

And through all of this welter of change and development that you will face, your mission remains fixed, determined, and it is to win our wars. Everything else in your professional career is but a corollary to this vital dedication. All other public purposes, all other public projects, all other public needs, great or small, will find others for

their accomplishment, but profession of arms, the will to win, the sure knowledge that in war there is no substitute for victory, and that if you lose, the Nation will be destroyed.

What are we setting our troops up for? Are we dissipating our troops? Are we putting ourselves on a slippery slope, like we did in Vietnam, where we never have recovered economically, like the post-Vietnam wars? And the spirit of America took a hit that we were not even able to begin to recover until we had a President like Ronald Reagan who could really again show us how we could go in and win with the likes of Colin Powell and Dick Cheney.

Mr. GANSKE. I thank the gentlewoman, and I am sure your phone calls have been the same as mine: overwhelmingly against this. The public does not understand the reason that we should be there, and my phone calls are 8 or 9 to 1 against this. Time and time again, people are phoning saying, do not do this. We do not understand. We think you will not accomplish anything of significance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, we have exactly the same experience, and I know a lot of our Democratic friends had that experience. The other day one representative, when asked how many letters do you get on this subject and what are they saying, she said all of them are against, 100 percent; not even one or two out of 100 supporting it. And I think the wisdom of the people in this case is right on the mark. People are not stupid. They know where our national interests ought to lie.

No one has convinced us that American lives are at stake, even though Bosnia is one of the most tragic situations in the world. So was Cambodia, so were a number of places, so are those places right now in Asia and the Mideast and Africa. But we cannot be, as I said earlier today, super cop to the world, and that is sort of what we are getting ourselves into.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield for a minute, there is an option. The option is something that Senator DOLE, for instance, recommended a couple of years ago, and that was make for a level playing field. Lift the arms embargo. Allow the various factions to have a level playing field and to settle their own civil war with the same type of support that we have done in the past, logistical and air, and yet not interpose ourselves into the middle of essentially a civil war.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, one of our most successful operations, as the gentleman knows, happened under the Carter administration. It is ironic that many of the advisers of President Carter also are advising this administration. But what they did that was

successful, they began the effort to provide arms to the Afghan Mujaheddin, and through Pakistan they did just that as really a covert operation without using American troops, and they were able to have sufficient arms go in that the world's second strongest superpower was driven out of Afghanistan where it never should have been in the first place.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, let me summarize, and I thank my colleagues for joining me in this colloquy. I believe that this mission is primarily going to involve a breathing space for the warring parties. They need to rearm. They will do that on a brief enforced peace.

I think at the end of the day it is not that America cannot tolerate casualties; it is that Americans just do not tolerate casualties unless they can see a real purpose.

#### UPDATE ON BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I have got to collapse a 60-minute special order into 5 minutes, but that is all right. I am signed up for some next week.

Let me give you an update on what is happening with our leadership getting a vote before the 1st Armored Division officers and men arrive in the dead of winter in a very, the most dangerous area of Bosnia where most of the fighting has been going on, unit-to-unit, man-to-man combat. And a few women.

We see the terrible destruction of Sarajevo because of some cleverly hidden cameras and some of the people with the guts to come in from the Sarajevo airport to film that rocket fire at night, with huge shells slamming into modern Holiday Inn buildings. I mean actual Holiday Inn franchise buildings set up for the Olympics.

We saw the horrible killing and the marketplace explosions in Sarajevo, but the last nightmarish killing of innocent men, women, and children during what they thought was a breather, and God knows who fired the mortars, but the suspicion is that it came from the Bosnian Serb side. That was in Tuzla.

□ 1930

We are going into Tuzla. That is where most of the mines are around in the hills along with the hills surrounding Sarajevo. And I want to do everything I can to get another vote here.

Here is what I have been promised. I want to thank our conference chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. COX], the policy leader on this side. I have been told I will get

at 9:30 Wednesday morning, there is not going to be any votes until late Tuesday night, I want a full-court 235 healthy men and women in my conference, if that is possible on Wednesday morning, the so-called peace accords are going to be signed on December 14, the next day, I want on Wednesday, today is Pearl Harbor day, the 13th, Wednesday the 13th, 9:30, I am going to ask for a vote not to table my words and we can perfect my words, if this does not satisfy, not to put this off to the policy committee.

My words, which I have not read since two nights ago are, Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal fund shall be appropriated or otherwise available for the deployment on the ground of United States Armed Forces in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina as part of any peacekeeping operation or as part of any implementation force.

Now, the 30 or so, more conservative Senators in the other great body said that if they even tried to bring this up, it would never be allowed on the floor. Their words are simpler, and this a rough draft, that the Congress, House and Senate, opposes the deployment of United States ground forces into the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina to implement the general framework agreement for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its associated annexes.

I and other Members have pleaded with them not to have a section 2. Section 2 is insulting. They even indicate we might not support our forces, including all the aforementioned support forces, by the thousands and millions of dollars that are already functioning there to try and keep these people educated, intelligent, cultured people, from slaughtering and raping one another. But several of the Senators want this, that the Congress strongly supports the United States Armed Forces who may be ordered by the President to implement the general framework agreement for peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina and its associated annexes.

Madam Speaker, I think I told you this yesterday, Colonel General Leonty, L-E-O-N-T-Y, Shevtsov, S-H-E-V-T-S-O-V, is the chief of staff of the Russian forces in Chechnya. He was there from December 1994, when the killing was at its height, ruining our Christmas last year with savage pictures of man's inhumanity to man, and he commanded through April of last year.

By the way, there have been 1,500 instances of the Moslem Chechnyan guerrillas attacking young Russian boys who should not have to die this month of Christmas 1995. This Russian commander who was there when atrocities were committed has been put in as the commander of the Russian forces.

As we approach this Christmas, Madam Speaker, there is not a single

Russian soldier, it has been a long, hard 6 years Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Hungary, the now-separated Czechoslovakia and Slovak Republics, Czech Republic, there are no Russian troops there, but they are on their way into the Balkans. They will be subject to Serbia because they made the Serbian case.

I close on this, Clinton leading Maj. Gen. William Nash, who fought so hard in Vietnam, and Gen. George Joulwan, who fought in Vietnam, leading them down the driveway, not to follow him to Bosnia like Alexander the Great or Caesar but to do his dirty work. Madam Speaker, God forbid it. Let us stop it.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following information:

RESUME OF SERVICE CAREER OF WILLIAM LAFAYETTE NASH, MAJOR GENERAL, COMMANDING OFFICER, 1ST ARMORED DIVISION

Date and Place of Birth: 10 August 1943, Tucson, Arizona.

Years of Active Commissioned Service: Over 26.

Present Assignment: Commanding General, 1st Armored Division, United States Army, Europe Seventh Army, APO AE 09252, since June 1995.

Military Schools Attended: The Armor School, Officer Basic Course; The Infantry School, Officer Advanced Course; United States Army Command and General Staff College; United States Army War College.

Educational Degrees: United States Military Academy—BS Degree—No major; Shippensburg University—MS Degree—Public Administration.

Foreign Language(s): Russian.

Major Duty Assignments:

Aug. 1968–Oct. 1968: Student, Ranger Course, United States Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia.

Oct. 1968–Nov. 1968: Student, Armor Officer Basic Course, United States Armor School, Fort Knox, Kentucky.

Dec. 1968–Apr. 1969: Platoon Leader, Troop L, 3d Squadron, 3d Armored Cavalry Regiment, Fort Lewis, Washington.

Apr. 1969–Feb. 1970: Platoon Leader, Troop A, 1st Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, United States Army, Vietnam.

Feb. 1970–Jun. 1970: Executive Officer, Troop B, 1st Squadron, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, United States Army, Vietnam.

Jun. 1970–Jul. 1971: Assistant G-3 (Operations) Training Officer, later Assistant G-3 (Operations) Chief of Force Development, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Jul. 1971–Nov. 1971: S-3 (Operations), 1st Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, later Procurement Officer, Board for Dynamic Training, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Nov. 1971–Feb. 1973: Commander, Troop A, 1st Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, 82nd Airborne Division, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Mar. 1973–Jul. 1973: Student, Officer Rotary Wing Aviator Course, United States Army Helicopter Center/School, Fort Wolters, Texas.

Jul. 1973–Dec. 1973: Student, Officer Rotary Wing Aviator Course, United States Army Aviation School, Fort Rucker, Alabama.

Jan. 1974–Sep. 1974: Student, Infantry Officer Advanced Course, United States Army Infantry School, Fort Benning, Georgia.

Sep. 1974–Jun. 1977: Platoon Leader and Assistant Operations Officer, later Platoon Commander, and later Regimental Plans Officer, Air Cavalry Troop, 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, United States Army Europe, Germany.

Aug. 1977–Jun. 1978: Student, United States Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Jun. 1978–Apr. 1979: Staff Officer, Regional Operations Division, Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, United States Army, Washington, DC.

Apr. 1979–Jun. 1982: Aide and Assistant Executive Officer, later Executive Officer to the Vice Chief of Staff, Army, Office of the Chief of Staff, Army, Washington, DC.

Jun. 1982–Jun. 1983: Deputy Executive Assistant to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, DC.

Jun. 1983–Jun. 1985: Commander, 3d Squadron, 8th Cavalry Regiment, 8th Infantry Division, United States Army Europe, Germany.

Aug. 1985–Jun. 1988: Student, United States Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania.

Jun. 1986–May 1988: Assistant Chief of Staff, G-3 (Operations), 1st Cavalry Division, Fort Hood, Texas.

May 1988–May 1989: Executive Officer to the Commander-in-Chief, United States Army Europe, Germany.

Jun. 1989–Dec. 1990: Commander, 1st Brigade, 3d Armored Division, United States Army Europe and Seventh Army, Germany.

Dec. 1990–Apr. 1991: Commander, 1st Brigade, 3d Armored Division, DESERT STORM, Saudi Arabia.

Apr. 1991–Jul. 1991: Commander, 1st Brigade, 3d Armored Division, United States Army Europe and Seventh Army, Germany.

Jul. 1991–Jun. 1992: Assistant Division Commander, 3d Infantry Division (Mechanized), United States Army Europe and Seventh Army, Germany.

Jun. 1992–Jul. 1993: Deputy Commanding General for Training, United States Army Combined Arms Command, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Jul. 1993–Jun. 1995: Program Manager, United States Army Office of the Program Manager, Saudi Arabian National Guard Modernization Program.

Promotions and Date of Appointment:  
2LT—Temporary: 5 Jun 68; Permanent: 5 Jun 68.

1LT—Temporary: 5 Jun 69; Permanent: 5 Jun 71.

CPT—Temporary: 5 Jun 70; Permanent: 5 Jun 75.

MAJ—Permanent: 10 Jun 77.

LTC—Permanent: 1 Nov 82.

COL—Permanent: 1 May 89.

BG—Permanent: 1 Mar 92.

MG—Frocked.

U.S. Decorations and Badges: Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star Medal with "V" Device (with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters), Purple Heart, Meritorious Service Medal (with Oak Leaf Cluster).

#### 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. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GIBBONS, today, for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. POSHARD, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. MFUME, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. VENTO, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Ms. JACKSON-LEE, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. BRYANT of Texas, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. PALLONE, today, for 5 minutes.  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)  
 Mr. SOUDER, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. LEVIN, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. HAYWORTH, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mrs. CHENOWETH, today, for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOKE, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. GOSS, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. HORN, today, for 5 minutes.  
 Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes each day, on December 12 and December 13.  
 (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)  
 Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.  
 (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)  
 Mr. DORNAN, 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. ABERCROMBIE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BARCIA.  
 Mr. TOWNS.  
 Mrs. LOWEY.  
 Mrs. MEEK of Florida.  
 Mr. FROST.  
 Ms. KAPTUR.  
 Mr. REED.  
 Mr. SERRANO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HORN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.  
 Mr. KOLBE.  
 Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.  
 Mr. NEY.  
 Mrs. FOWLER in three instances.  
 Mr. SOLOMON.  
 Mr. BURTON of Indiana.  
 Mr. WALSH.  
 Mr. BALLENGER.  
 Mr. SANFORD.  
 Mr. WOLF.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DORNAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KING.  
 Mr. THOMPSON.  
 Mr. CALVERT.  
 Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.  
 Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. MARKEY.  
 Mr. SHUSTER.  
 Mr. ROTH.  
 Mr. CARDIN.  
 Mr. HERGER.  
 Mr. WARD.  
 Ms. DELAURO.  
 Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. ROEMER.  
 Mr. MARTINI.  
 Mrs. KENNELLY.  
 Mr. WILSON.  
 Mr. GILMAN.  
 Mr. TORRES.  
 Mr. CLAY.  
 Mr. FILNER.  
 Mr. HYDE.  
 Mr. FAZIO.  
 Mr. FARR.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2204. An act to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 1058. An act to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, December 11, 1995, at 12 noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1782. A letter from the Deputy and Acting CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a list of property that is covered by the Corporation as of September 30, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101-591, section 10(a)(1) (104 Stat. 2939); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1783. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's first annual report to Congress summarizing evaluation activities related to the Comprehensive Community Mental Health Services for Children with Serious Emotional Disturbances Program, pursuant to section 565(c)(2) of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

1784. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 2000 resulting from passage of S. 395, S. 440, and S. 1328, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1785. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the semi-

annual report of the office of inspector general and management's report on audit recommendations for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1786. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National Service, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1787. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1788. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1789. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual management report for the year ended September 30, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 306(a) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1790. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) Sec. 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1791. A letter from the Chairperson, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1792. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the semiannual report on final action for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1793. A letter from the Deputy Independent Counsel, Office of Independent Counsel, transmitting the Counsel's annual report on audit and investigative activities, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. 3 section 8E(h)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1794. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period of April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and management response for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1795. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1796. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the semi-annual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1797. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the semi-annual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, and the management report for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 6(b); to the Committee on Government and Oversight.

1798. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

1799. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish an equipment capitalization fund within the Bureau of Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Resources.

1800. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the FAA report of progress on developing and certifying the Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance System [TCAS] for the period July through September 1995, pursuant to Public Law 100-223, section 203(b) (101 Stat. 1518); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1801. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to authorize the Administrator of General Services to transfer title to surplus Federal personal property to State agencies when the transfer document for donation is executed; jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and National Security.

1802. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the report on accounts containing unvouchered expenditures potentially subject to audit by GAO, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3524(b); jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, Appropriations, and the Budget.

#### 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. GOSS: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 293. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2621) to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations (Rept. 104-388). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GEKAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 394. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit State taxation of certain pension income; with an amendment (Rept. 104-389). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALKER: Committee on Science. H.R. 2196. A bill to amend the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 with respect to inventions made under cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes; with an amendment

(Rept. 104-390). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### 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. LUCAS:

H.R. 2736. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of certain Federal land holdings in the State of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 2737. A bill to amend section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, to extend its protections to U.S. Customs Service employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself and Mr. HANSEN):

H.R. 2738. A bill to make amendments to the Central Valley Project Improvement Act and to the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 2739. A bill to provide for a representational allowance for Members of the House of Representatives, to make technical and conforming changes to sundry provisions of law in consequence of administrative reforms in the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. HOKE (for himself, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. CREMEANS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. JONES, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. KING, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. NEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 2740. A bill to protect sports fans and communities throughout the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. BALLENGER (for himself, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. PAYNE of Virginia):

H.R. 2741. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 in order to promote and improve employee stock ownership plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 2742. A bill to set aside a portion of the funds available under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to be used to encourage the redevelopment of marginal brownfield sites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 2743. A bill to establish a source of funding for certain border infrastructure projects necessary to accommodate increased traffic resulting from implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 2744. A bill to require the Postmaster General to submit to the Congress a plan for the reduction of the accumulated debt of the Postal Service within 7 years; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Ms. FURSE (for herself, Mrs.

MORELLA, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. YATES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. STARK, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PORTER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROSE, Mr. BELLENSON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. SCHROEDER, and Mr. BONIOR):

H.R. 2745. A bill to repeal the emergency salvage timber sale program enacted as part of Public Law 104-19; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. KENNEDY of Rhode Island (for himself and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 2746. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the restriction on assistance to the Government of Indonesia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself, Mr.

OBERSTAR, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WISE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BAKER of California, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HORN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TUCKER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. MASCARA, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MARTINI, and Mr. MCHALE):

H.R. 2747. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to States for the purpose of financing the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of water supply systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER (for herself, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr.

FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. RIVERS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STOKES, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina):

H.R. 2748. A bill to prohibit insurance providers from denying or canceling health insurance coverage, or varying the premiums, terms, or conditions for health insurance coverage on the basis of genetic information or a request for genetic services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. STOCKMAN (for himself, Mr. DELAY, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BONO, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BARR, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. PARKER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. JONES, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 2749. A bill to determine if Alfred Kinsey's "Sexual Behavior in the Human Male" and/or "Sexual Behavior in the Human Female" are the result of any fraud or criminal wrongdoing; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. STUPAK:  
H.R. 2750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to delay the application of the substantiation requirements to reimbursement arrangements of certain loggers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. HOYER):

H.R. 2751. A bill to provide temporary authority for the payment of retirement and separation incentives, to provide reemployment assistance to Federal employees who are separated as a result of work force reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EWING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY):

H. Res. 294. Resolution to congratulate the Northwestern University Wildcats on winning the 1995 Big Ten Conference football championship and on receiving an invitation to compete in the 1996 Rose Bowl, and to commend Northwestern University for its pursuit of athletic and academic excellence; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTON of Texas:

H.R. 2752. A bill to approve Sensor Pad, a medical device; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 2753. A bill to allow the marketing of the Sensor Pad, a medical device to aid in breast self-examination; to the Committee on Commerce.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 42: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 218: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BARR, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. FRISA, Mr. JONES and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 266: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 282: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 351: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 497: Mr. EMERSON Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 519: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 911: Mr. WICKER, Mr. WARD, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 1047: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1078: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 1210: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1262: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1448: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee.

H.R. 1462: Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FOX, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. FARR, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. KLINK, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1500: Mr. FAZIO of New York, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 1619: Mr. CRAPO.

H.R. 1757: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 1946: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 1950: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1972: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 2180: Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2270: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. FUNDERBURK, and Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2310: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 2320: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOKE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2463: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2472: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. KAPTUR, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. FURSE, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 2507: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 2566: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 2579: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. TUCKER, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 2604: Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 2634: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2654: Mr. OWENS and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2664: Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 2704: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. EWING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. YATES, Mr. WELLER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. CRANE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 2722: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2723: Mr. CREMEANS and Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 2729: Mr. WARD, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.J. Res. 117: Mr. STUDDS.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. UPTON.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. KLINK.

H. Con. Res. 91: Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Con. Res. 118: Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HORN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. CASTLE.

### AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 17, strike lines 17 through line 5 on page 18.

Page 18, line 6, strike "(2)" and insert "(1)", and beginning in line 6 strike "Construction" and insert "The Secretary's activities in connection with the designation of a route, the acquisition of rights-of-way, and the construction".

Page 18, line 18, strike "(3)" and insert "(2)", and beginning in line 21 strike "the need for" and all that follows through "transportation" in line 25 and insert "the timing of the initial availability of the transportation facilities or alternative means of transportation".

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 23, strike lines 6 through 17 and insert:

"(c) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall provide technical assistance and funds to States, affected units of local government, and Indian tribes through whose jurisdiction the Secretary plans to transport spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste for transportation planning and for training and equipping public safety officials and emergency service providers of appropriate units of local government. Training and equipment shall cover procedures and requirements for safe routine transportation of these materials, as well as dealing with emergency response situations. The Secretary's duty to provide technical and financial assistance under this subsection shall commence within 90 days of the date of the enactment of this Act."

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 24, insert after the period in line 9 the following: "Such a facility may not be located in any State which does not have a licensed commercial nuclear reactor."

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 24, line 19, insert "(1)" after "provide".

Page 24, insert before the period in line 24 the following: "(2) for on-site capability to open a storage canister, and if necessary (3) for the repackaging of the spent nuclear fuel contained in such facility".

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 25, beginning in line 23, strike out "100 years" through "Secretary" in line 25 and insert "50 years".

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 26, strike lines 2 through 16, in line 17 strike "2" and insert "1" and in line 3, on page 27, strike "3" and insert "2".

Page 27, strike the comma in line 22 and insert "and", and in line 23, strike ", and the construction and operation of any facility".

Page 28, insert after line 8 the following:

"(A) INTERIM STORAGE FACILITY.—Construction and operation of an interim storage facility shall constitute a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment for purposes of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The Secretary shall prepare an environmental impact statement on the construction and operation of such facility prior to commencement of construction. In preparing such statement, the Secretary shall adopt, to the extent practicable, relevant environmental reports that have been developed by other Federal and State agencies.

Page 28, line 9, strike "(A)" and insert "(B)", line 19, strike "and", line 23, strike "in a generic manner." and insert "; and", insert after line 23, the following:

"(ii) shall adopt the Environmental Impact Statement prepared by the Department of Energy to the extent practicable."

Page 28, line 24, strike "(B)" and insert "(C)".

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 31, insert before the period in line 2 the following: "If such storage does not exceed the phase limits in subsections (c)(2) and (c)(3)".

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 32, insert after the period in line 14 the following:

No amount may be expended from the Nuclear Waste Fund during fiscal years 1996 through 2000, or otherwise appropriated for such fiscal years, for site characterization of the Yucca Mountain site in the State of Nevada.

Page 33, insert after line 9 the following:

"(5) STUDY.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The National Academy of Sciences shall conduct a study to examine and recommend a scientific means for determining a suitable location for a repository for the permanent deep geologic disposal of high-level radioactive waste and spent nuclear fuel, including whether examination of a single potential site or simultaneous examination of multiple potential sites is the most scientifically valid approach.

"(B) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study under this paragraph, the National Academy of Sciences shall consult with the Secretary of Energy, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, and other interested persons.

"(C) REPORT.—The National Academy of Sciences shall, not later than September 30, 1998, submit to the Congress a report setting forth its findings and recommendations as a result of the study conducted under this paragraph.

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 36, insert after the period in line 10 the following: "In seeking modifications to the repository licensing procedure, the Secretary shall evaluate the merits of emplacing waste at the site and consider whether acceptable results could be obtained from carrying out confirmatory tests at off-site Federal nuclear facilities or laboratories."

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 36, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 24, on page 38, and insert the following:

"(d) LICENSING STANDARDS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection

Agency shall promulgate standards for protection of the public from releases of radioactive materials or radioactivity from the repository based upon, and consistent with, the findings of the National Academy of Sciences as provided in section 801 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 68, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 5 on page 69, and insert the following:

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall be subject to and comply with all Federal, State, and local environmental or land use laws, requirements, or orders of general applicability not preempted by applicable Federal law, including those requiring permits or reporting, or those setting standards, criteria, or limitation.

"(b) APPLICATION OF FEDERAL LAW.—If the requirements of any law are inconsistent with or duplicative of the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act and this Act, the Secretary shall comply only with the requirements of the Atomic Energy Act and this Act in implementing the integrated management system.

"(c) EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the President shall exempt the Secretary from any Federal, State, or local requirement (including any law, regulation, or order requiring any license, permit, certificate, authorization, or approval, or setting any standard, criterion, or limitation) if the President determines the requirement was imposed for the purpose of delaying or obstructing construction or operation of the interim storage facility, transportation facilities, the repository, or associated facilities under this Act.

H.R. 1020

OFFERED BY: MRS. VUCANOVICH

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 68, beginning in line 23 strike "Any" and all that follows through line 5 on page 69.