

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, January 25, 1996

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 25, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable CHARLES H. TAYLOR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Among all the gifts, O gracious God, we treasure the gift of peace—in our hearts and in the world. On this day we remember with appreciation and gratitude those men and women of our armed services who seek by their skill and dedication to contribute to stability and security among those who have been at enmity. We earnestly pray that they and their families will be sustained under the shelter of Your grace and upheld by our thoughts and prayers. May the duty and honor of serving You and their country ever enable them to take pride in their calling and make them faithful in Your service. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PALLONE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

nounced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1494. An act to provide an extension for fiscal year 1996 for certain programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive ten 1-minute per side.

STATE OF THE UNION ANALYSIS ON TARGET

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the pregame analysis about Tuesday night's State of the Union Address was completely on target. All the pundits and talking heads agreed that President Clinton would come to Capitol Hill and make a centrist-sounding, middle-of-the-road, warm and fuzzy speech. This time the pundits got it right. The President was his usual split-the-difference self: not too liberal, not too conservative.

But there are things that even he missed. Like reality. He said that the era of big government was over. Well, he is right. But not because of anything Bill Clinton has done. In fact, the President has become big government's little buddy. Just this month he vetoed the first major overhaul of the welfare state in a generation. And last year he vetoed the first balanced budget to reach a President's desk since 1969.

Mr. Speaker, if this truly is the end of big government, it is only because Republicans in Congress have had the courage to stop Washington liberalism and say "no" to Washington spending.

CALL FOR A CLEAN DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, we are getting perilously close to default. When I listen to some of the comments that are being made by Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican leadership about the debt ceiling and when we are going to bring up a clean debt ceiling, or whether we even will, I get very concerned.

Yesterday I listened to the Speaker, and he said that the debt ceiling or the possibility of bringing up extension of the debt ceiling was going to be linked in some way to a budget agreement, or further action on other legislation before this House. I think that is the wrong way to go.

President Clinton said very emphatically in his State of the Union Address that we should have a clean debt ceiling and we should not wait around much longer to do it. Already it is a possibility that after today we will not be in session either next week or for a few weeks thereafter, and so far I have heard no statement by the Republican leadership that they are going to bring up a clean debt ceiling bill to extend the debt and to allow us to prevent default. When is this going to come up?

How much longer are we going to have to wait around here for the Republican leadership to play around with this issue? Already it is having a negative impact on our economy and I think it is about time that we faced up to our responsibility and brought up a clean debt ceiling bill so this Government does not go into default.

DEBT CEILING MUST BE LINKED TO BALANCED 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, I listened with great interest to my friend from New Jersey again and again and again using the word "clean." I would suggest to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that is inappropriate for this fundamental reason: We have failed to clean up this city. Thus far, the mission is still in front of us, to try to reconcile the problems of our Nation but not to always resort to big government as the answer.

The point was made at this podium 2 nights ago. The President of the United States came in, and on the headline in the Washington Post it said the President embraces GOP themes. Well, let us break it out from party authorship or pride of authorship and let us work together.

The problem remains the same. The budget has yet to be brought into balance despite the fact that this new majority gave the President a balanced budget with some votes from the other side of the aisle. To clean up our situation, we must embrace fiscal sanity, and these things are joined together,

☐ 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.

and we have to reconcile the differences.

PROTECT MEDICARE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, last evening we had another reminder that democracy is alive and well in this great country. Yes, on national television Speaker GINGRICH conceded that his effort to dismantle Medicare this year, in his words, let it wither on the vine, has failed. That failure results directly from the voice of the American people, those who spoke out, those who wrote, those who demanded that their elected Members in Congress be accountable for protecting one of the most effective programs in American history, Medicare, which assures the security for health care of millions of older Americans and people with disabilities.

I commend the Speaker. Even though he pledged to try again to dismantle Medicare next year, he has finally yielded to the voice of the American people.

But I disagree with him on this. Mr. Speaker, we cannot walk away from our commitment to a balanced budget. We do not need a minimal down payment on the deficit. We need to bring the deficit down just as the last speaker said. And we can do that without bringing Medicare down with it. That is what the American people want. Protect Medicare, assure a balanced budget. We can deliver on that.

LET US JUDGE THE PRESIDENT BY PAST PERFORMANCE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, in his State of the Union Address, President Clinton painted a rosy picture of our Nation's economy. He takes credit for reducing the deficit and a drop in the crime rate.

What he did not tell you is that since President Clinton took office, our national debt has increased by \$800 billion, causing the debt to rise from \$4.1 to \$4.9 trillion. In addition, under the Clinton balanced budget proposal, our deficit would also increase from \$172 billion in 1996 to \$223 billion in 2002.

As for the economy, which he claims is moving in the right direction, the economic growth is questionable. From 1982 until 1990, it averaged about 4 percent a year. Under Clinton's watch, it only increased by 1.9 percent in the last year.

If there has been a drop in the crime rate, it can be attributed to our Governors implementing tough truth-in-sentencing and three-strikes-and-you're-out.

Mr. President, it is time to stop all the rhetoric and get down to business. We need a balanced budget and we need to lower our national debt.

10-YEAR-OLD TO BEAR CHILD

(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, a 10-year-old girl in Houston is pregnant. The child of this child is due in about 2 weeks. The father of this child's child is the mother's boyfriend. This 22-year-old boyfriend is being charged with aggravated sexual assault. The mother's boyfriend has been with this child since she was 8 years old, and evidently the mother was completely cognizant of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, a woman who bears a child is not necessarily a mother and a man who sires a child is not necessarily a father, and this 22-year-old so-called man is not the only person at fault. This so-called mother should not pass "go." She should go directly to the damn slammer. Think about it.

ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the President has joined the flood of other former Democrats that have switched parties? If you watched the same State of the Union speech I did, one might think so.

But it is really not what the President said that matters, because he had said it all before. What matters is what he does.

I was hoping the President would present a real plan to reduce the size of government, lower taxes, save Medicare, and reform the failed welfare system.

Instead he gave us a mirage filled with double speak. It looks good from a distance, but the closer you get, the more you realize nothing is there. The President cannot have it both ways.

Our future is too important to risk with a mirage. Now it is time to draw the line in the sand, and stand up for our principles.

The old adage is "Actions speak louder than words." The President has given us a lot of words. Now he needs to follow up with his actions.

STATE OF THE UNION ANALYSIS

(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, the President gave a speech Tuesday night filled

with great rhetoric about downsizing government, cutting spending, and returning power to the people. However, we know from experience that these policies of higher taxes, more government spending, and bigger Federal bureaucracy prevail. The President's record, it speaks louder than his words. He vetoed a balanced budget amendment, or a balanced budget bill. He vetoed a pro-family, pro-jobs tax cut. He vetoed real welfare reform, emphasizing work, family, and responsibility. He vetoed legislation returning power to the States, communities, and families, and he vetoed a long-term solution for Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, the President's actions are clear contradictions to his words. He will say anything and then support the liberal policies of the status quo. Big government bureaucracy, big government spending, and a big government intrusion into our lives. As Majority Leader DOLE said, "It's time to walk the walk and talk the talk."

DUMB AND MUCH DUMBER

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, if this were a movie, it would be called "Dumb and Much Dumber." It was dumb to shut the Government down for a month, but it would be much dumber to default on the national debt.

Yesterday Moody's, the world-renowned bond rater, put \$400 billion of U.S. securities on the credit watch list, and Moody's has reason to worry. Many in this House, exhibiting a combination of arrogance and ignorance, a dangerous combination, want to allow us to default, in the vain hope it will bring a budget agreement. Not in the 220 years of our country's existence has America's credit rating ever been downgraded from triple A.

Some in the Republican Party are playing with fire, and if they are not careful we will all get burned. The Speaker is dancing on the edge of a fiscal abyss.

□ 1015

He may go down and take all of us with him if he does not stand up to the extremists in his own party.

Mr. Speaker, a month ago I would have said not even this Congress would be stupid enough to default on the debt. Today I am not so sure, because the inmates in a real sense, are running this asylum.

AVOCADO IMPORTATION

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, it would seem Secretary of Agriculture Dan

Glickman is on a one-man crusade to destroy California's multibillion-dollar fruit and vegetable industry.

That is exactly what will happen if he allows the importation of Mexican avocados. These avocados will bring fruit flies, seed weevils, stem borers, and other pests that will destroy California's economy.

"Not to worry," says Secretary Glickman, "we have used good science."

That is not true.

An independent report by University of California Riverside, Cornell University, Boston University, and Oregon State University states that "there is no rational basis for USDA's estimate of risk." The importation of Mexican avocados could mean catastrophe for California.

The introduction of these pests will destroy our oranges, our avocados, and our grapes. Not for one season, but for a generation. This is bad public policy, based on bad science. Do not ruin California's economy.

Mr. Secretary, institute a credible peer review process, now.

CONGRESS MUST BE RESPONSIBLE ON BUDGET

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is no time to gloat, even though the Republicans raised \$16 million at a fundraiser last night. I think it is time to listen to the President's message. We should never, never, never shut the Government down again.

But if we do not pass a new debt ceiling limit, I will tell you what we will do. We will not be able to pay Social Security payments on March 1. We will not be able to pay veterans benefits on March 1. And, yes, we will not be able to pay our troops in Bosnia on March 1.

How outrageous. Wall Street is trembling. Six former Secretaries of the Treasury said this is outrageous that we would bring a government, a nation, to its knees.

Congress, wake up, stand up, and work together. Pass a new debt ceiling limit and be responsible to the American people. This is no time to play with our lives and jeopardize the lives and the hopes and dreams of our seniors, our veterans, and our men and woman laying their lives on the line in Bosnia.

ERA OF BIG GOVERNMENT OVER?

(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, no one gives an upbeat speech better than our President. Analyst

Kevin Phillips described the President as a chameleon because of his extraordinary ability to delivery a conservative message that masks his liberal government agenda.

For instance, in his State of the Union Message, our President twice told Americans that the era of big government is over.

However, in the same State of the Union Message, the President twice told Americans that we cannot fend for ourselves.

Which is it, Mr. President?

Liberals believe that Americans can't fend for ourselves. That's why liberals built up the monstrous Federal Government in Washington over the last 30 years.

Americans want the Government off our backs.

Mr. Speaker, if the President is really serious about ending the era of big government, why did he propose to expand or create no less than six new Federal Government programs in his State of the Union?

Actions speak louder than words.

LIMITING INCREASE IN MARKETABLE DEBT

(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 am introducing a bill this morning that I would invite all Members to cosign with me. It is a bill that says there shall be no increase in net marketable debt after December 31, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, both sides of this issue on how we reach a balanced budget have agreed to have a balanced budget and not have an increase in debt. I think when you analyze the President's budget though, we need to remember two figures: \$300 billion and \$200 billion. The President's budget proposal for balance has \$300 billion more spending than the Republican proposal. It has \$200 billion more taxes than the Republican proposal.

Mr. Speaker, if one wants to continue to tax and spend, then it is OK to go with the President's proposal. The Republicans cannot accept that if we give a hang about what happens to our kids and grandkids. Let us at least agree on the final line, the final resolution, to not increase net marketable debt after the year 2001.

"DON'T LET ME HAVE TO TELL YOU TWICE"

(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, my mother always said, "Do not let me have to tell you twice."

We heard you, Moody's. We do not need to hear from Standard & Poor's,

too. We need to respond that we are not the kamikaze Congress. The markets actually responded positively all during our tortured balanced budget negotiations. There were Dow Jones records broken. The reason, of course, is that they expected a balanced budget. A more balanced budget compromise would have the same effect, only this time the benefits would not be only to the markets, but also to jobs, to renewed confidence in our economy, and especially in much needed renewed confidence in the Congress of the United States.

WHAT THE DEBATE IS ABOUT

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, any time you hear Members come to the floor advocating the President's balanced budget, you need to understand what that means. The fact is the President did as he was requested to do. He came in with a balanced budget that does meet balance in 7 years. The problem is that it always reflects his sense of priorities, and in that balanced budget the President has told us he wants to spend more, he wants to tax more, he wants bigger government, not less government, and that is what the debate is about. It is not whether or not you get to balance; it is how you get there and what you are doing, what are the programs and the priorities that you espouse.

The programs and the priorities espoused by President Clinton lead us to more problems for the future. Why? Well, it is a little like going on a diet and telling yourself I am going to lose 20 pounds this month. In the President's budget, what he does is says we will not lose one pound in the first 29 days of the month, and then in the last 2 days of the month we will lose the other 19 pounds. In our budget, what we do is say let us make the hard choices up front. That is a big difference.

SCHOOLS AND INFORMATION SUPER HIGHWAY

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise, first, to thank the President for challenging this Nation and those who are elected to govern it, and also for his reasonable stand on our budget crisis.

Second, I want to thank the President for recognizing the importance of educational technology in our schools. While serving in the California State Legislature, I authored the California Educational Technology Act, which now drives public schools throughout California into modern technology.

In his State of the Union Address, the President spoke of continuing and expanding on this project.

The California Educational Technology Act highlights the importance of computer technology in the classroom.

In my district, children at Manzanita Elementary School in Seaside, use computers to communicate with students from around the world to learn about geography, different cultures, and languages.

They can also communicate with scientists doing research in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary together with the National Weather Service to learn more about science.

This project is an outstanding example of the benefits that come from local, State and Federal Government partnerships with private industry.

Connecting our schools to the information super highway is exactly the type of program that will prepare America's youth to lead American economic growth and technological development into the next century. Thank you, Mr. President, for your leadership in education.

SCARE TACTICS AND DEMAGOGUERY

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, for the past 8 months liberal interest groups have been advertising in my district, and we have heard a drum beat of the same message here in the Congress from the minority, where millions of dollars have been spent trying to scare seniors about Medicare and mislead the public about what Congress is trying to do to secure America's future.

Most people recognize that the ads and the rhetoric are completely politically motivated and dismiss them, but the problem with the big lie is that if it is repeated often enough some people will believe it. And the real tragedy will be if it works, because, let us face it, it really does not matter if I am back or any particular individual is back, but what matters very, very deeply is if our Nation misses this extraordinary opportunity to stop stealing from our children's future to save Medicare from bankruptcy, most importantly, to renew the American dream and to get our country back on the right track. That would be an incalculable tragedy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just hope that you are listening and the American people are listening, and that this demagoguery and scare-mongering is not effective.

DANGEROUS CUTS IN EDUCATION

(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, last night I spoke on the House floor about the devastating cuts House Republicans are making to education.

After I left the floor, a Member on the other side of the aisle challenged the accuracy of my remarks—forcing me to repeat the facts to my colleagues and the American people today.

Fact: According to the Department of Education, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill passed by the House last year cuts education programs by 13 percent in 1 year alone. In fact, almost one-half of the bill's cuts come from education.

Fact: According to the Department of Education, if the Gingrich Republicans continue to fund education at the level in the current continuing resolution, education will be cut by a total of \$3.1 billion below last year—resulting in the largest cut to education in the history of this country.

□ 1030

The facts are clear, but if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle can't do the math, I'd suggest that they go back to school for a little math refresher course. Then, maybe they'll learn that their cuts to education are both real and dangerous.

WAIVING REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 4(b) OF RULE XI WITH RESPECT TO SAME DAY CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED BY COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 342 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 342

Resolved, That the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported from that committee before March 16, 1996, and providing for consideration or disposition of any of the following measures:

(1) A bill making general appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(2) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

(3) A bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving (for a temporary period or otherwise) the public debt limit under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, any amendment thereto, any conference report thereon, or any amendment reported in disagreement from a conference thereon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gen-

tleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 342 is a simple resolution. The proposed rule merely waives the requirement of clause 4(b) of rule XI for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House for resolutions reported from the committee before March 16, 1996, under certain circumstances.

This narrow waiver will only apply to special rules providing for the consideration or disposition of measures, amendments, conference reports, or items in disagreement from a conference that: make general appropriations for fiscal year 1996; include provisions making continuing appropriations, that includes provisions increasing or waiving the public debt limit.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 342 is straightforward, and it was reported by the Committee on Rules with unanimous voice vote. The committee recognizes the need for expedited procedures to bring these legislative measures forward as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 342.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today's rule marks not the first but the second time my Republican colleagues have waived the two-thirds requirement for same day consideration of bills this session and this session just started.

Mr. Speaker, it's looking an awful lot like my Republican colleagues are having trouble running the Congress.

Today we are one-third of the way into the fiscal year and the Government is barely running—when it is it's doing so by the skin of its teeth, thanks only to a series of hastily passed continuing resolutions.

For those who may have forgotten why the Government keeps shutting down for those who may not realize why all these continuing resolutions are necessary in the first place.

It's because the Republican Congress has failed to fulfill its most basic responsibility.

The responsibility to pass 13 appropriations bills by October 1.

Those appropriations bills are probably the most important job Congress has and despite an unprecedented amount of wasted time and paper last year this Republican Congress has accomplished less than any Congress since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, October 1 was 116 days ago—what's the hold up?

I certainly hope this rule will prove to be the magic bullet. I certainly hope this rule the second time around will give my Republican colleagues what they need to get this Congress working and this Government running, for good.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize the need to act quickly on these long overdue bills.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think what is an important issue to remember here is that this decision on this budget is the most important economic decision of this generation. Not only is it the most important decision of this generation; it is the most important economic decision this generation is going to make for the next generation.

So, I find it a little interesting that my colleague and my friend over on the other side of the aisle sits there and talks about the time it has taken to change the last 24 years of deficit spending; 24 years, by the way, which were under Democratic control.

It is time that people in American have a balanced budget. It is time the people in America can expect this Congress to step forward, and if it takes some time to reverse 24 years of mismanagement of this budget, the American people can expect us to step forward with some solid decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised by my colleague on the other side who stands up and says that perhaps it is a badge of courage, or a badge of accomplishment, if we pass a lot of legislation. I do not think we need more laws in this country. I think we have a lot of laws in this country. The IRS has 72,000 regulations. We need more laws to tell the American people that we are doing a good job in Washington, DC?

I think what the American people are saying is, why not take a look at what we have got on the books? Is it working?

This is the first time since the days of the Great Society that a Congress has had enough guts to stand up and say, hey, what happened to individual responsibility? Should this program be questioned? Is it accountable? Those kinds of questions ought to take priority over passing a bunch of laws.

If we are going to measure the accomplishments of the U.S. Congress by a score board on how many laws we pass, geez, talk about inefficiency, that is not what we are going to do over on this side of the aisle. If we are going to pass a law, it is going to mean something, and we have passed legislation here that meant something.

But, Mr. Speaker, you know what is good? We have stopped legislation that is bad legislation.

Why not talk about what we have stopped in these Chambers that was bad legislation? I think that, first of all, it is kind of a diversion from the rule. This rule came out of the Committee on Rules on a unanimous decision. There wasn't this kind of discussion in the Committee on Rules last night. But I guess it did offer an opportunity on the House floor to try and take one more shot at discrediting what the Republicans are trying to do.

But I think the biggest credit for the Republicans is taking a look at 24 years of deficit spending, a Government right now that spends \$30 million an hour and adds that to its debt every hour of the day. Some \$30 million more going out than coming in, that is what we ought to take a look at.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, well, I just want to commend my good friend from Colorado for his statements.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], my good friend, question the leadership of the Republican Party and in being able to run this place. Let me just remind him and everyone else, "It's the spending, stupid." This is what got us into this mess.

Mr. Speaker, all we have to do is look at what is happening to America today. This country is going down the tubes because of the irresponsible spending habits of this U.S. Congress. And let us not go blame it on Presidents in our past; let us blame it on this Congress, particularly this House of Representatives which controls the pursestrings. They are responsible. They are the ones that have driven this deficit to a point where we are now drowning in a sea of red ink that threatens the very future of our country, especially for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, \$5 trillion in debt? When we look at the pie that makes up the Federal budget, that huge pie of \$1.5 trillion, and when we consider that \$250 billion of that hunk of the pie goes to pay just the debt service, that means the interest that is due on the debt that is accumulated over these years, \$250 billion. Do the American people realize how much money that is? It is almost as much money as we spend on the national defense budget of this country.

We hear the other side of the aisle railing about how much money we spend on national defense. Imagine, we spend as much on the interest payments each year as we spend on national defense.

We are kind of fortunate right now because interest rates are low and inflation rates are low. But what happens when we continue on this kind of

spending spree? Interest rates rise and inflation rises like it did back in the 1970's when inflation was running rampant at about 13 percent and interest rates, the prime interest rates that small businessmen had to borrow money at from banks, was running at 22 percent. A small businessman had to pay about 2 percent over that; I know because I was one, 24 percent interest.

What would happen if interest rates go back up and inflation goes back up? That hunk of the pie would be about \$400 billion. That means an additional \$150 billion in interest payments. And where do we think that comes from? It comes out of those funds that might be available to help those people that are truly needy.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked back at the beginning of last year when the President gave us a budget and projected spending for the next 5 years. He projected an increase in the deficit of over a trillion dollars, over \$1 trillion. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine that? We can talk about all of the programs that we have, but the only way we are ever going to get these deficits under control is by curtailing spending, either the growth of it or actually cutting programs.

I was very proud at the beginning of last year to introduce a budget, along with 16 of my colleagues, that actually balanced the budget in 5 years, not 7 years. And it did so by making the cuts in the early years, in years 1 and 2, not in years 4, 5, 6, or 7. That is how we are going to balance this budget. That is what we are going to stick to.

Make no exception about it, no matter what happens, we are not going to veer off this course. There are those of us in this Congress that are going to stick to this. We are going to force this Congress to vote on every single one of these issues to finally put this House back in order financially, and we can count on that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman, he may not like the way this Congress is being run, but it is going to be run that way; as long as the Republican majority is in control in this House, there is going to be no more deficit spending.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, they will not be calling that economic index Standard and Poors; if we keep going like we are going, it will be just poor.

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

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1*	Compliance	H. Res. 6	Closed	None.
H. Res. 6	Opening Day Rules Package	H. Res. 5	Closed; contained a closed rule on H.R. 1 within the closed rule	None.
H.R. 5*	Unfunded Mandates	H. Res. 38	Restrictive; Motion adopted over Democratic objection in the Committee of the Whole to limit debate on section 4; Pre-printing gets preference.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 2*	Balanced Budget	H. Res. 44	Restrictive; only certain substitutes	2R; 4D.
H. Res. 43	Committee Hearings Scheduling	H. Res. 43 (OJ)	Restrictive; considered in House no amendments	N/A.
H.R. 2*	Line Item Veto	H. Res. 55	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 665*	Victim Restitution Act of 1995	H. Res. 61	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 666*	Exclusionary Rule Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 60	Open; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 667*	Violent Criminal Incarceration Act of 1995	H. Res. 63	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 668*	The Criminal Alien Deportation Improvement Act	H. Res. 69	Open; Pre-printing gets preference; Contains self-executing provision	N/A.
H.R. 728*	Local Government Law Enforcement Block Grants	H. Res. 79	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 7*	National Security Revitalization Act	H. Res. 83	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 729*	Death Penalty/Habeas	N/A	Restrictive; brought up under UC with a 6 hr. time cap on amendments	N/A.
S. 2	Senate Compliance	N/A	Closed; Put on Suspension Calendar over Democratic objection	None.
H.R. 831	To Permanently Extend the Health Insurance Deduction for the Self-Employed.	H. Res. 88	Restrictive; makes in order only the Gibbons amendment; Waives all points of order; Contains self-executing provision.	1D.
H.R. 830*	The Paperwork Reduction Act	H. Res. 91	Open	N/A.
H.R. 889	Emergency Supplemental/Rescinding Certain Budget Authority	H. Res. 92	Restrictive; makes in order only the Obey substitute	1D.
H.R. 450*	Regulatory Moratorium	H. Res. 93	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 1022*	Risk Assessment	H. Res. 96	Restrictive; 10 hr. Time Cap on amendments	N/A.
H.R. 926*	Regulatory Flexibility	H. Res. 100	Open	N/A.
H.R. 925*	Private Property Protection Act	H. Res. 101	Restrictive; 12 hr. time cap on amendments; Requires Members to pre-print their amendments in the Record prior to the bill's consideration for amendment, waives germaneness and budget act points of order as well as points of order concerning appropriating on a legislative bill against the committee substitute used as base text.	1D.
H.R. 1058*	Securities Litigation Reform Act	H. Res. 105	Restrictive; 8 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference; Makes in order the Wyden amendment and waives germaneness against it.	1D.
H.R. 988*	The Attorney Accountability Act of 1995	H. Res. 104	Restrictive; 7 hr. time cap on amendments; Pre-printing gets preference	N/A.
H.R. 956*	Product Liability and Legal Reform Act	H. Res. 109	Restrictive; makes in order only 15 germane amendments and denies 64 germane amendments from being considered.	8D; 7R.
H.R. 1158	Making Emergency Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions	H. Res. 115	Restrictive; Combines emergency H.R. 1158 & nonemergency 1159 and strikes the abortion provision; makes in order only pre-printed amendments that include offsets within the same chapter (deeper cuts in programs already cut); waives points of order against three amendments; waives cl 2 of rule XXI against the bill, cl 2, XXI and cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments in the Record; 10 hr time cap on amendments. 30 minutes debate on each amendment.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 73*	Term Limits	H. Res. 116	Restrictive; Makes in order only 4 amendments considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure and denies 21 germane amendments from being considered.	1D; 3R.
H.R. 4*	Welfare Reform	H. Res. 119	Restrictive; Makes in order only 31 perfecting amendments and two substitutes; Denies 130 germane amendments from being considered; The substitutes are to be considered under a "Queen of the Hill" procedure; All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5D; 26R.
H.R. 1271*	Family Privacy Act	H. Res. 125	Open	N/A.
H.R. 660*	Housing for Older Persons Act	H. Res. 126	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1215*	The Contract With America Tax Relief Act of 1995	H. Res. 129	Restrictive; Self Executes language that makes tax cuts contingent on the adoption of a balanced budget plan and strikes section 3006. Makes in order only one substitute. Waives all points of order against the bill, substitute made in order as original text and Gephardt substitute.	1D.
H.R. 483	Medicare Select Extension	H. Res. 130	Restrictive; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill; makes H.R. 1391 in order as original text; makes in order only the Dingell substitute; allows Commerce Committee to file a report on the bill at any time.	1D.
H.R. 655	Hydrogen Future Act	H. Res. 136	Open	N/A.
H.R. 1361	Coast Guard Authorization	H. Res. 139	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act against the bill's consideration and the committee substitute; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the committee substitute.	N/A.
H.R. 961	Clean Water Act	H. Res. 140	Open; pre-printing gets preference; waives sections 302(f) and 602(b) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration; waives cl 7 of rule XVI, cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Makes in order Shuster substitute as first order of business.	N/A.
H.R. 535	Corning National Fish Hatchery Conveyance Act	H. Res. 144	Open	N/A.
H.R. 584	Conveyance of the Fairport National Fish Hatchery to the State of Iowa.	H. Res. 145	Open	N/A.
H.R. 614	Conveyance of the New London National Fish Hatchery Production Facility.	H. Res. 146	Open	N/A.
H. Con. Res. 67	Budget Resolution	H. Res. 149	Restrictive; Makes in order 4 substitutes under regular order; Gephardt, Neumann/Solomon, Payne/Owens, President's Budget if printed in Record on 5/17/95; waives all points of order against substitutes and concurrent resolution; suspends application of Rule XLIX with respect to the resolution; self-executes Agriculture language.	3D; 1R.
H.R. 1561	American Overseas Interests Act of 1995	H. Res. 155	Restrictive; Requires amendments to be printed in the Record prior to their consideration; 10 hr. time cap; waives cl 2(1)(6) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; Also waives sections 302(f), 303(a), 308(a) and 402(a) against the bill's consideration and the committee amendment in order as original text; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; amendment consideration is closed at 2:30 p.m. on May 25, 1995. Self-executes provision which removes section 2210 from the bill. This was done at the request of the Budget Committee.	N/A.
H.R. 1530	National Defense Authorization Act FY 1996	H. Res. 164	Restrictive; Makes in order only the amendments printed in the report; waives all points of order against the bill, substitute and amendments printed in the report. Gives the Chairman en bloc authority. Self-executes a provision which strikes section 807 of the bill; provides for an additional 30 min. of debate on Nunn-Lugar section; Allows Mr. Clinger to offer a modification of his amendment with the concurrence of Ms. Collins.	36R; 18D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1817	Military Construction Appropriations; FY 1996	H. Res. 167	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; 1 hr. general debate; Uses House passed budget numbers as threshold for spending amounts pending passage of Budget.	N/A.
H.R. 1854	Legislative Branch Appropriations	H. Res. 169	Restrictive; Makes in order only 11 amendments; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against the bill and cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill. All points of order are waived against the amendments.	5R; 4D; 2 Bipartisan.
H.R. 1868	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 170	Open; waives cl. 2, cl. 5(b), and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Gilman amendments as first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendments; if adopted they will be considered as original text; waives cl. 2 of rule XXI against the amendments printed in the report. Pre-printing gets priority (Hall) (Mendez) (Goss) (Smith, NJ).	N/A.
H.R. 1905	Energy & Water Appropriations	H. Res. 171	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Shuster amendment as the first order of business; waives all points of order against the amendment; if adopted it will be considered as original text. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.
H.J. Res. 79	Constitutional Amendment to Permit Congress and States to Prohibit the Physical Desecration of the American Flag.	H. Res. 173	Closed; provides one hour of general debate and one motion to recommit with or without instructions; if there are instructions, the MO is debatable for 1 hr.	N/A.
H.R. 1944	Rescissions Bill	H. Res. 175	Restrictive; Provides for consideration of the bill in the House; Permits the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee to offer one amendment which is unamendable; waives all points of order against the amendment.	N/A.
H.R. 1868 (2nd rule)	Foreign Operations Appropriations	H. Res. 177	Restrictive; Provides for further consideration of the bill; makes in order only the four amendments printed in the rules report (20 min. each). Waives all points of order against the amendments; Prohibits intervening motions in the Committee of the Whole; Provides for an automatic rise and report following the disposition of the amendments.	N/A.
H.R. 1977 *Rule Defeated*	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 185	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act and cl 2 and cl 6 of rule XXI; provides that the bill be read by title; waives all points of order against the Tauzin amendment; self-executes Budget Committee amendment; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A.

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS: COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H.R. 1977	Interior Appropriations	H.Res. 187	Open; waives sections 302(f), 306 and 308(a) of the Budget Act; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against the Tausin amendment; provides that the bill be read by title; self-executes Budget Committee amendment and makes NEA funding subject to House passed authorization; waives cl 2(e) of rule XXI against the amendments to the bill; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1976	Agriculture Appropriations	H. Res. 188	Open; waives clauses 2 and 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides that the bill be read by title; Makes Sken amendment first order of business, if adopted the amendment will be considered as base text (10 min.); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1977 (3rd rule)	Interior Appropriations	H. Res. 189	Restrictive; provides for the further consideration of the bill; allows only amendments pre-printed before July 14th to be considered; limits motions to rise.	N/A
H.R. 2020	Treasury Postal Appropriations	H. Res. 190	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.J. Res. 96	Disapproving MFN for China	H. Res. 193	Restrictive; provides for consideration in the House of H.R. 2058 (90 min.) and H.J. Res. 96 (1 hr). Waives certain provisions of the Trade Act.	N/A
H.R. 2002	Transportation Appropriations	H. Res. 194	Open; waives cl. 3 of rule XIII and section 401 (a) of the CBA against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 6 and cl. 2 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Makes in order the Clinger/Solomon amendment waives all points of order against the amendment (Line Item Veto); provides the bill be read by title; Pre-printing gets priority. "RULE AMENDED" .	N/A
H.R. 70	Exports of Alaskan North Slope Oil	H. Res. 197	Open; Makes in order the Resources Committee amendment in the nature of a substitute as original text; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides a Senate hook-up with S. 395.	N/A
H.R. 2076	Commerce, Justice Appropriations	H. Res. 198	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Pre-printing gets priority; provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 2099	VA/HUD Appropriations	H. Res. 201	Open; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; Provides that the amendment in part 1 of the report is the first business, if adopted it will be considered as base text (30 min.); waives all points of order against the Klug and Davis amendments; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides that the bill be read by title.	N/A
S. 21	Termination of U.S. Arms Embargo on Bosnia	H. Res. 204	Restrictive; 3 hours of general debate; Makes in order an amendment to be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee (1 hr); If motion to recommit has instructions it can only be offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	ID.
H.R. 2126	Defense Appropriations	H. Res. 205	Open; waives cl. 2(f)(6) of rule XI and section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; self-executes a strike of sections 8021 and 8024 of the bill as requested by the Budget Committee; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 1555	Communications Act of 1995	H. Res. 207	Restrictive; waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes in order the Commerce Committee amendment as original text and waives sec. 302(f) of the Budget Act and cl. 5(a) of rule XXI against the amendment; Makes in order the Biele amendment (30 min.) as the first order of business, if adopted it will be original text; makes in order only the amendments printed in the report and waives all points of order against the amendments; provides a Senate hook-up with S. 652.	2R/3D/3 Bipartisan.
H.R. 2127	Labor/HHS Appropriations Act	H. Res. 208	Open; Provides that the first order of business will be the managers amendments (10 min.), if adopted they will be considered as base text; waives cl. 2 and cl. 6 of rule XXI against provisions in the bill; waives all points of order against certain amendments printed in the report; Pre-printing gets priority; Provides the bill be read by title.	N/A
H.R. 1594	Economically Targeted Investments	H. Res. 215	Open; 2 hr of gen. debate. makes in order the committee substitute as original text	N/A
H.R. 1655	Intelligence Authorization	H. Res. 216	Restrictive; waives sections 302(f), 308(a) and 401(b) of the Budget Act. Makes in order the committee substitute as modified by Govt. Reform amend (striking sec. 505) and an amendment striking title VII. Cl 7 of rule XVI and cl 5(a) of rule XXI are waived against the substitute. Sections 302(f) and 401(b) of the CBA are also waived against the substitute. Amendments must also be pre-printed in the Congressional record.	N/A
H.R. 1162	Deficit Reduction Lock Box	H. Res. 218	Open; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the committee substitute made in order as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1670	Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1995	H. Res. 219	Open; waives sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; bill will be read by title; waives cl 5(a) of rule XXI and section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the committee substitute. Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1617	To Consolidate and Reform Workforce Development and Literacy Programs Act (CAREERS).	H. Res. 222	Open; waives section 302(f) and 401(b) of the Budget Act against the substitute made in order as original text (H.R. 2332), cl. 5(a) of rule XXI is also waived against the substitute; provides for consideration of the managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text.	N/A
H.R. 2274	National Highway System Designation Act of 1995	H. Res. 224	Open; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill; Makes H.R. 2349 in order as original text; waives section 302(f) of the Budget Act against the substitute; provides for the consideration of a managers amendment (10 min.) If adopted, it is considered as base text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 927	Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act of 1995	H. Res. 225	Restrictive; waives cl 2(L)(2)(B) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order H.R. 2347 as base text; waives cl 7 of rule XVI against the substitute; Makes Hamilton amendment the first amendment to be considered (1 hr). Makes in order only amendments printed in the report.	2R/2D
H.R. 743	The Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995	H. Res. 226	Open; waives cl 2(f)(2)(b) of rule XI against consideration of the bill; makes in order the committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1170	3-Judge Court for Certain Injunctions	H. Res. 227	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 1601	International Space Station Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 228	Open; makes in order a committee amendment as original text; Pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.J. Res. 108	Making Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 230	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	
H.R. 2405	Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act of 1995	H. Res. 234	Open; self-executes a provision striking section 304(b)(3) of the bill (Commerce Committee request); Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2259	To Disapprove Certain Sentencing Guideline Amendments	H. Res. 237	Restrictive; waives cl 2(f)(2)(B) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of the Senate bill S. 1254 as original text; Makes in order only a Conyers substitute; provides a Senate hook-up after adoption.	ID
H.R. 2425	Medicare Preservation Act	H. Res. 238	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the text of H.R. 2485 as original text; waives all points of order against H.R. 2485; makes in order only an amendment offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5 of rule XXI (9% requirement on votes raising taxes).	ID
H.R. 2492	Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill	H. Res. 239	Restrictive; provides for consideration of the bill in the House	N/A
H.R. 2491	7 Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Social Security Earnings Test Reform.	H. Res. 245	Restrictive; makes in order H.R. 2517 as original text; waives all points of order against the bill; Makes in order only H.R. 2530 as an amendment only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; waives all points of order against the amendment; waives cl 5 of rule XXI (9% requirement on votes raising taxes).	ID
H.R. 1833	Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1995	H. Res. 251	Closed	N/A
H.R. 2546	D.C. Appropriations FY 1996	H. Res. 252	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; Makes in order the Walsh amendment as the first order of business (10 min.); if adopted it is considered as base text; waives cl 2 and 6 of rule XXI against the bill; makes in order the Bonilla, Gunderson and Hostettler amendments (30 min.); waives all points of order against the amendments; debate on any further amendments is limited to 30 min. each.	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 257	Closed; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee.	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Debt Limit	H. Res. 258	Restrictive; Provides for the immediate consideration of the CR; one motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by the Minority Leader or a designee; self-executes 4 amendments in the rule; Solomon, Medicare Coverage of Certain Anti-Cancer Drug Treatments, Habeas Corpus Reform, Chrysler (MI); makes in order the Walker amend (40 min.) on regulatory reform.	5R
H.R. 2539	ICC Termination	H. Res. 259	Open; waives section 302(f) and section 308(a)	N/A
H.J. Res. 115	Further Continuing Appropriations for FY 1996	H. Res. 261	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A
H.R. 2586	Temporary Increase in the Statutory Limit on the Public Debt	H. Res. 262	Closed; provides for the immediate consideration of a motion by the Majority Leader or his designees to dispose of the Senate amendments (1hr).	N/A

FLOOR PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS; COMPILED BY THE RULES COMMITTEE DEMOCRATS—Continued

Bill No.	Title	Resolution No.	Process used for floor consideration	Amendments in order
H. Res. 250	House Gift Rule Reform	H. Res. 268	Closed; provides for consideration of the bill in the House; 30 min. of debate; makes in order the Burton amendment and the Gingrich en bloc amendment (30 min. each); waives all points of order against the amendments; Gingrich is only in order if Burton fails or is not offered.	2R
H.R. 2564	Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995	H. Res. 269	Open; waives cl. 2(D)(5) of rule XI against the bill's consideration; waives all points of order against the Istook and McIntosh amendments.	N/A
H.R. 2606	Prohibition on Funds for Bosnia Deployment	H. Res. 273	Restrictive; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; provides one motion to amend if offered by the Minority Leader or designee (1 hr non-amendable); motion to recommit which may have instructions only if offered by Minority Leader or his designee; if Minority Leader motion is not offered debate time will be extended by 1 hr.	N/A
H.R. 1788	Amtrak Reform and Privatization Act of 1995	H. Res. 289	Open; waives all points of order against the bill's consideration; makes in order the Transportation substitute modified by the amend in the report; Bill read by title; waives all points of order against the substitute; makes in order a managers amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.); waives all points of order against the amendment; Pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 1350	Maritime Security Act of 1995	H. Res. 287	Open; makes in order the committee substitute as original text; makes in order a managers amendment which if adopted is considered as original text (20 min.) unamendable; pre-printing gets priority.	N/A
H.R. 2621	To Protect Federal Trust Funds	H. Res. 293	Closed; provides for the adoption of the Ways & Means amendment printed in the report. 1 hr. of general debate.	N/A
H.R. 1745	Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995	H. Res. 303	Open; waives cl. 2(I)(6) of rule XI and sections 302(f) and 311(a) of the Budget Act against the bill's consideration. Makes in order the Resources substitute as base text and waives cl. 7 of rule XVI and sections 302(f) and 308(a) of the Budget Act; makes in order a managers' amend as the first order of business, if adopted it is considered base text (10 min.).	N/A
H. Res. 304	Providing for Debate and Consideration of Three Measures Relating to U.S. Troop Deployments in Bosnia.	N/A	Closed; makes in order three resolutions; H.R. 2770 (Dorman), H. Res. 302 (Buyer), and H. Res. 306 (Gephardt); 1 hour of debate on each.	1D; 2R
H. Res. 309	Revised Budget Resolution	H. Res. 309	Closed; provides 2 hours of general debate in the House	N/A
H.R. 558	Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact Consent Act	H. Res. 313	Open; pre-printing gets priority	N/A
H.R. 2677	The National Parks and National Wildlife Refuge Systems Freedom Act of 1995.	H. Res. 323	Closed; consideration in the House; self-executes Young amendment	N/A
PROCEDURE IN THE 104TH CONGRESS 2D SESSION				
H.R. 1643	To authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (MFN) to the products of Bulgaria.	H. Res. 334	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered.	N/A
H.J. Res. 134	Making continuing appropriations/establishing procedures making the transmission of the continuing resolution H.J. Res. 134.	H. Res. 336	Closed; provides to take from the Speaker's table H.J. Res. 134 with the Senate amendment and concur with the Senate amendment with an amendment (H. Con. Res. 131) which is self-executed in the rule. The rule provides further that the bill shall not be sent back to the Senate until the Senate agrees to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 131.	N/A
H.R. 1358	Conveyance of National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Gloucester, Massachusetts.	H. Res. 338	Closed; provides to take the bill from the Speaker's table with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report; 1 hr. of general debate; previous question is considered as ordered.	N/A

* Contract Bills, 67% restrictive; 33% open. ** All legislation 1st Session, 56% restrictive; 44% open. *** Legislation 2d Session, 100% restrictive; 0% open. **** All legislation 104th Congress 59% restrictive; 41% open. ***** Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules as well as completely closed rules and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. This definition of restrictive rule is taken from the Republican chart of resolutions reported from the Rules Committee in the 103d Congress. ***** Not included in this chart are three bills which should have been placed on the Suspension Calendar. H.R. 101, H.R. 400, H.R. 440.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with many of the things that my colleagues on the other side have said but there is still no excuse why all of the appropriation bills have not been finished on time.

We can do this without regard to the budget. We have done it when we were in the majority. And there is no reason that they could not have done it; and that is the reason we are here today in this capacity.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] say that there will be no more deficit spending with the Republicans in control. I had understood the Republican budget to accept the reality of the fact that there will be deficit spending for the next 6 years.

The 7-year budget means that the deficit ends in the seventh year, but for the first 6 years of the Republican budget there is a deficit. So, to say that there will be no more deficit spending is to assume that we will go into a coma for 6 years and then come out in the seventh.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York did have a tougher budget. It is true. It was a very tough budget. That is why I believe a majority of the Republicans voted against it.

But the key here is procedural and not substantive. I gather this is the

first time the House has been asked, not at the end of the session when we are trying to clean things up, but at the very outset of a session to change the rules substantially to diminish the chance to discuss publicly legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is doing away with the two-thirds vote. For a group that came in boasting about how open and democratic they were going to be, this is an extraordinary diminution of our ability as a legislative body to discuss things.

□ 1045

And the reason for it is simple. I want to be very clear. I am not impugning the motives of my colleagues in this regard. I would not do it even if the rules allowed me, in this one case at least. I do not think they came intending to diminish openness and fairness. I do not think it was part of their explicit program to do so. But they have a problem. The problem is their own incompetence. They have been unable to do the business of the public sufficiently well to stick to openness. And authoritarianism is the result of incompetence.

We will not have a chance fully to debate these issues because they are so disorganized, so unable to cope with their own internal divisions, apparently surprised, one of the things I have heard is Members on the other side have said, it is not our fault, there

is something called the U.S. Senate, they have said. In the U.S. Senate they have something called the filibuster, and that has interfered with us.

Some of us, a year or two ago, were urging that in our rules of reform we deal with Senate filibuster. We said we did not like it. Universally the Republicans said, no, you cannot do that. That is a bad idea. So they were the great defenders of the Senate filibuster when we last talked about rules reform. When some of us talked about trying to curtail the filibuster through the mechanism of rules reform, the joint rules, Republicans said that was a terrible idea. Now they are apparently shocked to find on it that this filibuster causes some problems.

But the Republicans control the Senate and the Republicans control the House. And under Republican control, we have compiled the worst record in simply doing our job that I can remember. The appropriations bills were not passed. They were passed in November and December. They were all supposed to be passed by October 1.

So how do they deal with this problem? They come in today with a resolution that substantially diminishes the ability of the American public to look at these things and hear them debated because they abolish the rule that says you cannot do them all in the same day.

Part of the problem may be this and we have seen this from the Republican

side. The Republican leadership comes up with a proposal and the Republican membership immediately attacks it. It may be that what we are being given here is an effort not to throttle the Democrats, not to keep the press out, but it may be that the Republican leadership has finally figured out that they cannot give their own membership time to read these things. Maybe they figure that Republican freshmen, being new to this place, will not be able to figure it out in a day. It will take them 2 days and they will have had it passed already. Because what they are saying is they should be able to bring up major legislation involving their failure to do appropriations bills and pass it the same day, not have that 1-day waiting period when it goes in the press, when it can be talked about on television, when the public has a chance to react. That is what we are talking about.

What we are talking about now is the ability of, apparently, the Republican leadership to bring up legislation dealing with the appropriations and get it passed the same day, lest it be talked about.

I have to say, since we are the minority, unanimously we do not have the votes to stop them from doing what they are doing. What they are afraid of are their own Members. What they are afraid of is the kind of, oh, we cannot do this.

The problem is that there is a gap; there is a gap between the views of many of the Republican Members and reality. And their fear is that the Republican leadership, now that they have learned that shutting down the Government is disruptive and unpopular and in fact fiscally quite irresponsible, since it adds to Government costs, the Republican leadership does not want again to have a Government shutdown. But they have a problem, because they have difficulty in getting the votes on their own side and with their own colleagues to pass legislation that keeps the Government working.

One way they have decided that they can minimize that difficulty is to reduce the possibility for public input, to reduce the chance for discussion, to speed this up. And that is why we have an extraordinary motion today from the advocates of procedural fairness and openness, substantially to diminish the time which the U.S. House of Representatives will have to discuss the expenditure of billions of dollars.

I regret very much that they have not been competent enough and sufficiently organized within themselves to deal with the difficult task of governing. But I do not think that democracy ought to be the victim of that incompetence.

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

When I stand here and listen to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I

would kindly remind my colleague that there has been more discussion and more debate about a balanced budget in these Chambers in 1 day than they have had in the last 24 years on the Democratic side of the aisle. We are serious about this situation.

We have determined there are more people riding the wagon than there are pulling the wagon. It is about time we get some people helping contribute to this. The gentleman talks about management as if the last 24 or 26 years of deficit is good management. He talks about competency as if this Congress is held out by the American people as being economically competent.

Go out and ask the American citizens, would they let the U.S. Congress run their checkbook? Go out across this country and say to somebody, if you got a gift of \$100 million and you wanted to donate \$10 million to the needy people of this country, would you send that check to Washington, DC, for distribution? Of course, they would not do that.

The other point that should be brought up here is part of the delay in this process is there are Members on their side of the aisle who are devoting their resources and their energy not into helping us find a solution for this budget deficit but in making sure we are not the ones that find the solution.

We want them to join the team. The time has come for economic reality. The President of this country stood up here and said the era of big Government, which was supported by that side of the aisle for the years that it had control, it is over. Power needs to shift back to the States; power needs to go back to the individuals. We have moved the President, but I am not sure we have moved many on your side of the aisle.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, what are we considering? We are considering, as both gentlemen from Massachusetts have already pointed out, a rule which allows for 1 day of consideration of matters, which means that neither Members nor the public will have an opportunity to review that which is being proposed.

I do not know whether the gentleman representing the majority on the Committee on Rules knows, but perhaps he can inform me at the end of this debate whether or not this kind of rule has ever been proposed prior to June 30 of any legislative year in the history of the Congress.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from the other side does not know, I will tell him, no, it has never been proposed before June 30.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Why do I ask that question? I ask that question because, when the Republicans were in the minority, they used to rail regularly about the arbitrariness of the Committee on Rules controlled by the Democratic Party. That pushed them to the position that they could not reflect or debate on issues confronting the Congress.

So what do we see? We see for some reason an incredible motivation to get out of town. This is January. We are beginning the session, the second session of the 104th Congress, the historic 104th Congress, as our Speaker, a historian himself, tells us regularly.

So how do we begin this Congress? With one of the most arbitrary rules that we have. Is there precedent for such rules? Yes, there is. Did we utilize them? Yes, we did. When did we utilize them? At the end of sessions, either because we were going on summer break in August or we were going out of session in October or November or December so that we could accelerate the process at the end of sessions. But now we have a rule that says, at the very beginning, in the first instance, before we really do any substantive business, we are going to have a rule that says we will not take the time.

Apparently, we are going to go on 30 days break, as I understand it. We are not in control, and I am not sure about that, but that is what I understand. What is the reason for this rule? I cannot figure it out.

Let me say in addition, my friend said something about management. That is an interesting concept over the last 40 years as to how long the Republicans have been in management. Under the Constitution of the United States, article II of the Constitution of the United States, article II of the Constitution gives executive authority, that is management authority, to the President of the United States. The Presidency of the United States in the last 17 or 15 years has been in the hands of Republicans 12 out of those 15 years. In fact, we hear the Republicans railing about how the President will not cooperate. That is why they cannot do their agenda.

To some degree, they are correct. But my, my, my, I never hear the Republicans say why Ronald Reagan or George Bush did not stop the irresponsibility of which they accuse the Democratic Congress. I never hear them say that for 6 of those 12 years there was a Republican leadership in U.S. Senate.

My colleagues, the fact of the matter is, we do have a serious problem. It is a budget deficit on a regular basis that this country nor its children can afford. That is why this Member of the

Congress has voted three times to pass a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget. That is why this Member of Congress right here voted for a budget which cut deficits faster and further than the Republican alternative and is, frankly, in my opinion, the budget that we ought to pass. I think the President would sign. And it would reduce deficits further and faster than the Republican alternative.

My colleagues, this martial law rule is proposed because we need to come to grips with this year's fiscal policies, which we have not yet adopted. The fiscal policies in my opinion of the Republican leadership during the past year are worthy of careful consideration by the American public and then deserving of the American public's contempt.

The Republican shutdown of Government and the Gingrich premeditated tactics of forcing America to default prospectively on its debts, both, my colleagues, are arguably historically the most irresponsible fiscal policies proposed by any leadership of the House of Representatives in its history.

We ought to have a rule on this floor which says that we will pass a clean debt limit extension. Secretary Donald Reagan wrote me a letter and said that is what we ought to do, not on this one but when the Republicans had the Presidency. Secretary of the Treasury Jim Baker asked me to do the same. Secretary Brady asked me to do the same.

All three of those Secretaries of the Treasury said it would be the height of irresponsibility not to accommodate past policies and pay America's bills. Moody's has just yesterday made an observation that they may change the cost of borrowing in America by changing our rating. If they do that, every homeowner, every person who goes into the Hecht Co. in this area or Woodward and Lothrop or K-Mart and uses a credit card will pay more.

□ 1100

Every foreign government will up its price of money to the U.S. taxpayer. The fact of the matter is I do not know of a responsible financial person that I have talked to in my district or in this country that thinks that putting the American Government into default is anything other than insanity. Yet, it was a proposed policy by Speaker GINGRICH earlier this year. That is why I called it a premeditated policy of placing America at risk of defaulting on its debts.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is not inherently evil. It is a rule that will accommodate action. I understand that. I do not allege that it is, in and of itself, a rule that is particularly pernicious. But its timing is historic because we never found the need to do this before, in my opinion, in the history of the House of Representatives, because we

were always prepared in January, February, March, April, and May to consider matters in a timely fashion. It was only at the end that we needed to accelerate.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States said we ought to come together. We ought to jettison confrontation and adopt cooperation and put this country on a sound fiscal footing, make a commitment that we are not going to shut down government, not just for Federal employees, but for Americans who rely on government on a daily basis, that they will not be at risk, and that we ought to commit ourselves to quickly passing a clean debt limit extension, so we can tell all the world America, America can be relied on.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman that just spoke is an eloquent speaker, and not exactly on point, but he is an eloquent speaker. I guess the gentleman brings up that we finished talking about the word management. Now let us talk about the word participation. The gentleman acts as if there was no opportunity to participate last night. The Committee on Rules had an open meeting.

By the way, the meetings under the Republican management of this Congress have been open, sunshine. They are open to the press. By the way, we do not have proxy voting anymore. Under the old management team, the Democratic management team, you could go home to your district and you could have a proxy vote cast on your behalf. You did not even have to be at a committee hearing.

What did we do? We said, "Wait a minute, we are going to change the management around here. We expect you to be at your meetings. If you are going to cast a vote, you are expected to be there and cast a vote in person." The gentleman does not bring up the point that last night his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle did not carry this kind of debate in the Committee on Rules. In fact, they voted for this rule. In fact, they voted for it unanimously. We did not even do a rollcall vote on it. We did a voice vote on it. I think it is important to remember those kinds of things.

I think it is important to take a look. I think the gentleman is credible when he starts talking about his personal efforts at balancing the budget. I think he is terrific in that area. But my big question is, Why did his party not follow him? The party had 26 years since the last time this country balanced their budget, and I do not know how many years the gentleman has served over there. I know it is many, and I know he has served with distinction. But my question that I would like at some point to be answered is, Why did the gentleman not convince his

own party during the period of time that he served to balance the budget? That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman brings up the point about the interest rates. Do Members want to lower interest rates for the working Joe and working Jane in this country? Then balance this budget. Quit spending more money than you bring in.

There is not a family in America that gets to operate under these fiscal rules. There is not a special district, there is not a city, there is not a county, there is not a State in this country that gets to operate under such crazy fiscal rules. Constantly, for a period of 24 years, you spend more than you bring in.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I just am really taken aback by my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], when he says this rule is not inherently evil. I thought this gentleman wanted this rule in the worst way. I know that the Federal employees that I represent want this rule in the worst way. A number of them on my way to work this morning approached me and said "We hope you can deal with this problem today. Please do not furlough us again next week."

That is exactly what this is meant to do. I understand that Speaker GINGRICH received a call from Air Force One, from the President, last night where they talked about putting together this continuing resolution that was going to continue the Government, keep it working, and that is exactly what we are trying to do here today.

Mr. Speaker, someone, I guess the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] mentioned that this procedure had never been done before.

Mr. HOYER. Prior to June 30.

Mr. SOLOMON. We have a whole list of when it was done in the 103d Congress. Let me just point out, here is a list of all of the vetoes and the veto overrides of all of the Presidents since George Washington.

I have to point out to the gentleman, because I was here during the Reagan years, and all during those Reagan years when you had a very philosophical President with an opposing party in this body of Democrats opposing him, never once did Ronald Reagan fail to sit down and negotiate these appropriation bills that keep the Government functioning. There were several occasions when, for 1 day, we overlapped; in other words, we did not quite make it, but there was no prolonged argument.

Ronald Reagan knew that he had to govern. He recognized that this House of Representatives had control of the pursestrings. Unfortunately, he never accomplished what he wanted to accomplish, because he could not do it

with these Democrats in control of this House.

Let me point out, right now most of the appropriation bills have been enacted into law. There are four major ones that have not. There is one that deals with the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Housing, the National Space Center, the Environmental Protection Agency, and 47 other smaller agencies. We negotiated that with the Senate. There was no holdup over in the other body. We sent that to the President. The President vetoed it, because the cuts were too deep in the Environmental Protection Agency, he said, and a couple of other things.

We told him that there is an increase in medical care delivery systems for veterans of about \$400 million, and we will not negotiate that, because that has to stay. But if you want to shift that spending in the rest of that bill, you do what you want to do. We will reenact the bill and send it to you. That whole portion of the Federal Government will be working, without any question.

The Interior Department appropriations, which funds all the national parks, the Department of Energy, Endowment for the Arts, Endowment for the Humanities, so forth, he said that the cuts were too deep in that. We told him, "Change it any way you want to. We do not care where the funding lies, but as long as you stay on the glide path to the balanced budget." He never gave us any of his recommendations.

Finally, the Commerce, Justice, State Department, that funds the Department of Commerce, Department of State, Department of Justice, he said the cuts were too deep there. Basically, he said, "We cut Commerce, technology, we cut international operations, we cut peacekeeping activities and the Legal Services Corporation too much." So we told him, "Change it any way you want to, as long as you stay in the glide path, and all of those employees will go back to work permanently through September 30, the end of this fiscal year."

I would say to the gentleman, we have been doing everything we could to cooperate, but when you stand here and say this rule is not inherently evil but it is a bad rule, I am willing to put it up to a vote, and let us let whoever wants to vote for it vote for it. But this is a rule that is going to keep this Government functioning for the next 6 weeks so we can try to work out these differences.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Maryland, who knows that I fight for his rights for his employees.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the public, notwithstanding the philosophical differences, the gen-

tleman who chairs the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], and I are good friends, and we work closely together on a number of issues. I respect him, and believe he respects me.

The gentleman raises a number of interesting points. First of all, I do not believe I said this was a bad rule. I said the timing of this rule was historic, and the reason being because we apparently are going to go home, Mr. Speaker. Let me further say that, very frankly, the reason you need this rule is not because there could not be a unanimous consent resolution on our side which says we will keep Government working past the 26th at the levels currently in force, by unanimous consent. You would not need a rule for that.

Mr. MCINNIS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. HOYER. Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the gentleman yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] who yielded to me.

Mr. SOLOMON. Reclaiming my time, I would just continue to yield to the gentleman from Maryland for 30 seconds, but I have to consider the manager of the bill.

The Speaker pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] who has reclaimed the time, and therefore would be the one to yield the time. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], if yielded to, may yield to the gentleman from Maryland for a question.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS].

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman pointed out under Ronald Reagan and George Bush what happened was, because we could not override the President's veto any more than you can override President Clinton's veto, and what happened from our perspective, I tell my friend, the gentleman from New York, is that the Democratic Congress accommodated President Reagan and President Bush on issues on which there was strong feeling on this side, on which the President said he will not sign a bill if it has, for instance, pregnancy termination rights, which was one of the issues on which there was deep difference.

We accommodated the President. Why? Because we could not override the veto, and there was no intent to shut down the Government. I understand what the gentleman is saying. I understand the purpose of this rule, and I understand that if it goes forward, perhaps we could have movement.

Mr. SOLOMON. Vote for the rule. It is a good rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank the gentleman from New York for pointing out that Ronald Reagan signed every appropriation bill, so the next time you hear people say this terrible deficit happened purely because of the Democrats, quote the gentleman from New York. Remind people that the gentleman from New York said that Ronald Reagan and George Bush signed every appropriations bill. No penny was spent during the Reagan and Bush administrations that they did not sign. As my friend, the gentleman from Maryland, points out, in some cases they wanted more spending. So every dollar in the deficit that we have with the joint participation of Reagan, Bush, and the Congress. I appreciate the acknowledgment.

Second, he said we needed this rule to keep the Government open. In the first place, a two-thirds vote would allow us to pass the CR today. If you were not trying to be excessively controversial, you would not need this rule. It is a two-thirds vote. So it is not that we need this rule to pass it today, we need it to do it without a two-thirds vote.

Even more important is this point: Why are we at the point where we need to bring up a complicated policy-oriented continuing resolution and pass it the same day? It is because the other side has been too incompetent.

They have been too incompetent to do it better than this. No; it is not good management to bring it up and vote on it the same day. They have created the crisis by shutting down the Government, by their own internal ideological turmoil, and now they come to us and say "We are going to solve the crisis." They lurch from one self-created crisis to another, and then, like the arsonist who sets the fire, take credit for putting it out. It is a shambles of how to run the place.

Mr. Speaker, I will say, I admire one thing about the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS. At no point has he defended this rule. He has talked about balancing the budget, he has talked about everything else, but in the last couple of conversations he has not defended the rule, because what we have is one more self-created crisis that the Republicans have tried to solve.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate. I am seldom up on a rule. But all of us can see through this rule. We can say whatever we want to say about the rhetoric. All of us understand each other. All of us, 100 percent

of us, want to balance the budget. There is no question about that. The question is balancing the budget in two diverse ways.

For the most part, the people on the Democratic side of the aisle do not want to balance the budget by cutting education, cutting all of Medicaid, cutting all of Medicare, and making sure that people do not have access to clean and safe water. We want considerations.

All of us know that when we start altering the rules of the House, coming up with different rules to get by, it is to muffle those voices. All of us know that the reason why the Government has been shut down is because the attempt has been to pass these drastic, draconian cuts in the continuing resolution. Let us not play games with each other. It is time for us to give the American people a sensible solution, and we cannot do it by forgetting that they exist.

□ 1115

They exist and they need to be given attention. We just cannot steamroll it through and think that we are taking care of the business of the American people. The bulk of the people in this Nation, 80 percent of them, care about the education of their children for the future.

We have all said we need better educated, better trained work forces. How are we going to get them with all of the opportunities to cut, and we know that that is what we are doing in a rule that simply passes all of the philosophical types of draconian cuts in a continuing resolution, knowing full well that we are going to blame the Republicans, because that is where we sincerely feel it is going to be. The Republicans are going to blame the Democrats in saying they do not want to balance the budget.

All of us want to balance the budget and all of us know that. It is the way in which we want to balance it. I would say it is time for us to stop playing games with the public and with ourselves.

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

I would be interested to know how the gentlewoman from Texas voted on the balanced budget amendment, after she stands down here and talks about how everybody supports a balanced budget.

Furthermore, I should point out to the gentlewoman from Texas, with all due respect, she had 26 years to balance the budget her way, 26 years to do something. The gentlewoman had the President of her party last year; she had at least 2 years while I was here to balance this budget.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we might have had 26 years, but the budget was unbalanced during the Reagan-Bush years on the backs of the same people we are victimizing now.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, if I may reclaim my time, I notice I did not get an answer to my question which was, how did the gentlewoman vote on the balanced budget amendment?

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during that 12 years when we went toward a downward spiral, the whole philosophy was trickle-down. We are trying to reinvent that. It does not work. It did not work then; it will not work now.

We cannot victimize and enslave all of the people of this Nation just to say we are balancing the budget to give this tax break to the wealthy. It will not work.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I assume that answer means the gentlewoman voted "no" on the balanced budget.

Let me move on to the rule. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] stated that we have never before June 30 ever had the same-day two-thirds requirement waived, and my good friend, the gentleman from the Committee on Rules, stated another statement similar to that. But I felt in order to be more credible up here I would use your statistics on has this occurred before.

Waivers of the two-thirds vote requirement for same-day rules in the 103d Congress before June 30: House Resolution 61, Family Medical Leave Act, February 3, 1993. House Resolution 111, emergency unemployment, March 3, 1993. House Resolution 142, budget resolution, March 30, 1993. House Resolution 150, supplemental appropriations, April 1, 1993. House Resolution 153, supplemental appropriations, April 21, 1993. I go on. House Resolution 322. House Resolution 356. Emergency supplemental appropriations. House Resolution 395.

The point that I am making here is that it is somewhat incredible for Members I guess opposed to this rule, and I am not even sure they are opposed to the rule, to show up at the microphone and say we are setting history or a new precedent. This whole book, which is your statistics, is full of the precedent.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have a management tool. I believe last night, if I heard the gentleman correctly and I will yield to him so he has an opportunity to correct me if I am wrong, but last night in the Committee on Rules the gentleman said, we understand the need for management. This went out of the Committee on Rules unanimously. There were not these kind of eloquent speeches last night in the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, the bills that my friend speaks of were single-purpose bills. This is a general bill that would allow anything to happen. Those were specific reasons to waive the two-thirds rule, but anything could be waived under this.

Yes, last night, we did not want to present an obstacle by raising any ruckus in the Committee on Rules, but that does not mean that we voted in favor of it; we just did not raise any opposition.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that first of all to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the waiver is very specific. He said it is not specific at all. It is very specific.

Second of all, I guess the gentleman is going to sing in a different tune now. I do not remember that when he said prior to June 30 he specified it or restricted it to certain conditions or a single subject. The fact is we had this rule for a purpose. The rule was not just created last night in the Committee on Rules, it is there as a management tool.

One of our responsibilities in the Committee on Rules is to manage these bills primarily today so that we can keep the Government operating, which is a concern of everybody in this Chamber.

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

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

I do not want to prolong the management tool. I mean, we can chop down a cherry tree with an ax or we can knock it over with a bulldozer. I think this is not a general-purpose, two-thirds waiver. Anything, any budget, any bill could be taken up in the same day.

As I say, the matters that the gentleman from Colorado referred to were specific instances in the two-thirds vote that was waived for that specific instance.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I find this interesting because maybe somewhere on this floor there is this bill that we are talking about, but I cannot find it. My understanding is we now have this martial law rule for a bill that is not here. So after we pass this, then I guess we are going to go into recess while they are still writing it.

Someone told me that there have now been over 30 different versions of this bill, and we have not seen it yet. Maybe that is misinformation. But what we are doing is giving permission for them to write anything they want, bring it here and then it is take it or leave it, or shut the Government down again.

Mr. Speaker, I do not really care what George Washington did, nor do my constituents today. They do not want a history lesson. They want to know what we are going to do today, and they are a little tired of the fact that we have wasted almost \$2 billion of their money on this stop and start of the Federal Government, and we are about to do it the third time.

The gentleman from Colorado, I guess it was the gentleman from New York, said Federal employees want this in the worst way. That is right. They are in the worst way. It gets shut down tomorrow if we do not do this. So we are being told as Members of the House, accept this bill that we have not shown you yet, give us this rule to bring it up any way we want, and then take it or leave it one more time. I do not think that is the democratic process.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the reason that this rule is being put forth today is because obviously, I say to my colleague, the reason you put the martial law issue, at some point you want to decide you want to end the debate, you want to stifle debate and you do not want to allow alternatives, you do not want to allow amendments. We were here and we are here today because apparently at one time there was just a high principle of 7 years, CBO-scored and a balanced budget. Apparently that all evaporated sometime Tuesday night.

What we now find out is that 7 years is no longer important; CBO is no longer important; a balanced budget is no longer important. The authentic revolutionary who stood there the first day of the session in the chair of the Speaker has now become an incrementalist. Because the Speaker has now become an incrementalist, they now want to stifle the debate. They were willing to throw people out of their jobs, at risk in the Social Security system, at risk in the AFDC payment system. They were going to put them all at risk because they were going to save this country with the 7-year CBO balanced budget. Today they want to take it off the floor, they want to deny the President \$700 billion in savings that he has already agreed to. They do not want to give us the alternative for \$700 billion in savings.

What they want to do is patch up the system in the same old way of business as usual. That is why they need martial law, because if they do not have martial law, they have to accept amendments, they have to accept debate, and they have to accept the discussion. But they brought in their freshmen, they said there was nothing more important to the country.

Well, they have just decided that apparently something else is more impor-

tant, and that is apparently the tax cut or patching up this system and getting out of town for a month and not coming back. They would rather get out of town than have a debate about whether or not we should still go for the hundreds of billions of dollars in savings that this administration has already agreed to. That is why they need martial law. And they should be denied martial law.

As was pointed out, they have martial law for a bill that we have not even written yet. That is not the democratic process, that is not an open process, and that does not allow for comment. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the gentleman from California hit it right on the head. That is exactly what is happening here. We are asked to be able to bring this thing to the floor because if we do not take it, by gosh, the Government shuts down tomorrow, and guess what? We are going to be out of town, because they are planning to go off again for another 3 weeks or whatever it is. I think that is absolutely ridiculous.

What is really happening is, if we vote for this rule, what we are voting for is the right for them to write anything they want in some dark room somewhere. I happen to believe government is not a fungus, it can thrive in sunshine, and then they can bring it out here and say you either have to agree to what we wrote in the dark room with none of you around, or we go down on the Government for the third time.

Let us be real clear. That is what it is about. It is not about how many vetoes George Washington had or anything else. This is about the fact that they are all over the lot over on that side.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is about the fact that they have had the most massive meltdown in failure on their side after putting people at risk in this country that now what they want is a minimalist bill and get out of town. This is about just getting out of town so that nobody will discover that they have dramatically changed apparently the priorities of this Nation. They have gone from a balanced budget to business as usual.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his statement, because I think that is absolutely right. People are already out of this Chamber. I wish I knew, I wish I had the bloodhounds to go find out where they are meeting and where we are now having the rewrite of this bill or whatever it is. But if this rule passes, then we are going to be

faceted with having a bill out here with whatever they put in it. It is going to be one more manufactured crisis. And do not forget, we are now in the fourth or fifth month of this fiscal year without having our work done. That is unbelievable. I think the American people are sick and tired of it.

I think that to constantly manufacture these crises is costing us a tremendous amount of money. As I say, now they are saying almost \$2 billion for these prior shutdowns, and then putting it here where we either take it or leave it or one more time we go through this. We look terrible in this country. I have never seen this done before.

Now, I must say, on the other hand, I am one of the people who is retiring and I am sitting here in the front row thinking, why am I giving this job up? This is great. You get great pay, you show up 3 days a month. This is fabulous. You do not have to make decisions on anything. They do martial law, they go meet somewhere, they bring it out here, you duck, you do not have any responsibility, but that is not what the democratic process is about. It is not about giving people permission to meet in dark rooms and do what they want.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would ask the gentlewoman, is the thrust of this rule to give even more power to a Speaker who already has extraordinary power?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from Texas asks a very good question. I do not know where this meeting is going on, and I do not know why we do not have the bill in front of us that this rule affects.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman would yield further, this rule is for a bill that we do not have.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would say in response to the gentleman, we do not have it on our side. And I ask if anybody had it over there. I do not see it on the table; nobody seems to be coming up with it.

My understanding is that we are going to vote for this rule that will allow whatever bill they are now writing. Whether it is in the Speaker's office or someplace else to come up and be immediate law and, once we vote on this rule, we will all go into recess for a while, do special orders until they finally get it written. But I do not think there are any Democrats in the room, I can tell you that. I do not know who is in that room, I do not even know where the room is, but I know we should be debating here in public those issues.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would continue to yield, I heard the Speaker of the House, who will have extraordinary power, announce last night on national television that his effort to dismantle

Medicare this year has failed and that he is giving up on it.

What I do not understand is why he is walking away from a balanced budget as well. He talks about some minimal down payment at a time we ought to be bringing the whole budget deficit down without bringing Medicare down with it. Is that not involved centrally, and the reason they want to walk out of town rather than debate what this is all really about?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I guess so. I am very troubled by that. I am also very troubled by the fact that Moody's came out and said they are close to making the bonds of this great Nation almost the junk bond. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to play fast and loose with the credit rating of this great Nation, which has never been done before, and what they are doing is, they are meeting somewhere we do not know. And we are supposed to give them authority to do anything. We get out of town, and then who knows if the credit rating sinks or falls? I do not know. I am very confused about that.

I do not know why the Speaker would say that on public television and not be willing to come here and defend it.

□ 1130

Mr. DOGGETT. They may well take us, in the month of February, right to brink of fiscal disaster, to default on this Government's full faith and credit. And when they get there to the cliff, if they mishandle this whole issue of Government default the way they have mishandled the governance in this House for the last year where they have accomplished so little after expending so much time here on the floor of this House, then we may actually fall into default.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is right. This is just one crisis after another, all artificially manufactured.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] has expired.

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

For the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Texas who just spoke, I want to assist the gentleman a little. We are not talking about a rule on a bill. The gentleman's procedure, if he was following procedure, we are discussing a rule on a rule. I just want to point that out to the gentleman from Texas.

The gentlewoman from Colorado, of course, stands up and talks about the gentlewoman is leaving the U.S. Congress and that we get great pay back here. I would also remind the gentlewoman we have great retirement funds back here.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. No, the gentlewoman has had her time. All of you have had

your time. In fact, your time has expired.

To the gentleman from California, if the Republicans did nothing else this year, just to hear the gentlewoman from Colorado and the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Massachusetts talk about a balanced budget is a victory for this country.

We have had lots of debate. We have had more debate in 1 day, and I bet some days we have had more debate in 1 hour than the Democratic Congress has had in 26 years. You have had an opportunity to do this. We are trying to reverse that.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. The gentlewoman has had her opportunity with time. The gentlewoman took several minutes up there. The gentleman's time has expired. I ask that she allow me to continue with my time which I intend to do.

There was some statement made about martial law. The gentleman from California talked about martial law. I wonder if the gentleman from California made those same kinds of allegations to the Democrats, the distinguished Democrats who serve on the Rules Committee. I wonder what their feeling would be if the gentleman from California went up to these four Democratic Members who last night voted unanimously by voice vote for this rule, went up and said, "You just put in the Marshall plan," or, "You put in martial law." Of course, he is not going to say that to them. What are they doing? It is rhetoric.

Mr. Speaker, this rule has been used on a regular basis, and I gave citations, statistics to the Democrats. It is a management tool; it is a rule on a rule. Now the gentlewoman brought up the issue, what about the bill?

The bill is not here because right now negotiations are going on with the administration, in good faith, to determine what the administration can live with and what they cannot live with. Once we determine some kind of an agreement, we will get it over here because we do not want this Government to shut down.

It is a waste of our resources to go ahead today and slap a bill together without consulting with the Democratic administration, sending it over there and finding out the President is not going to approve it. Come on. We need to work as a team, and that is what we are encouraging. The Committee on Rules last night worked as a team. That is why this came out as a unanimous vote. I think that all of us should work unanimously to try to get our business done today so that we can keep the Government open tomorrow.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Could the gentleman from Colorado at least tell us where they are meeting?

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] will not yield.

Mr. MCINNIS. Addressing the gentlewoman from Colorado once again, the gentlewoman has had her time. The gentlewoman knows we are each allotted an equal amount of time. You have consumed all of your time; we now wish to continue with the allotted time we have.

Mr. Speaker, let me repeat another important part of the rule. We got somewhat diverted on the balanced budget issues. We went the whole spectrum, from there to whether this rule has been utilized. We covered the spectrum of the balanced budget, we talked about retirement pay, we talked about pay increases.

Let me refocus this issue back on the rule. It is a rule on rules, and it says, in our rule, this narrow waiver will only apply to special rules providing for the consideration or disposition of measures, amendments, conference reports or items in disagreement from a conference that makes general appropriations for fiscal year 1996, include provisions for making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 1996, or any bill or joint resolution that includes provisions increasing or waiving the public debt limit.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I will not yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

What I think is important is that the Rules Committee is ably represented from the Democratic side, at least during the period of time that I have been able to serve on that committee. I can assure my colleagues that at any time when I was present, I have attended almost all of the meetings, at any time that I was present when members of the Democratic side felt that a rule was somewhat unfair, was somewhat nondemocratic, even had the slightest inkling of cutting the Democratic side short, they opposed it and they debated and they were well within their rights to do it, and I would say they did it, I think, very profoundly.

Last night we did not have that. Last night, not one Democratic member of that Committee on Rules stood up and made any of the kind of statement that we heard from the gentleman from California or from Maryland or Massachusetts or the gentlewoman from Colorado.

They understood last night, we need this as a management tool. They understood we need to put the Government back to work. They understood that it took teamwork. They understood that it was going to take cooperation. That is why this rule passed with a unanimous vote and not only did it pass with a unanimous vote, it passed with a voice vote.

What has happened today, what we have witnessed today, is some people who—by the way, many of the people who spoke today did not take the time last night to come to the Committee

on Rules, to attend that Committee on Rules and see what was said. Instead today they have tried to divert from a procedure and try and get into peripheral arguments dealing with everything from the Marshall plan to the history of pay of the Congress, to how many days the U.S. Congress works.

This debate today is on a rule. This is a procedural debate. I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote for this rule and to follow the lead of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 229, nays 191, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—229

Allard	Crapo	Hancock
Army	Cremeans	Hansen
Bachus	Cubin	Hastert
Baker (CA)	Cunningham	Hastings (WA)
Baker (LA)	Davis	Hayes
Ballenger	Deal	Hayworth
Barr	DeLay	Hefley
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Heineman
Bartlett	Dickey	Heller
Barton	Doolittle	Higley
Bass	Dornan	Hobson
Bateman	Dreier	Hoekstra
Bereuter	Duncan	Hoke
Bilbray	Dunn	Horn
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Hostettler
Bliley	Ehrlich	Houghton
Blute	Emerson	Hunter
Boehert	English	Hutchinson
Boehner	Ensign	Hyde
Bonilla	Everett	Inglis
Bono	Ewing	Istook
Brownback	Fawell	Johnson (CT)
Bryant (TN)	Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam
Bunn	Flanagan	Jones
Bunning	Foley	Kasich
Burr	Forbes	Kelly
Burton	Fowler	Kim
Buyer	Fox	King
Callahan	Franks (CT)	Kingston
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Knollenberg
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kolbe
Campbell	Frisa	LaHood
Canady	Funderburk	Largent
Castle	Galleghy	Latham
Chabot	Ganske	LaTourette
Chambliss	Gekas	Laughlin
Christensen	Gilchrest	Lazio
Chryslers	Gillmor	Leach
Clinger	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Coble	Goodlatte	Lewis (KY)
Coburn	Goodling	Lightfoot
Collins (GA)	Goss	Linder
Combest	Graham	Livingston
Cooley	Greenwood	LoBiondo
Cox	Gunderson	Longley
Crane	Gutknecht	Lucas

Manzullo	Quillen
Martini	Quinn
McCollum	Radanovich
McCrery	Ramstad
McHugh	Regula
McInnis	Riggs
McIntosh	Roberts
McKeon	Rogers
Metcalf	Rohrabacher
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen
Mica	Roth
Miller (FL)	Roukema
Molinari	Royce
Moorhead	Salmon
Morella	Sanford
Myers	Saxton
Myrick	Scarborough
Nethercutt	Schaefer
Neumann	Schiff
Ney	Seastrand
Norwood	Sensenbrenner
Nussle	Shadegg
Oxley	Shaw
Packard	Shays
Parker	Shuster
Paxon	Skeen
Petri	Smith (MI)
Pombo	Smith (NJ)
Porter	Smith (TX)
Portman	Smith (WA)
Pryce	Solomon

NAYS—191

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

Williams	Wise	Wynn
Wilson	Woolsey	Yates
NOT VOTING—13		
Archer	Lewis (GA)	Waxman
Chapman	McDade	Wyden
Chenoweth	Serrano	Young (AK)
Jefferson	Waldholtz	
Klug	Waters	

□ 1158

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts 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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 17, I wish to be recorded as voting "yes." My vote was missed because I was detained by a medical emergency.

□ 1200

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the Chair if the rules of the House would permit the clerks to move their chairs over a little bit, so that Members who wish to sign Discharge Petition No. 8 will have plenty of room. I see there are many standing there to sign the Discharge Petition No. 8, if they could move over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair believes there is sufficient room.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will now entertain 1-minute and special orders without prejudice to further legislative business later today.

NOW IS THE TIME TO WORK TOGETHER TO RAISE THE DEBT CEILING

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, the other evening, on Tuesday night, the President said, "Let us work together," on many things. Now is the time to work together to make sure that we increase the debt limit that needs to be done so that the financial conditions of many, not only of the U.S. Government, but of many of our municipalities, our States, and even some of my school districts that have Treasury bonds, do not have their bond rating reduced.

Mr. Speaker, we can work together to do this. All we have to do is come

forward and sign the Discharge Petition No. 8 that provides that we will have before this House a clean debt limit extension so that we can do it and we can get past this hurdle.

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that if we do not do this, that under the leadership of our Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], we are not going to get it done, and we are going to see a chaotic financial condition throughout this country for no purpose whatsoever.

There is no reason that we cannot increase the debt limit and do it now. Now is the time to do it, not to wait until the Government has to default on their bonds.

So if Members want to prevent that from happening, the easiest way to do it is to sign Discharge Petition No. 8. Any Member can sign it. They do not have to be a Democrat; Republicans can sign it, and I welcome Republicans to sign the discharge petition.

INCREASE IN DEBT CEILING MUST BE LINKED TO BALANCED BUDGET COMMITMENT

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the President the other night asked for a clean increase in the debt ceiling. Prior to coming to Congress, I was a practicing physician. I treated a lot of people with not only medical problems, but also with some psychological and emotional problems. One of the things that I did occasionally see is people with serious gambling problems, and the last thing that I would ever recommend for a bank to do would be to give somebody with a gambling problem a line of credit.

Mr. Speaker, we have a President that does not want to balance the budget. He has fought us on balancing the budget, he has fought us on welfare reform, he has fought us on tax cuts, even though he cannot pay for all of those things; and now he wants us to give a clean increase in the debt ceiling so that he can go on his merry way with liberal tax-and-spend programs, the programs that have driven this country almost into bankruptcy, 5 trillion dollars' worth of debt, \$18,000 for every man, woman, and child.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to increase the debt ceiling, we need to get on the road to balancing the budget and not fairy tale stories about balancing the budget, not saying that we support the balanced budget and then opposing it for the last year, like he has.

HONORING PAST COMMITMENTS IS NOT A GAMBLING DISORDER

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to give a 1-minute at this point in time, but the previous speaker is brandnew to the House, and very frankly, he is incorrect, totally, absolutely incorrect. I hope his advice as a physician was far better for his patients than his advice just now in his 1-minute.

The extension of the debt limit has to do with policies that were signed by Ronald Reagan and George Bush, as well as previously adopted policies of this Congress. Not prospective. Not prospective.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman does not want to pay Social Security on March 1, I understand that. He can get up and say that. If he does not want to pay veterans' benefits that are committed and expected, I understand that, and he can get up and say that. But to imply for 1 second that extending the debt limit so that America can pay its bills that it has already incurred is somehow like giving a person that has a gambling disorder additional money is totally, absolutely inaccurate and unfortunate.

REVIEW OF PAST DEBT EXTENSIONS

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], my neighbor and good friend.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be good for all of us to review exactly where we have been in debt extensions: Since 1980, H.R. 7428, a debt extension with increases in the import fee. In 1985, H.R. 3721, a debt ceiling increase with an increase in the cigarette tax and expanded benefits for unemployed.

In House Resolution 372, debt extension with a Gramm-Rudman attached. In 1986, debt extension with budget reconciliation, with a large increase in social spending.

In 1987, a long-term debt limit extension with liberal modifications to Gramm-Rudman. It goes on and on. We have tied everything in the past to debt ceilings that we wanted to get a President that did not pay attention. This is going to continue.

APPEAL FOR A CLEAN DEBT LIMIT EXTENSION

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker has been here only 3 years, the same as I, but in the last

several months he voted three times to extend the debt limit.

In his budget reconciliation bill, in these budget bills, in these horrendous bills that the other side put forward to give \$245 billion in tax breaks to the wealthiest and cut Medicare and Medicaid, Mr. Speaker, if we look in those bills, three times my Republican colleagues have already voted to extend the debt limit. So what is the problem? Give us a cleaner CR. Let us increase the debt limit.

The other speakers would say we are spending money prospectively. Brimley School District in the Upper Peninsula is waiting for its \$600,000 impact aid payment it cannot have because the other side will not pass a full, clean CR. They will not pass a debt limit extension. They will just sit on their hands as this school district has to go out and borrow money to stay afloat; while they stand here and say, "We never did this." But my Republican colleagues have done it three times already this year.

Mr. Speaker, let us be honest with the American people. Let us get a clean bill up here. Let us get a clean CR and let us raise the debt limit, as they have already voted to do three times.

CONGRESS SHOULD SUPPORT SANCTIONS AGAINST CASTRO

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today because a most distinguished colleague of ours took the floor earlier this morning and said that he had a meeting with dissidents in Havana, Cuba, last week, and he mentioned a couple of names of dissidents who were opposed to our sanctions against Castro.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to mention those names and not mention that in that same meeting, in that same meeting, the most prestigious members of the internal opposition of Cuba came out in favor of sanctions and in favor of our Helms-Burton bill. I think that is only fair to mention.

It is also fair, and I have got the names. I only have 1 minute, so I will submit them into the RECORD. I have the names of those people who got up and told our colleague that they supported sanctions. Also, another most prestigious member, Osvaldo Paya Sardinias, when an aide of our colleague wanted a show of hands, said, "That's an internal intervention into our affairs and if the Congressmen of the United States want to support Cuba, they should support the internal opposition, support democracy, and start getting on the issue or putting pressure on Castro," like we have done on other dictatorships in the past, such as South Africa or Chile.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to set this record straight.

RUSSIAN ROULETTE POLITICS CAN BRING NATION DOWN

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, let us recognize what is going to happen in the next few weeks if this debt limit is not extended. We are going to raise the cost, if the interest rates in this country go up just 1 percent, the average cost of a home mortgage will go up \$1,200. The cost of borrowing by the Federal Government will go up by \$150 billion; more than our entire education budget in the course of the next 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues are talking about fiddling with the fundamental economic system that this world has developed to pay its bills. What we can have here is the extremism of the Republicans. Not that they want just a balanced budget, which I want; not just a balanced budget scored by CBO, which I want; but, they want their particular version of the balanced budget or else they say they are going to send the entire debt of the United States of America into default.

Mr. Speaker, it is blackmail. It is the kind of Russian roulette politics that brings a nation down, and does not make it greater. We have a Constitution in this country that divides power between the President and the Congress, the House and the Senate. Let that policy of compromise move forward. Do not let one particular group of freshmen Republicans put their extremist views on the people of this country.

MEMBERS' PIQUE OVER TRAVEL OFFICE FIRINGS DOES NOT INCLUDE PRE-CHRISTMAS FIRINGS OF HOUSE EMPLOYEES

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday about two dozen Republican Members of the House Government Operations Committee told the former members of the travel office how mortified they were, how terrible they felt that they had lost their jobs. Of course, all of them but Mr. Dale have gotten other jobs. Mr. Dale has some serious management problems and some indictable offenses that he is dealing with. But none of these Members raised a pique when 11 people who worked for the Clerk's office were fired before Christmas. One guy had four little children. They do not care what happened to him.

Mr. Speaker, they were given no justification; just fired so that the House

management would not have to pay for the comp time those people had earned by working late hours. That is why. Because we voted to apply private sector laws to the Congress. Because we did, they did not want it to apply to them and so they fired them before Christmas.

But, Mr. Speaker, not one peep in their defense. Not one peep. What hypocrisy.

□ 1215

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). 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.

FULFILLING OUR RESPONSIBILITIES

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 of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think that once again it is important to explain to the American people really what is going on in this body. The American people have sent us to work. There are millions and millions of citizens every day going to work. They hold in this body a great deal of trust. The responsibility of funding and financing this Nation, of ensuring defense, of presiding over the commerce and making sure that the economy is both healthy and provides opportunity for jobs belongs to this Congress. Yet now we find on January 25 we do not have a budget, primarily because the Republican majority never completed the task of providing the right appropriations bill in early fall of 1995.

We find now that we are discussing not lifting the debt ceiling limit and frivolously bringing this Nation to the brink of economic destruction. We have six former Secretaries of the Treasury who have indicated that, if we do not lift this debt ceiling and default on the full faith and credit of these United States, we will send this Nation into a tailspin that will be comparable to the Depression of the 1930's. Yet, we find that being still raised as a possibility by the leadership of the Republican majority.

My plea is not personally. It is not a personal plea. I will be here to work, for it is the duty I owe to my constituents and my responsibility is to be here in the U.S. Congress to ensure that we have a budget. My plea is for those Social Security recipients on March 1 who will not get their checks. My plea is for the veterans who will not get their checks on March 1. And my plea, again, is for the Bosnian troops who will not get their checks on March 1.

It is for the working man and woman, who have a variety of credit cards. They might not want all those credit cards, but on each one is an interest amount. That will go up if we do not raise the debt ceiling by a certain period of time. So will the consumer loans, so will the education loans, all of that, the interest will be outrageous.

I do not believe that there has been a great deal of compromise to date. Much of the media reported the fact that the President spent most of the holiday in one-on-one meetings with the Republican majority leadership of the House to discuss saving Medicare, to discuss saving Medicaid, to discuss saving education opportunities for our young people and protecting the environment and to discuss balancing the budget.

Many great leaders have fallen over the last couple of weeks, and most of them were the kind of leaders who said government is not a win/win situation; government is the art of compromise and the ability to work together. Government should not allow diverse interests, singular interests to take over, but it should work toward common ground, focus, funnel your energies toward what is best for all of America.

I stand before this House because I am saddened as a freshman to believe that we have forgotten the Founding Fathers' wisdom, for we would imagine that they did not have the strength of mind to understand that this Nation would be some 200 million citizens plus when only at that time there were some 4 million in a few colonies.

They had a vision by establishing a presidency, the judiciary and these bodies of Congress, both House and Senate. They gave us our special responsibilities, the House being in control of the purse strings, getting through the budget and ensuring that this Nation stood strong with a solid economy.

Yet, I believe that the Republican leadership has forgotten the words and wisdom of our Founding Fathers, and that was that these bodies of government should work together, that we should not overtake each other but, in fact, in our own wisdom and responsibilities, we should each play our role. The President having responsibility for all of this country, and we, as a collective body, representing our constituents, coming together for the best common good.

This has not happened. So my challenge is that we must pass a clean resolution that lifts the debt ceiling to ensure that veterans are paid, to ensure that Social Security payments are made, that the troops who are laying their life on the line in Bosnia are paid and their families back home are protected and that we never, never, never again shut this Government down. We owe this not only to our working Americans but to all America, because it is a tragedy that we have forgotten

the words of our Founding Fathers that we are to work for the common good and together. We must do that.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, here we go again. There are not many on the floor again. We are not doing anything. Day before yesterday we did a few minor bills. Yesterday we did one conference report that everybody basically agreed with, very few Members disagreed with.

What have we done so far today? Nothing. What are we going to do today? I do not know.

Talk about lunacy. A mental institution, that is what this is. I never saw any place that operates like this. There is one Member, we are supposed to take up a continuing resolution today to continue the operations of the Federal Government that are not funded because the Republicans have not passed the appropriation bills. They have been working behind closed doors, some of them, maybe 5 or 10 of them at the most, not one Democrat, not one member of the public, not one member of the media has been working on that bill. Nobody knows what is in it.

I have been told that there is one Democrat, one that just recently got a copy of what he thinks might be the latest version, which has gone through many changes on what they are proposing to do this afternoon to keep the Federal Government open.

It is very easy. All they have to do is come up here with a resolution that is clean and says that the Government shall be funded, those that are not shall be funded continuously for another 30 days, 60 days, up to September 30, anything they want to do. That is all they have to do. And it will pass here overwhelmingly. It will pass the Senate and the President will sign it and we can get out of here. But, no, not the way they are going to do it. It is lunacy.

What they are going to do is come up here with something nobody has seen. I doubt if one Member that is sitting here from the other party can tell me what is in that resolution. The gentleman from Michigan, can you tell me? No. The other gentleman from Michigan? No. None of them can. They cannot tell us. They do not know what is in it. I will yield to them. I want them to tell me what is in that continuing resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

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

I wanted you to know, it is not totally perfected yet. It is a continuing resolution. My understanding is it will go to March 15. It takes those appropriation bills the President has vetoed. It reinstates some of that funding to give the President another chance to keep Government open. It takes targeted legislation at appropriations that are going to extend all the way through the rest of this fiscal year.

Mr. VOLKMER. Do you know the ones that are being targeted and the ones that are not being targeted?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the argument is still going on, including Democrats in that argument, but the fact is, no, I do not know the final resolution of that bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. None of us know.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and I have been to quite a few meetings. When were these appropriations bills due?

Mr. VOLKMER. They were due to be done by September 30. We all know that. The American public does not know. They think that we as Democrats have had something to do with the closing of the Federal Government. We do not have anything to do with it. We cannot write the legislation. We cannot bring the legislation. It is only those Republican members who can do it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, there was a rumor out earlier today, they seem to persist around here, that they were on the 30th resolution of this CR and had not come up with one that is acceptable even for the Republican Party.

Mr. VOLKMER. The 30th draft.

Mr. HEFNER. Hopefully we will get there when we get to—

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to mention one other thing, folks, that is going on here that they are planning to do, this great majority that is running this Congress. They cannot get a dang thing done. I could use a harder word but it is not permissible on the House floor.

They did not do anything the first session. You can look at the total bills that they passed. It is the worst record since 1933. Do you know what these, I do not know what you call them, people are proposing to do today? They are going to finally bring in something here that asks us to vote for it, which we have never seen, and then they are going to say, OK, bye-bye, we are going.

They are going to send it to the Senate. They do not know what the Senate is going to do with it. And if the Senate does not pass it that way, because it has to be done that way, you cannot change one t in it, one i in it, one pe-

riod in it. If they do not take it, then the Government closes down. They are not going to stay here to wait and see if they can work something out with the Senate. No, they want to leave here. Get out of here.

I say stay here, stay here until we make sure that the Senate does it. And if the Senate does not do it, we work it out with the Senate. And then after it is all worked out and we know if it takes until tomorrow we know then that the Federal Government is going to continue to operate, then we do it.

But the way you are proposing to do it, you are saying to the Senate, take it or leave it. I do not think the Senate is going to do that.

BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also say, let us stay here, let us resolve the issue. It seems to me that again we need a review of what is happening with this budget process.

The Democrats criticize the Republicans for probably biting off more than they can chew in terms of spending cuts. As it turned out, those Democrats were probably right. We had a lot of ideas that we wanted to accomplish to bring spending under control. But, Mr. Speaker, I say to the American citizens, wake up, America.

Anybody under 50 years old better start putting in some studying time on what is happening to this Federal budget, what is happening to overspending, overtaxing and overborrowing, because it is going to affect your lives. It is going to affect your kids' lives. We have now mounted a huge Federal debt of \$4.9 trillion, plus the extra \$100 billion that Secretary Rubin has creatively come up with that is no less an obligation of this country to pay back.

We are looking at a situation now where we have made such huge promises in social programs that we cannot afford to pay for them. Civil service retirement has an unfunded liability or a so-called actuary debt of a half a trillion dollars; Medicare, \$5 trillion actuary debt; Social Security, \$3.2 trillion actuary debt.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 1230

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be argumentative. I will not speak about the CR as such. I want to speak just a minute about the debt limit. I would like to make a point. The gentleman is a man of real intelligence and very well respected here.

On the extension of the debt limit, absolutely we have no choices, it has to

be done. We have spent the money in my district, in your district, in 435 districts around this country. Every Member of this Congress has something in his district that calls for Federal funds. We have to do that. Why are we making such a production and tying this up? Because it has to be done. It is just like death and taxes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, it is a moral obligation to pay the bills we owe. Why it is reasonable to attach the debt limit to the consideration of an overhaul of spending is because Congress has lost its control over spending for 50 percent of what this Government spends. Those are now on automatic pilot in the so-called welfare and entitlement programs. Those programs are the biggest reason that we need additional debt limit in the future. So it is reasonable to tie these two together.

I mentioned earlier today, Mr. Speaker, in a 1-minute, all of the previous debt limit extensions forcing Presidents to do things that they did not otherwise want to do by increasing taxes. The most recent, of course, was the 1993 bill, where we had the largest tax increase in history, but also George Bush in 1990, where the large tax increase was tied to that debt limit extension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point, the question is really this: Mr. President, why did you not submit the balanced budget that you submitted on January 6 on December 15, and then the Federal Government would not have been shut down? It was available to them since last July, because it was the budget of Senator DASCHLE. We would have been able to keep the Government employees working and we would have kept the Government going.

So whose fault is it that this Government shutdown happened? Clearly, the President could have submitted that budget. Clearly, he could have kept the Government running. Most importantly, he could have kept his word to the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely correct. The eastern media do not say it, but it takes two to tango. We need to bring both sides to this table. If we are serious about a balanced budget, we can do it. The fact is that it is much easier to say you want a balanced budget than to come up with the spending cuts to do it. It is too easy for the other side to demagog every spending cut, to go to that interest group and say, Look at these mean-spirited Republicans and what they are doing to you.

Mr. Speaker, we have overcommitted ourselves. We are no longer the rich

Nation we were. If people under 50 years old want anything left in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the kinds of programs that we should be running, it is important that we start being reasonable. We not only reduce spending and stop deficit overspending, but we start paying back some of that huge, huge debt that we already owe.

Mr. CHRYSLER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, we have put forth a bipartisan budget. Every budget that we have submitted in this Congress has had bipartisan support, where the President, who has now submitted five budgets, has yet to receive the first Democrat and/or Republican and/or independent vote for any of the budgets that he has supported.

So, certainly, we have a good, strong bipartisan effort, and I think that is what we are going to see come to the floor in the next few weeks, and the President has yet to get his first vote for anything.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are two numbers that I think the American people and all of us should remember about the President's budget. One number is \$300 billion, one number is \$200 billion. He spends \$300 billion more than Republicans. He increases or has higher taxes, \$200 billion more, than the Republican proposal.

CUTTING BUDGET DEFICITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight here, talking about all the budgets the President has submitted. If you want to be honest about this thing, in all honesty, the budget you people offered there was not the President's budget. You made a big to-do about it. You took some numbers out of some statements that were made. It was not a budget that was offered by the President of the United States. That is totally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when you wanted to rewrite history, you offered a budget. The budget passed. The President vetoed it. You went into deliberations with the President of the United States. You said, "We will not talk anymore until the President offers a balanced budget scored by CBO." That was the big argument in this House and in the Senate and across this country, scored by CBO.

The President came up with a budget that was scored by CBO. It was not to your liking, so you said, "No, that is not good enough. You have to move closer to where we want to go. And if you do not, if you do not accept our deal, there will be no deal and we will shut the Government down."

Let us not rewrite history here in these 5-minute speeches. The President in good faith offered a 7-year budget scored by CBO. The President stood in this well on his State of the Union Address and said, "We have got enough cuts to balance the budget in 7 years." Why do you not agree to take these cuts and balance the budget, and then we will talk about these philosophical arguments later?

You mention Medicare, you mention Social Security, you mention Medicaid. When you start talking about these programs, gentlemen, I hate to say it, but you do not have any credibility. You opposed all of these programs since their inception. You opposed Social Security, you opposed Medicare, and one of the candidates for President of the United States, our dear Senator from the other body said, "Thirty-five years ago I stood and said it would not work. I fought Medicare." Your Speaker of this House said, "It is going to die on the vine. Medicare, we hope it dies on the vine." Your majority leader said, "Social Security should never have been established." So your record ain't good on these programs.

If you want to talk about philosophy and these things, we can talk about that, but there is a proposal that the President of the United States has offered that balances the budget in 7 years, and it is scored by CBO.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

My good friend from Michigan is a wonderful Member, and I am very fond of him. But his memory is short; it tends to be a little on the convenient side. The gentleman has forgotten where this big debt came from.

When Jimmy Carter left office and Ronald Reagan came in, the national debt of the United States was \$700 billion. With Reagan's first budget, the so-called Gramm-Latta budget, Democrats over here warned that the practical consequences of that was going to be that it was going to enormously increase the debt because it immensely increased military expenditures, cut expenses in other programs slightly, and gave a massive tax cut to the well-to-do.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, the national debt by the time that Mr. Reagan left office went from \$700 billion to \$4.5 trillion. It multiplied somewhere between 5 and 7 times.

My Republican colleagues, in talking about debt, deficits, and fiscal irresponsibility, forget the fact that it was their budget. They also forget the fact that the Democrats during that period of time who controlled the House cut, cut the Reagan budgets by \$49 billion, and they reapportioned the money so we spent less on defense and we spent more on environment, on health, on

senior citizens, on education, and on things that are really important to the long life of this country.

I want to tell my good friend something else. He is complaining about the entitlement programs. The Republicans on this side of the aisle came up with a great idea, that cost-of-living should be included in Social Security. Up until that time, the Congress always raised Social Security payments and adjusted the income and the outgo so that the two figures would be roughly in balance, and so that the fund would remain safe and secure and solvent. There was a congressionally managed program, which we managed very carefully.

My Republican colleagues did not like voting on that, and they figured that the best way they could get out of casting that vote was to then tie it to the cost-of-living, so that is how Social Security began to get out of balance, because my Republican colleagues came up with a splendid idea that Social Security should become essentially a pay-as-you-go, rather than a trust fund program. That is why we have that program to address today. That is why the budget is in such a mess.

AMENDING TITLE XI, D.C. CODE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak today on a bill that we have introduced, H.R. 1855. This is a bill that amends the District of Columbia Code, title XI of the D.C. Code, but basically what it does is it allows Dr. Elizabeth Morgan and her daughter Ellen to return to the United States.

This bill is the product of my own deepest feelings and knowledge, and as a society, we are far more sensitive to the pain that children can feel than we were when I was coming of age. Legislative bodies across the land at every level have recognized the importance of listening more carefully to what children say, and the laws that we now pass arise from an enormous and growing body of evidence that in many cases of domestic stress and conflict, it is too easy to lose sight of who is being harmed.

Commonsense actions to slice through the Gordian knot of pride and anger can often prevent permanent emotional damage and allow wounds to heal as quickly and completely as possible. That is what H.R. 1855 attempts to do. That is all H.R. 1855 intends to do.

Domestic conflict and stress can take many forms. Its victims are too often unintended and innocent. As a local jurist has said in connection with the very situation that gives rise to this bill, when elephants fight, the grass

suffers, so I believe that I would not be true to the great lessons I have learned in life were I to just take the easy way out when confronted with a difficult situation involving a child's life.

Yes, it would be easy for me to ignore Ellen Morgan, a soon-to-be 13-year-old American child who is afraid to come back to our country, our country, unless this bill is passed. It might be easy for us to ignore Ellen Morgan, to wash our hands of her unusual and tragic situation, but I believe that would be wrong. I believe very strongly that I owe it to this 13-year-old child still within me to try to intervene to break the truly vicious cycles that have impacted Ellen Morgan's life.

What I want to do and what this bill does is to permit Ellen Morgan to be and feel free to return to the United States with no cloud of legal intervention over her head. She deserves to have that choice. In the real world she does not have that freedom now. This bill is an opportunity, perhaps the last chance, to heal the wounds that are all too fresh in Ellen's life.

If there were another approach that Ellen could take, I know she would have taken it by now. We have attempted to allow the District of Columbia Superior Court to make appropriate motions to rehear this case, to revisit the situation, and as of yet they have been unable to do so, even though several years have elapsed since 1989, when this body and the other body put forward a bill that allowed Elizabeth Morgan to get out of jail for contempt and resume habitation with her daughter in New Zealand.

If I felt that Ellen was free to return to this country unfettered I would not do anything about this bill, but this bill, I think, represents the best approach that can be taken under all the circumstances. The bill is straightforward. It seeks to make out only very minor and temporary changes in title XI of the District of Columbia Code.

Under the Home Rule Act, the District government cannot amend title XI, and thus cannot legally legislatively affect this case. Only Congress can make these changes. These changes are only temporary and will sunset when Ellen reaches the age of majority and custody-visitation issues would be moot.

H.R. 1855 reflects the commonsense basic principle that the law ought not to compel one who has reached the age of reason from being forced to be unsupervised with someone by whom that person asserts they have been sexually abused. As a practical matter, such visitation cannot be enforced, and would create even greater danger if it were. Permitting a child of 13 and above to choose whether or not such custody or visitation should occur under the strict and limited strictures of this bill is the only sensible course.

The basic facts which form the necessary background of this bill bear repeating. There is an outstanding court order for the District Court for the District of Columbia dated August 28, 1987, in the case of Morgan versus Foretich. Under that order Dr. Morgan was jailed for civil contempt in the District of Columbia after she hid her child, Hilary, now known as Ellen, and refused to give that child up for court ordered unsupervised visitation with her father. At that point her income approached \$1 million a year. She gave that up to go to jail for 2 years to protect her daughter. She spent over 2 years in the District of Columbia jail.

In September 1989, Congress enacted H.R. 2136, sponsored by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from northern Virginia [Mr. WOLF], Public Law 101-97. This law limited to 12 months the amount of time that an individual could be imprisoned for civil contempt in the family division of the D.C. Superior Court. This legislation essentially freed Dr. Morgan from jail.

□ 1245

From there she went to Australia, where she is exiled today, until this legislation can pass. Mr. Speaker, I intend to do everything I can in the coming months to move this bill out of committee and to move this bill to passage.

BRING THE MORGANS HOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by seconding and commending my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] for moving this legislation.

I want to bring the House up to speed on where we are on this so when this issue comes up, we can pass it very, very quickly.

Back in 1989, Dr. Morgan was in jail for 2 years. We passed the legislation, that passed this House overwhelmingly, to have her released from jail. She and her daughter then went to New Zealand, and they are there wanting very desperately to return home.

Why is it important that we allow this to take place? Dr. Morgan has had a very serious life-threatening operation in New Zealand and will need two additional operations.

Second, Dr. Morgan's mother, who is 81 years old, who is in New Zealand taking care of both Dr. Morgan and the daughter, Ellen, is elderly; and the concern is, what if something were to happen to her, and with Dr. Morgan ill, what would happen with regard to Ellen?

Third, Dr. Morgan's father, who is in his 80's, is in a hospital now and not very well, and we do not know what is going to happen with regard to that.

Last, Dr. Morgan's husband, who lives in the Washington, DC area, can only visit her twice a year; and it is very difficult to commute to New Zealand, cost-wise and time-wise, so he visits her twice a year.

Since this Congress has acted in the past on this issue, what we are going to be asking, through the leadership of Congressman DAVIS, is that we bring this bill up early and get it out so that Dr. Morgan and her daughter, Ellen, can return to the United States without fear of Judge Dixon, without fear of incarceration.

It is the humanitarian thing to do; it is the right thing. All you have to think of is, if you have a daughter in this case, what would you do? It reminds me of the story years ago about a man without a country. These are people, frankly, without a country, that cannot get back into their own country.

I would like to also submit for the RECORD, if I may, a copy of the letter from Dr. Morgan's husband, detailing the medical condition and the circumstances surrounding Dr. Morgan.

I have pledged to the family that I am going to work with Congressman DAVIS, and we will put this bill on any bill that moves, any appropriations bill; and if we get to the end of the year and it has not passed, then as chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Committee on Appropriations, I will put this bill in the transportation appropriations bill so that it will be passed and be signed.

Our goal is that Dr. Morgan and her daughter, Ellen and her mom will be allowed to return to the United States early this year, hopefully before the springtime is over.

So in closing, when Members have the opportunity to vote on this, we would hope for unanimous consent and complete support, and I want to commend my colleague, Mr. DAVIS, for taking the leadership to allow Dr. Morgan and Ellen Morgan and Mr. Morgan's mom to return to the United States.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is important for the House to know that Dr. Morgan and her daughter are, frankly, gagged right now from even communicating with Members of Congress or lawyers in the United States because a New England gag order has come as a result of legal efforts by her former husband to do that, and that has made this more difficult. So we are communicating through friends as we approach this, but our efforts to speak directly have now been thwarted, too, which I think adds to the urgency of moving this legislation through at this time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman is right. Many

times all we hear about on both sides are economic issues. We have passion for them. We should also have passion and compassion for people who are in a situation like this, and through the Davis bill, this family will be able to be reunited and come back to the United States, hopefully before, it would be nice, before the end of springtime.

A copy of the letter mentioned earlier follows:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT,
January 23, 1996.

Hon. TOM DAVIS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN DAVIS AND WOLF: As you requested, I provide the following update concerning my step-daughter, Ellen Morgan, and my wife, Dr. Elizabeth Morgan, based on my visit with them in New Zealand from December 21 to January 18.

Ellen talked of feeling rejected from still being in exile, as she has been since 1987; because of the inaction so far on the bill to allow her safe return, she fears abandonment. The high point of her life, she said, was having Congressman Davis read her letter into the record at the hearing on August 4, 1995. She said this was the first time anyone in authority ever listened to her. After the hearing, however, Ellen suffered dashed hopes as control of her future seemed to slide back to the hands of Judge Dixon after Ellen's father moved to modify Judge Dixon's orders.

As you may know, contrary to his promise to the subcommittee, in his motion to Judge Dixon Dr. Foretich did not withdraw his requests for custody and visitation, but asked Judge Dixon to remove custody from Dr. Morgan and to order visitation. To my knowledge, after holding a hearing in December, Judge Dixon has not ruled on Dr. Foretich's motion. Nor has he ever ruled on Dr. Morgan's motions of 1987 and 1988, for example to reconsider his visitation orders and admit the evidence of the abuse of Ellen's half-sister.

With respect to Dr. Morgan, I am sorry to report that she has suffered a health calamity. After months of increasing frustration, including watching Ellen's demoralization, Elizabeth developed serious ulceration throughout her large intestines. In early January, following our move to Auckland, Dr. Morgan collapsed, was hospitalized and underwent major surgery. Her entire colon was removed (colectomy) and she also had an ileostomy, as a result of which she now has to wear a bag. Fortunately, she is now home and, so far, convalescing well. Nevertheless, she faces two more operations, attempting to repair her digestive system. She must also regain the weight and energy she lost during the month she was unable to eat or drink, and from the surgery itself.

It is no exaggeration to say that she could have died prior to the operation because of what her doctors described as "toxic mega colon." Although lab tests results are still awaited, the New Zealand doctors assure me that they believe grave danger has passed. In turn, I believe that she received good care in Auckland Hospital even though a week passed between her emerging admission and her emergency surgery. While I have confidence in her New Zealand doctors, I remain concerned because, in my view, nowhere in

the world can one receive the quality of medical care for serious conditions that is available here in the United States.

Another factor which I believe contributed to Ellen's discouragement and Elizabeth's health crisis was Dr. Foretich's escalating efforts throughout 1995 to gag Ellen. I am informed that he now asks the New Zealand Court to prohibit Ellen from talking with any Member of Congress, staffer, private lawyer, or journalist without his prior review, a court hearing on his objections and the Court's agreement. It is my understanding from Dr. Morgan's New Zealand lawyer that pending decision, Ellen is prohibited from discussing anything about her past with such officials and persons. Therefore, in contrast to last year when, at his request, she wrote freely to Congressman Davis and spoke to him on the phone, today she may be barred from doing so. From Ellen's discussions with me, I know how upset she feels over the present success of her father in silencing her while he continues to talk publicly. It aggravates her growing frustration with her father's success so long keeping her away from home, family and country.

Although the New Zealand Court has fully protected Ellen from contact with Dr. Foretich and has thus protected her physically, her emotional well-being has not been as successfully assured. For example, in the New Zealand Court, since January 1995, Dr. Foretich has blocked Ellen from being deposed in a lawsuit he himself brought against ABC Television for the documentary movie about Ellen and Elizabeth. This has enraged Ellen since she wishes to be heard in this sealed deposition about what happened to her and to contradict Dr. Foretich's own deposition denying everything. Indeed, the court-appointed psychiatrist in New Zealand, I understand, has opined that since Ellen herself wants to testify, such an opportunity to be heard may further heal Ellen from the trauma of her earlier years.

My report would not be complete without briefly mentioning Ellen's grandparents, Dr. William J. and Antonia Morgan, who hid and thus protected her from 1987 when the Washington Family Court refused protection until 1990 when the New Zealand Family Court gave protection. Bill is seriously ill in Suburban Hospital in Bethesda, Maryland, suffering from congestive heart failure and kidney failure. Only last week Ellen told me how horrified she feels that if her grandfather were to die, she would be prevented from attending his funeral. She is upset enough about missing the May, 1996 wedding of her step-sister, Margaret Michel, but expressed herself as finding the possibility of missing a family funeral intolerable. Antonia, now 81 and frail, remains in New Zealand helping my wife and Ellen to have as normal a family life as the courts have allowed. Understandably, however, Antonia finds it anguishing that in her twilight years family reunification for her as for everyone else seems forever deferred and delayed. Her other children and grandchildren and husband, of course, are here.

Contrary to what some people may assume, the difficulties of life in exile for all three of the women in my New Zealand family grow, now diminish, while each passing year. The recent setbacks of the gagging of Ellen and her resulting dependency and the ulcerative colitis that nearly killed Elizabeth only exacerbate those difficulties. In addition, Ellen's teenage years are not helped by being deprived of family life with her step-father. As it is, she sees me only two months each year. My long-suffering family

thus suffers still—and, in the ways described above, even worse.

I cannot express how grateful I am that, in the midst of the issues you and your colleagues face, you two Congressmen have not forgotten the plight of a mother and daughter left in legal limbo and thus trapped in endless exile.

Sincerely,

PAUL R. MICHEL.

IN CHILD CUSTODY—NEW LAW LIMITS CIVIL CONTEMPT

On September 23, President Bush signed my legislation limiting the amount of time an individual can be imprisoned for civil contempt of court in a District of Columbia child custody case. The limits imposed by this new law brought about the release of Dr. Elizabeth Morgan, a local surgeon who had spend more than two years in jail for refusing to disclose the whereabouts of her daughter.

The case of Elizabeth Morgan has drawn national attention and some recent commentaries on the new law have obscured many of the important issues concerning my legislation. I believe it is important to explain the background and the effect of the new law.

Every American understands that all individuals who face significant punishment deserve to have their case heard by a jury of their peers. That is fundamental to our system of justice.

Yet in most jurisdictions no such right exists for individuals imprisoned for civil contempt of court. Such was the situation of Dr. Elizabeth Morgan. She was incarcerated for over two years and had never been accused or convicted of any crime and her case had never been heard by a jury.

My legislation, now public law 101-97, addressed this fundamental flaw in the D.C. legal system without taking sides in any specific dispute before the court.

Imprisonment for contempt of court is designed to coerce an individual to comply with a court order. Over time, however, if compliance does not occur, it becomes likely that further incarceration will not produce the desired result. In that situation, coercion has become punishment.

My legislation closed a loophole in District of Columbia law that allowed an individual to be imprisoned indefinitely for civil contempt of court in a child custody case.

With the new law in effect, no individual imprisoned for civil contempt of court in a D.C. child custody case can spend more than one year in jail unless they are charged with criminal contempt of court and given a jury trial to determine their guilt or innocence.

The legislation, written with input from the academic and legal communities, took great care to protect the ability of the court to enforce its rulings. While the jury trial provision in my legislation protects the individual from indefinite incarceration, it also protects the power of the court by creating a means by which the court can pursue additional coercive measures. Individuals cannot simply "wait out" the year-long period and expect to walk away from their obligation to obey the court. Under public law 101-97, Dr. Elizabeth Morgan technically could still be charged with criminal contempt of court and be brought before a jury.

My legislation was modeled after laws currently on the books in California and Wisconsin that limit to six and 12 months respectively the amount of time an individual can be imprisoned for civil contempt of court. Neither of those states have the jury trial provision included in my legislation.

Furthermore, an additional precedent for my legislation can be found in federal law which prohibits a recalcitrant grand jury witness from being imprisoned for more than 18 months.

I have written to the governors of the 48 remaining states asking them to consider using the new D.C. law as a model for enacting reforms in their own states.

Some individuals have characterized the congressional action as an inappropriate interference into the affairs of the District of Columbia. It should be known that under the 1974 Home Rule Act, the United States Congress is the only legislative body with jurisdiction over the District of Columbia courts. Not even the D.C. City Council was capable of changing the D.C. civil contempt statute. D.C. Congressman Walter Fauntroy was an original cosponsor of my legislation, and City Councilman James Nathanson testified in favor of a congressional remedy similar to the one that was eventually enacted. House District of Columbia Committee chairman Ronald Dellums of California was also instrumental in guiding the legislation through Congress.

I believe that my legislation meets the most important test of all—common sense. Everyone would want a jury trial, for themselves or a loved one, if they were threatened with prolonged imprisonment. We must continue to work for the day when all Americans, even those imprisoned for civil contempt of court, will enjoy this most basic protection.

LET THE BULLIES BEWARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would take this opportunity during a special order break in the legislative business of the House, because we will have an important vote here at some point today to continue the Government, since tomorrow is the shutdown date, to discuss the abuse of the word "bully" in the press over the last few months, an absolute bass-ackwards concept of what bullying is.

When President Lyndon Baines Johnson used the IRS and the FBI to intimidate people, it was considered bullying in the extreme and you would even occasionally see, in conservative and liberal circles, the use of the word "fascism," as in police state tactics. When President Nixon corrupted the Central Intelligence Agency, a body formed to gather intelligence only outside the boundaries of the 50 United States and its territories, you saw much comment using the word "fascism."

But when the current occupants of the White House corrupt the Federal Bureau of Investigation as a way to intimidate and attempt to destroy the lives of the seven people in the travel office, to procure government contracts for Hollywood cronies and/or second cousins who are just 23 years old to run an office that had a bipartisan and press approval rating through 4 or 5 or 6 Presidents, that is bullying in the extreme.

That is bullying, and Billy Dale, the senior member of the travel office, who got a standing ovation last night at the largest political fundraiser in the history of the free world—I had never been in the D.C. Armory, did not have time to put on a tuxedo, was the only 1 of 9 Presidential candidates who showed up, which was bizarre in the extreme, and still it raised over \$16 million, I got extremely strong, pleasant applause, I can take that—but the two standing ovations were for a dignified retired Army general of Jamaican heritage, Colin Powell, and another standing ovation for Billy Dale of the heretofore-mentioned travel office.

This man is a courageous man. Unfortunately for the other side, he has a big, handsome, open face; it reminds me of the great Irish-American actor, Pat O'Brien, a star of the 1930's, 1940's, and 1950's, and Billy Dale has asked the people in the White House, including my pal Bill Bennett's brother, Bob—"Bill, control your brother, Bob," is what I would say. Mr. Speaker—Billy Dale has asked the occupants in the White House, and top, inside-the-beltway, high-powered, highly paid lawyer Bob Bennett, "Stop slaughtering my reputation. Mr. Clinton has apologized to me," to Billy Dale, "and wished me well in life. Stop having your hatchet men abuse my reputation and tear me up."

I am told by writers that, first, we may end up here yet with taxpayers' dollars paying the lawyer fees of all seven members of the travel office who had the FBI sicced on them within days of FBI Director Sessions being relieved of his job by the White House. I forgot, it was a few days after. It all surrounded the Vince Foster suicide, if it was that, all such a sleazy period. And when people call in when you are on a talk show or a radio show, in a townhall meeting, and say, Be careful, Congressperson, it sounds a little tabloid, what you are discussing here.

My response, thanks to my wife, Sallie, is when the occupant of the White House has lived a tabloid life, how do you discuss it without sounding a little bit like a tabloid? That is the problem we have. Bullying, filthy Phil Donahue and all of this disgusting talking-head mess that you unleashed on this country when you are talking about witch-hunts and bullying and protecting certain occupants of the White House who were not elected, remember, to sic the FBI or the IRS, whether it is a Republican administration or a Democrat administration, to do that to any human being, taxpaying citizen of this country, or anybody, whether they pay taxes or not, that is flirting with fascism and police state tactics.

We know where the bullying has taken place. As I check my Clinton countdown watch, 284 days to change it.

STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE
LACKS FACTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we heard in this Chamber just a few days ago the President of the United States give his State of the Union, and I think some of the things that he alluded to should be responded to. I am going to try to use as many facts as I can in my consideration of the State of the Union.

The President came before the Congress and he talked about how good the economy is and how things are going and how people felt good about economic data. I pulled up the economic data from the Joint Economic Committee, the last report that they had, and here is what they said:

Recent data shows the economy has slowed considerably. Manufacturing has contracted for 4 straight months, the lowest since 1991. Housing starts have fallen for 3 consecutive months. Both new orders for durable goods and leading economic indicators fell in October. Industrial production fell. New home sales fell.

This is the information that I have. In talking to the people of my district, too, during the recent recess and also around the country, I found that people are concerned about the future, that the major jobs that the President has talked about creating under this administration are, one, low-paying jobs, part-time jobs, and service jobs, all again low-paying jobs.

I heard, I think it was Senator BRADLEY, talking about one of his constituents who said he heard the President talk about this and said that several years ago the husband and wife had two jobs. And he says, now we see where the job increase has resulted. Because now we have four jobs to keep the income level that, in fact, we had some years ago.

Then we heard the President talk about the 200,000-job cut in Federal employment. Folks, that is strictly smoke and mirrors. I chair the House Subcommittee on Civil Service. We looked at the cuts. The cuts are almost 95 percent in the civilian defense work force and relate primarily to base closures, civilian defense employees. The bulk of bureaucrats, the 350,000 that we have just within 50 miles of the U.S. Capitol are still well entrenched, and there have not been cuts in that core bureaucracy.

The President talked about values, and he led off with V-chips and regulating cigarettes, and maybe he forgot that there is already a turnoff switch. Then he got to welfare. Maybe he had his priorities mixed up, because I see the crime, I see the problems in our society; and the people I have talked to say that it is coming from the welfare system that we have created in 40

years of Democratic rule of this House. It has perpetuated the problems that we see. It is not just answered by a V-chip or regulating cigarettes.

Then I heard him talk about immigration, and he said, immigration, illegal immigration is down. Well, I had a press report where 1,000 Haitians left his success story to come to the United States and had to be brought back, where over 40 died at sea in the last couple of months.

Then he talked about tightening up immigration. Well, he has, in fact, begun to talk about tightening it up, but what we have done in fact is changed our policy so many times it has been the policy de jour, like the soup de jour. In fact, we have imported into my State of Florida over 20,000 Haitians and Cubans in the last year. They have been flying them in at 500 a clip.

So this is the policy that I see, a failure. No economic plan in Haiti. We have empowered one party who has really executed the opposition, and we have no hope. We have put the entire country on a Clinton-style economic welfare program.

Then we heard about EPA, and that really galls me, because I served on the committee that oversees EPA; and the real argument with EPA is some of the policy that they have and also the operations that they have.

□ 1300

They have increased their number of employees from less than 12,000 about 10, 12 years ago, to now 18,000. They have almost as many employees, 8,000 people in Washington today, just a few miles from here, as they had in the entire program a little over a decade ago.

So this is the kind of debate that we have.

I served on that committee. We had a report that EPA wasted a half a billion dollars in a management information system. They could not even tell us where any of this money was spent.

Then we heard the President talk about cleaning up hazardous waste sites. We spent 85 percent of our money for studies and attorney's fees. I submit that that is not the way to go.

U.S. CREDIT RATING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, what I want to try to do is, I am here this afternoon along with several of my colleagues to talk about an issue really of great importance of the United States, the people of the United States, and, that is, in effect, what is going to happen to the credit rating of the United States in the next several weeks, a

very critical issue that is on the minds of folks here, not only on their minds but we are going to have to take some action with regard to the credit rating of the United States.

The situation, just to go back a little bit. Last month, Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership shut down the Federal Government in an effort, and in a well-described effort by themselves, to try to blackmail the President into signing their extreme agenda. Again by their own admittance, they failed to do that. But before they have indicated that they failed in that kind of a tactic, they shut the Government down twice.

They are now at it again. This is the best way that I can describe this. They are at it again. The crowd who brought us two Government shutdowns now is threatening to destroy the Nation's credit rating by defaulting on the debt.

If Speaker GINGRICH has his way, the world will be faced with a spectacle of the United States defaulting on the obligations that it has, its financial obligations, for the first time in the history of this country.

The Republican threats of Government default have sent unbelievable shock waves up and down Wall Street. In fact, and I know several of my colleagues are going to be more detailed about this, just yesterday Moody's Investors Service warned that it is considering lowering the U.S. credit rating because of the threat.

We all understand what a credit rating is about. We all have a credit rating. We all know that when we go to purchase something and we need to use credit, that is examined. And we know when we have a low credit rating what that means in terms of our ability to purchase and to get by.

Anything that hurts that credit rating hurts our families deeply. So that playing politics with our economy is bad news for Wall Street and the world in terms of the United States, but it is disastrous for Main Street and disastrous for families in this country.

If the Government financially goes belly up, which is what we are talking about, interest rates go higher and higher. That means higher and higher mortgage payments, higher and higher car loan payments, and higher and higher credit card payments.

Sometimes people think that what happens here does not affect their lives. I talk to kids and students about this all of the time. What we do in this Chamber, how our votes are registered on this board, has a direct effect on the lives of every single American. And, my fellow Americans, understand the import of what happens when the credit rating of the United States is destroyed and what it means to your lives.

Mr. DOGGETT. Would the gentleman yield for a question there?

Ms. DELAURO. I would be happy to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have known people that have gotten a bad credit rating, they maybe have lost a job, gotten behind on their bills, or maybe they just borrowed too much.

Ms. DELAURO. Exactly.

Mr. DOGGETT. That stigma of a bad credit rating has stayed with their family and prevented them from borrowing, when they had necessities that they needed for their family, for years.

Does the gentlewoman have any idea of how long, if the Gingrich leadership forces a default for the first time in 220 years, how long it will affect the Nation to have its credit rating suddenly go below junk bonds and how much that will cost taxpayers for generations to come?

Ms. DELAURO. In terms of what happens, the United States will never get out of that hole. Our credit, our word that says we will pay our bills, will no longer be believed by the rest of the world.

I will say, and I think people can attest to this, that even if it is 15, 20 years ago, if there is a stigma on your credit rating, they look 15 years, 20 years back. That is what this is about.

The United States will never be able to say to the rest of the world, "We will make good on our credit and our financial obligations," because of what will be done in this House in the next several weeks.

I would be happy to yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I think the gentlewoman makes an excellent point, and I think we all understand this from our own personal experience. If we go out to borrow money to furnish our living room and we default on our debt to the finance company or to the retailer who sold us the furniture, a mark goes on our record. Our credit report at the credit bureau downtown is there for every other retailer to look at before they decide to extend us credit or not. It may be that they will not extend us any more credit.

Our failure to pay our bills will be a black mark that we will not be able to live down, and we will not be able to borrow again. Or, as I think in the analogous case with the Federal debt, we will have to pay far more the next time we borrow because we are a risk. We are somebody who is a deadbeat, we are somebody who does not really pay our bills.

As a result, when we want to go back to the retailer and borrow some more money, we are going to have to pay 3.5 or 4 or 5 percent more, and that is a huge increase in what we have to pay as a family in order to be able to attain the goods and services that we need.

It is very similar to what each of us in our own life have to deal with. If you default on your mortgage, the next time you want to buy a house, you may be unable to get a mortgage, or you will pay so much it might make it im-

possible for you to maintain the level of standard of living, the kind of home you have come to understand that you would like to live in.

So the consequences for this country are just like they would be for us as individuals if we become a deadbeat and fail to pay our bills.

Ms. DELAURO. I think you have said it very accurately.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think we should also be aware of the fact that not only is it the actual default that could cause economic havoc, but the discussion of it and the anticipation of it. Millions of Americans have personal loans at the bank, credit card loans at the bank or their credit union, what have you, they have the mortgages on their home that are tied to indexing and to indexing averages that are tied to the interest rates on various indexes.

When you take the best credit rating in the world, which is the United States of America, it is what all other credit is rated according to. When that moves on a daily basis because of the uncertainty, because of the potential risk, whether we ever default or not, you have already cost homeowners, credit card borrowers, you have already cost them money because the average is higher than it would have otherwise been over the 30-, 60-, 90-day period of time. When they reconfigure your adjustable rate mortgage or your credit card or your home mortgage, it will be higher or not as low as it might have been when we see interest rates dropping as we have seen over the last couple of months.

So, bumping around that index, every day the Republicans threaten to impeach the Secretary of Treasury, they threaten to shut down the Government, they threaten to default on the debt, to expose our credit rating to this kind of questioning, you pay instantly as a homeowner, as a person out looking and using consumer debt in this country.

So this is not free, this discussion. This is not free, their threats. This happens immediately to people in terms of how those average indexes are used for their adjustable rate mortgages. What they are doing is, by their irresponsibility, by their threatening our credit rating, they are immediately impacting the cost of credit to every American family in this country.

Ms. DELAURO. The gentleman is absolutely right. The transition here is that they want to do that very loud and clear, as recently as reported in the Washington Times, they want to do it as a specific strategy of blackmail, of holding hostage in the same way that they did with the Government shutdown.

They are making no bones. It is a tactical maneuver to force the President to do something, and they are willing to play so fast and loose with every single individual's life in this country.

Mr. HEFNER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. I would just like to put this on a personal basis. Someone had made a statement here earlier that we were demagoguing this issue and playing fast and loose with the truth.

I think it is a bit hypocritical of any of us to go home to our constituents and say, "I am not going to vote to increase the debt of this country, I am not going to vote to borrow any more money. Let the Federal Government live within its means." That makes a good sound to a group that you are talking to.

But there is not a single Member, be he Democrat or Republican, that does not partake of the goodies that are in the budget every year. What it amounts to, the President of the United States borrows money to keep this Government going, to pay for these things, and he borrows it on behalf of every Member of this Congress.

Let me just give a little scenario. I have three district offices, and the people who work in my office work very, very hard, and they worked in the times when the Government shut down. Some people come and say, "I'm having trouble with my veterans benefits. I haven't been getting my check."

He says, "Oh, well, you come on in." And I do not care whether it is a Republican or a Democrat, he gets right on it to solve this problem for his constituents, whether it is veterans benefits, Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, whatever. Every Member that sits in this House, unless he does not participate in Government at all, only comes for this Congress and he does not participate in any programs is responsible for his portion of this debt. To come and to tie conditions and blackmail to keep extending this debt is totally, in my view, hypocritical.

I would like to make one other point. We have borrowed this money, we have spent this money, we have spent this money for disasters, in Oklahoma, in California, in Washington, all over this country, North Carolina, and other places, we have paid for things that benefited the American people. We owe the money. It is a legitimate debt. There is no way you can escape it unless you go bankrupt and throw the country into total chaos.

For people to tie contingencies to this and say, "No, I am not going to vote to increase the debt," in my view is the height of hypocrisy. We owe the debt. We are the greatest Nation on the face of the Earth morally, militarily, and economically. We owe these bills;

they are legitimate debts. It goes beyond politics. This is something that we owe. It is a moral obligation. That goes to the question of character.

□ 1315

Do we have the character to do the thing that is right, to pay our bills, to support the American people and the things that we stand for as a moral society? It is absolutely the height of hypocrisy for anybody to come to this well and say "I am not going to support the increase of this debt," that every Member, be he Republican or Democrat, liberal or conservative, has an obligation for a certain portion of this debt, and it is absolutely the height of hypocrisy for anybody to deny that. It has to be paid.

I would challenge the Republicans, let us do the moral and right thing and pass this debt extension, where we will keep our country from having to go into default and embarrassing us on the world stage as the greatest country on the face of the Earth, look after our Social Security people, Medicare, veterans, because this would have dire circumstances to all these people that depend on us to do what is right for this country.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. Before I recognize my colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. KENNELLY, I just want to tell you what kind of leader she has been on this issue. In the Hartford Courant today, the headline reads "The Nation's Credit Is at Stake." They say especially what we have been talking about here. It says, "It is the height of irresponsibility if we continue to deal with lowering the credit rating of the United States." It says "Someone has to be a grown-up. Democratic representative BARBARA KENNELLY of Connecticut has introduced a bill to raise the debt ceiling with no strings attached." The next line says, "Congress should pass it."

That is what this is all about. I would like to yield the floor to my colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I thank her for saying that and for taking this hour about the debt ceiling. It is a subject that I have been interested in, and I think anybody who understands what goes on in the financial world is certainly interested.

I have to hark back to when I was a major in economics at college, Trinity College right down here on Michigan Avenue, and then I went on to graduate school in economics, and I can well remember the phrase "full faith and credit of the United States of America." That is an impressive phrase.

The reason it is impressive is because there is something very impressive behind that phrase, and that is the securities of the United States of America. Up until now, they have been the safest in the world. The reason they have

been the safest and the reason that results in our having the safest credit rating in the world is the people feel fully free, whether you are an individual buying bonds of the United States of America, whether you are a foreign country buying bonds of the United States of America, the reason our securities are so safe is that people understood across this Nation and across the oceans that the United States of America never played fast and loose with their credit rating.

I know it has been said, and it continues to be said at various gatherings here as we address this whole situation, is that in the past, in the past, other things have been attached to the debt limit. I remember some time ago when that in fact was true. But the point of the matter is, and it is something that I keep trying to bring forth, is that this is not an issue of politics. This is an issue of governance, this is an issue of policy.

So lifting the debt limit should not be a matter of politics, because one does not have to go back in history to remember when Mr. Tom Foley was Speaker of this House, and before that majority leader, and in fact we, the Democrats, were in the majority. I can remember Mr. Foley being so adamant that you could have debate, you could have discussion about lifting the debt limit, but the fact of the matter was that because we, the Democrats, were in the majority, we could not step aside from the point that we had the leadership, and it was the responsibility of those in leadership, those in the majority, no matter which party, had to raise the debt ceiling, because you just did not fool around with that.

I remember that so, so clearly. Now we do not happen to be in the majority. The opposite side of the aisle, the Republicans, are in the majority. Therefore, it still should be an issue of policy, of governance, that we lift the debt ceiling.

The point is, as the gentleman from North Carolina just made, we are not talking about anything in the future. We are talking about money owed, money that has already been spent, money that has to do with the running of this country, and there should not be any argument in substance, because in fact the majority voted on the budget reconciliation bill that had raising the debt ceiling up to \$5.5 trillion. Our President of the United States has asked for the debt ceiling of the United States to be raised to \$5.5 trillion.

There is no difference. So my colleague from Connecticut, having taken this hour, I just hope we can remember that it really does not do any of us any good to politicize this issue; that what we have to remember is that this is something so serious, this is something so important, that I, as a former economist, hate to even mention the word that is being floated around this floor,

the word "default." To me, that is a word we should not even talk about, we should not even be saying out loud, because to me, and I think to anybody in any responsible position, that is something that we do not even consider. A, it has never happened in the United States of America. B, we do not know what would happen. But we know that none of it would be good.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentlewoman would yield, when Orange County could not meet its debts, they paid a premium for just the discussion of default because they said nobody has ever repudiated their debt in municipal bonds. You now have under active discussion the repudiation of your debt. You pay a premium for having that discussion. The discussion is not free. Forget the act, how horrible that would be. Just the discussion changes the way other investors look at this, because they are banking other people's money when they buy these securities and this debt of the country.

Ms. DELAURO. If I can make a point with what the gentleman said, and I would ask my colleagues to comment, in terms of our colleague from California talked about Orange County, this has enormous reverberations for every county, every mayor, every first select person, every State in terms of what happens to bonds that are issued, whether it is a school board, whether they are a general obligation. The bonds out there are in trouble.

Mrs. KENNELLY. I would like to end up by saying something about where we are. Since November 15 we should have raised the debt ceiling. We have not done it. As a result, and this is another thing that just kind of boggles my mind, we have not done it, so as a result, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, has had to use legal ways of paying the bills of the United States of America, without going beyond the debt limit.

Then we hear, oh, my heavens, he is doing something that is not correct because we in the Legislature, we, the House of Representatives, we have the purse strings, and therefore he should not be trying to pay the bills. But we are the ones that can vote to raise the debt limit.

It is another interesting thing that has happened here. Mr. Rubin has such an excellent reputation because he was in fact a financier, a very successful one. He gave of his time and has come to Washington to help us by being a public servant, and he has come to Washington and he is trying to do his job. He has taken an oath not to allow the Government of the United States ever to default, and he has done some things he would rather not have done, but they are perfectly legal, to make sure we pay our bills.

Then we have some saying he should not do that. And another word I do not like to use, "impeach." Yet the same

people are saying he should be impeached, will not allow him to do what he should be doing.

Then it gets even stranger and weirder. There are those on Wall Street that say, hey, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rubin, is such a fine gentleman, who knows exactly what he is doing, and he is not like those Washington kinds, so he would never allow default. The weirdness and the strangeness keeps going on.

So let me end by saying to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], we can end all this. We can stop it all. If in fact the majority of this House, if in fact the Speaker put on the calendar that we vote in this House on a clean debt limit, we could end all the discussion. I do not even like hearing it take place. We can raise the debt limit, pay the bills we owe.

We are always saying we have to conduct ourselves and be treated like everybody else in the United States of America, like we should be. Here is a perfect example. We should make it possible to pay the bills of those we have to, because, and I end here and I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut, because the fact of the matter is, come March 1, there are a lot of checks that have to go out from the Government of the United States, to the citizens of the United States who have paid into their Social Security, to the citizens of the United States who have served to protect their country in the military, to the citizens of the United States who in fact are owed that check on March 1.

Mr. Speaker, let us end the conversation, raise the debt limit, and get on with balancing the budget of the United States of America in 7 years.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank my colleague. Just one point that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] made, which is the abdication of leadership. That is precisely what is happening here, when you do not want to reaffirm the credit rating of the United States and say yes, we will be there. But I will tell you this, and I will just say I do not know what we can expect, what more we can expect from the folks in the leadership in this House.

This is the group of folks who said to the President of the United States, give us a 7-year balanced budget according to our economic assumptions, Congressional Budget Office economic assumptions. He did that, and now they are walking away from that. They have just walked away from what they have been asking the President of the United States to do, lo, these months and why they closed the Government twice.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman would yield, just one question about that point. These are also the same Republican leaders who for decades have presented themselves to the American people as the party of fiscal prudence,

of fiscal integrity. And now they are the ones who are engaged in this most imprudent act of threatening our credit rating for the first time in 220 years, for, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut said, even threatening to impeach the Secretary of the Treasury for trying to avoid that default.

All year long I have heard them call themselves revolutionaries. Do you think is what they meant by revolutionary, that they are now going to become the party of fiscal imprudence and jeopardize our credit rating?

Mr. PALLONE. If the gentlewoman would yield, I just wanted to follow up on what the gentlewoman said about this whole concept of hostage. As the other gentlewoman from Connecticut said before, we are already in a hostage situation. I think the only reason why we have not paid as much attention, if you will, to this whole problem of the credit rating, is because we faced the Government shutdown as the hostage.

In other words, for the last few months the Republican leadership and Speaker GINGRICH were holding us hostage because they threatened to shut down the Government. The only reason that we were able to continue to pay our debts was because of the effort that was being made by the Secretary of the Treasury to continue to find ways to continue the whole Government process without going into default. But now that the Republicans are saying, OK, we are not going to shut the Government down anymore, at least we hope not, we are still waiting to have an answer today, now they are saying OK, but we want to wait a little longer as this credit rating problem continues to persist.

The bottom line is, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY] said, on November 15 we were supposed to extend the debt ceiling, which would have allowed for our credit rating to remain intact and not have the threat of default. It is almost, what, 2 or 3 months later now, and we know by March 1, if we do not do something, if we do not act, if not sooner, we are very likely to go into default.

I do not think we should wait another day. One of the things I would like to mention is we have not even heard any vote being scheduled on the issue of the debt ceiling. We may very well end up passing some kind of continuing resolution tonight and be in recess or be adjourned until the end of February, and there has not been any effort to even suggest that we schedule a vote to deal with this problem of the credit rating.

In addition to that, we are now being told by GINGRICH and the Republican leadership that we will only consider dealing with the credit rating and extending the debt ceiling if you do other things, if you make certain spending cuts or do certain tax breaks or whatever.

Without commenting on the worthiness of the spending cuts or the tax breaks, or whatever, the bottom line is it is totally inappropriate to hold this Government hostage or to make this linkage between those issues and our credit rating. We are supposed to be responsible here. I am amazed, years past this session of Congress, I have never seen such irresponsible activity to suggest it is OK to threaten the credit rating.

We already know that certain reports have come out, I know my colleague from Texas is going to comment on it today, that indicate that the bond markets and the various groups that look at these things are now concerned about our ability to pay our debts. So it is not something that is pie in the sky. This is real. This is a real thing that is happening right now.

I can just go back to American history, because I listened to what the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mr. KENNELLY] said before. I remember, I do not remember all the specifics, but I remember from back in grade school when we took American history, and we remember, that after the Revolutionary War, one of the main things that the Government wanted to do, and I think it was Alexander Hamilton who was the main proponent, was that the Government, the new American Government, back in the 1700's then, had to be put on a sound financial system. He wanted to make sure that our credit was good. He wanted to make sure we were paying our debts, and that is why from day one, this country has been successful economically. It is one of the foundations of the whole Nation that we pay our debts, that we do not go into default, and we send a message by doing that to the rest of the world that that is what every one should do.

□ 1330

What kind of a message is this Republican leadership sending to the rest of the world when the greatest economic power and the one that drives world economy in this global market that we face is now sending a message that we are seriously thinking about going into default? It is just incredible to me. Maybe I am being naive, but I cannot believe that we are actually hearing this discussion from the Republican leadership.

Ms. DELAURO. It is taking a 200-year history of this great Nation of ours and truly trashing it, and saying that it is not worth it. I would have thought that the Speaker, who is a historian, when you brought up your frame of reference, I think what we need to do is to have some civics lessons here, and if we want to then try to really build on what the Founding Fathers have, their legacy, or whether we want to turn this country into, to quote a popular phrase today, deadbeat dads so that we are not meeting what our responsibilities are.

I see that my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], is on her feet. Let us get the gentlewoman into the discussion.

Mrs. MALONEY. I would like to add my voice to the lodge politics that is being practiced in this body.

My colleagues, the Republicans are practicing winner-take-all politics. If you do not do it my way, then we will shut the Government down for 21 days. If you do not do it my way, we will default on the Government bonds and the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government, even if this default would trigger a global financial catastrophe, not only in the United States, but globally.

This is not a revolution. My colleague, this is destruction, pure and simple. Compromise is a way of life in public policy. It is called give-and-take. It is called checks and balances. It is called making a decision and moving the Government forward even if you do not get everything you want. My way or no way is the mindset of a 5-year-old, not the leading legislative body of the Western World.

The Republicans, my colleagues know that the Republicans demanded over and over and over a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. The President met that demand, but this is Stairmaster politics. The President steps up, meets the demand, only to find that he has to step again to the same place just to stay in the same place. Every time they make a demand, they just raise the bar a little higher and make another demand.

The bad faith, winner-take-all negotiating stand is unreasonable, it is irresponsible, it is dangerous. It is time for the Republicans to moderate their position, join with the President and move the country forward.

The Republicans should not be playing Russian roulette with the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

I would like to be associated with the comments of my colleagues here and the discussion that the Republicans should put forward a clean bill on debt ceiling so that we may raise it, pay our bills and move forward and stop playing Stairmaster politics.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleague from New York.

I just remind people again that the world effects are there. Families will suffer here as well. I believe it was the Speaker who said back in September, "Even if we have to delay tax refunds, we should have our Government default." What happens with Social Security payments, with veterans' payments and military payments, all coming around. We are going to get in a few minutes our colleagues from Massachusetts to talk about that.

I see my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], and let me ask you to get back into this.

Mr. DOGGETT. So much of our discussion here this afternoon has been on

what might happen in the future, and the prospects are dire, indeed.

But I think it is important for the American people to understand what has already happened as of yesterday afternoon because at the same time our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], and I were trying to bring some sanity to this body and bring up a motion to go ahead yesterday and deal with the debt limit. Unknown to us, one of the leading credit rating agencies in the country was issuing a warning for the first time in history concerning the obligations of the U.S. Government. And I just turned to this morning's newspaper noting that, "In a warning shot fired at Washington, one of the Nation's leading credit rating services announced late today that it was considering lowering its ratings."

Already, even before they take us right to the edge of that cliff and jump off in a kamikaze fashion, they have already issued this warning, and it would signal that the United States might soon have to pay more to borrow money.

We have talked about Orange County, and we have talked about the United States. That is us. That is every American taxpayer. Everyone who pays taxes in these United States has a stake because we will all have to pay more money just like we are paying out billions of dollars now for the excesses of the Reagan years when he signed all those appropriations into law that escalated the Federal budget deficit.

Mr. HEFNER. If the gentleman would yield, I wanted to raise one point here. People keep talking about that this money is going to be used to give the President a credit card where he can go spend. I want to remind all of my colleagues that have lived in areas where there have been disasters, like in Oklahoma and California and even now in Pennsylvania, we have got Ohio and places where we are paying for disasters that have hit this country.

This is money that is going to be spent. We have made arrangements for the money. This is not a debate about amendments and what is going to be done. This is something that has to be done. This is just as certain as death.

If the country continues to stand, this has to be extended. There is no negotiation about it, no percentage negotiation. It is something that absolutely has to be done, and the longer we put it off the more it costs us. It is just like an operation: If you put it off too long, you can become terminal and it can do permanent damage that you never recover from.

I thank the gentlewoman for taking this time, and I think if the American people would just stop and listen to the consequences of this and get on and tell their Representatives, everybody is affected by this: the old, the young, our

senior citizens, our veterans, our armed services people, the people in Bosnia. If we do not have the money to pay these bills, it is going to be dire circumstances for us, and to play with this, make it a political game, in my view, as I said earlier, it is totally irresponsible and it is the height of hypocrisy for anybody to say that we do not have to do this and tie contingencies to it.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would just conclude by noting the reaction of one person, an investment banker, to note what may happen if they carry us over the cliff, but what already happened yesterday in taking us right up to the brink of disaster as this Gingrich-led Congress has done at a time when the President has come here and called for conciliation and goodwill and cooperation. Instead of doing that, they take us up to the edge of the cliff of financial disaster. The reaction of one investment banker was that this is a very strong warning to the system.

The whole notion that the U.S. bonds are on some kind of credit watch is wild. This is the kind of things that happens to some of our companies, not to the United States. It is embarrassing. And it is an embarrassment, but it is an embarrassment we are going to have to pay for.

In Texas, there are a lot of stickers and signs around that say, "Don't mess with Texas." We are saying today, Don't mess with the credit rating of Texas and these United States.

If these Republican colleagues want to go mess up somebody's credit rating, go mess up their own. Do not mess with my credit rating. I have worked to defend and preserve it. And that is what the American people should be saying to this Gingrichite leadership: Do not mess with our credit rating. We worked hard to preserve it, and you ought not to use these crazy, extremist political tactics to destroy the credit rating the generations of Americans have preserved.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to say thank you to the gentleman from Texas, and pardon me for not mentioning it earlier, and I see that our colleague also from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], has come on to the floor, and I am going to recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in a moment, but I want to compliment my two colleagues for your resolution of talking about a clean bill and not holding this country hostage. I know all the work that you have done.

One of the most incredible things is that they are going to do this; they have taken us to the brink and now they want to just say, Let us recess and go home, and no one knows what is going on. Talk about, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNEDY] pointed out, an abdication of leadership. You cannot govern if you do not want to make the decisions and

make the choices and let this country keep moving in a forward direction.

Let me just recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who has also a piece of legislation, who sits on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and clearly understands the ramifications of this, whether in the global market or whether it is for seniors, for veterans, for homeowners, or anyone else. Thanks for joining us this afternoon.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Let me thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] for making certain that this issue is understood more clearly by the American people and by all of those that might think that this is some sort of simple political maneuver that is entirely expected out of those rascals that run Washington, DC, these days.

This is a highly unusual and very provocative and extremist tactic that is being employed to bring about the imposition of a particular set of political beliefs by a particular group of Republicans.

I think it was interesting that, in the newspapers from Boston Globe to the New York Times and a number of others in today's news reporting, that they reported that Speaker GINGRICH just yesterday evening had offered a compromise to allow the debt ceiling issue to be avoided in the Congress. Yet, in all of the discussions that are taking place today on the House floor and among Republicans, we find that there is, in fact, no real agreement among Republicans to, in fact, come to grips with this debt ceiling.

I, in fact, debated early this morning with the leader of the movement in the Republican Party, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], over the issue of the extension of the debt limit. I did not get any sense that he and many other Republicans are now in a process of being willing to compromise on extending the debt limit. Rather, I think that there are a number of Republicans that have signed, in their belief in a contract which requires them to hold the debt limit at its current spending levels in order to impose upon this country the set of beliefs that they ran on when they ran for the Congress of the United States.

The truth of the matter is that we have a system in this country which has worked for well over 200 years which does not say that just simply because one gets elected to the Congress that you can impose your set of beliefs on the entire country. We have a process that is set up where you have to get a bill passed by the House of Representatives, passed by the U.S. Senate, if you get it passed by both of those, then you have to get it signed into law by the President.

If the President were to sign into law all of the provisions that the Republicans, this extreme group of Repub-

licans, want in their contract, then, in fact, we might be able to go along and have this debt ceiling raised without any controversy. The truth of the matter is there are a number of people in this country that do not believe that we ought to be gutting the Medicare Program, gutting the Medicaid Program, that do not believe that we ought to be doing that at the same time providing an enormous tax cut to the wealthiest people in the Nation. As a result of that specific provision, the Republicans are intending on dumping the entire debt of this Nation and potentially upsetting the whole apple cart of the world's economic finances and the trust that has been established over 200 years or more of history in terms of the United States being the premier creditor Nation in the entire world.

So, what essentially is taking place here is very simple. A small group of Republicans have held up the rest of the Republicans and have put a gun to the head of the entire American people and said, "You either accept our particular belief on how this country ought to move forward or else we are going to, No. 1, not pay our debt."

OK, we do not pay the first debt that is over \$380 billion that is going to come up in the next month. Wall Street has told us that if that debt is defaulted on, we can expect a minimum rise of 1 percent in our borrowing cost. A 1 percent borrowing cost increase for anybody with an adjustable rate mortgage is going to cost them \$1,200 a year.

□ 1345

Now, the entire tax break that the Republicans are insistent upon in order to get this is not even worth \$1,200 a year. So they are going to give away more to interest rate increases than they are going to get out of the tax break. This is the most ludicrous proposition that one could possibly design.

President Clinton has reached out to the Republicans and said that he will in fact come up with a 7-year balanced budget, with a CBO balanced budget; he will do it with cuts. What he will not do is go beyond the cuts that are required to get to a balanced budget and actually provide an enormous tax break, the lion's share of which goes to the wealthiest people in this country. It is a principled position. It is a reasonable thing to believe in in this country, a system of government that has been set into place, that does not allow an extremist view to come in and impose itself upon the rest of the Nation.

Those differences are what we are elected to then work out a reasonable compromise. We have a system of this country that allows that compromise to move forward. What we ought not to do is sit back and allow the imposition of a particular viewpoint to be rammed

down the throat of the rest of the Nation while we sit back and diddle.

I believe that it is important for us to have this debate. It is important for us to make certain that the American public understands that if in fact we go ahead and default on this debt, that this is not a tactic that anybody, many Republicans, JOHN KASICH included, have ever endorsed. I would ask JOHN KASICH and I would ask other moderate Republicans to join with over 150 Democrats that in just 1 day have signed a clean discharge petition. All you have to do is walk up to that front desk. Ask the clerk to provide you, they will even give you a pen. They will give you that pen. You put your name to the paper, and we can make this issue go away, provide the credit of this country with the service that it needs and provide this country with the kind of compromise solution that has worked for over 200 years of American history.

I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you for your work, Congressman KENNEDY. Well said.

My colleague from Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, who has really been the coauthor of the resolution to look at a clean debt limit extension, love to have you in this conversation. I welcome also, I might say, the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, who will join us in this discussion in a few minutes.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding to me. I would like to take a second to talk about what is going on here.

I was asked by a reporter yesterday as to why my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT], and I introduced a privileged resolution to bring a clean debt limit extension to the floor. My first response was, because it is the obligation of the Congress to make sure that America pays its obligations. The Speaker has chosen not to schedule on the calendar a clean debt limit extension, which has very serious implications.

Additionally, we have had to follow what Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts is trying to do through a discharge petition to bring this up, because we have a small band of self-described revolutionaries who do not think that we ought to do this.

Let me briefly remind this House that the last small bank of revolutionaries who chose not to pay their obligations were the Bolsheviks who in the early 20th century decided that they would not pay the obligations of the nation of Russia and thus defaulted on what were then called czar bonds, and even today there is no market for other obligations. Even today, the former Soviet Union, which has now broken the

shackles of communism, still finds trouble entering the capital markets because of that.

Let me briefly describe for the House what would happen in the event that we followed through with the default on our national debt. Not only would payments not be made on U.S. obligations, not only would Social Security checks not go out, veterans' checks, salaries to the men and women who are serving our Nation throughout this world in the armed services, including in Bosnia. But in addition, you would see a downgrade occur on the part of most debt held by State and local governments, school districts, water districts, which is backed by U.S. Treasury obligations.

You would also see a situation where there would be no secondary market for Treasury securities as pension funds and other holders, individuals, other nations would have to in effect dump their Treasury holdings. I would predict, quite confidently, that you would see interest rates on the long Treasury bond, the 30-year Treasury bond head up toward the 20-percent range, which is really quite unacceptable. I think that the impact on the stock market would be well expected to see a significant drop.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Let me ask my colleague, who understands the financial markets as well as any of the Members on our side of the aisle, if it is true, as I understand it is, that today the difference between our triple A bonds, which are the most secure bonds, the U.S. debt, and those that are graded at what Moody's says they may have to be graded at, triple B, I guess, that is about a 3.5-percent difference, is it not, in terms of additional burden that anybody borrowing with the full faith and credit of our Government would have to incur; is that about right?

Mr. BENTSEN. That is about right, around 3 to 3.5 percent, 350 basis points. That is a substantial additional interest cost. What you in effect do is you turn interest into principal and you thus incur more debt. It costs you money in the long run.

We would be raising the cost not only to the American taxpayers through the Federal Government, but we would also be raising the cost to State and local taxpayers, school districts. This is before people who have adjustable rate mortgages, which are coming due in the month of February and March, find out that exactly what that cap on their mortgage meant. If it was a 2-percent cap or a 3-percent cap, they are going to hit that cap.

This is sort of the version, the financial version of mutually assured destruction. This will cause a payment crisis in the U.S. markets that will transcend through every household in this country. It will preclude the Treasury from making Social Security

payments. It is totally unwarranted. It should not be done.

The Speaker should bring this bill up, and the last thing, the last thing we ought to do in this situation is to adjourn and go home so some people can campaign or run for President. For doing this, they should probably run away from their constituents for causing this to happen, but they should not be out campaigning. We should stay here, do the Nation's business and avert a default. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for having this time. I appreciate you yielding the time.

Ms. DELAURO. Thank you very, very much, for your help in the education process.

Let us now try to get into the discussion here, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the former budget chairman and the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget. No one knows this better than MARTIN SABO.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding.

Let me commend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] for his outstanding work in defining this issue to both the Congress and to the American public and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] for having had the foresight to introduce some time ago a bill to extend the debt ceiling.

I introduced a more recent version. For the first time in my career in Congress, I signed a discharge petition. I am not one who believes that that should be done lightly or for simple political reasons or for trivial issues. But here we are dealing with just the fundamental management of the financial integrity of this country.

I can think of nothing more foolish for the Congress to do than to refuse to extend the debt ceiling so that we go into default on our credit, so that we find ourselves in a position where we cannot send benefit checks that millions of Americans are expecting. And then the incredible long-term impact; when we look at the long-term potential of balancing the budget, one of the important ingredients that we manage is interest costs. If we are going to do foolish things now, playing political games, we may jeopardize our ability to reach any type of balanced budget over the next several years, simply because we are going to drive the interest cost factor in the Federal Government out of sight. It is foolish. It hurts people. It hurts other units of government and for no good, no good reason.

We should simply go about extending the debt ceiling so our credit remains the best in the world.

Sometimes people talk about we should run ourselves like a business. Can you imagine any business that would unilaterally go out and try and destroy their credit rating for no good

purpose? That would only be described as dumb. So let us not be dumb. Let us be smart and extend the debt ceiling. I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. Aply put, it is dumb, and to hark back to something our colleague from Texas said, that the Soviet Union is still trying to dig out of that morass of defaulting on those czar bonds. That is a history lesson well worth taking.

Let me ask my colleague from California to jump in.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for helping us focus on what would be one of the worst self-inflicted wounds I have ever seen this Congress contemplate. The Wall Street Journal, leading financial newspaper in the country, today talks about Moody's, which is the national version of your local credit bureau, considering downgrading the United States debt to the tune of about \$387 billion to in fact create much higher costs for all of us in this country in paying that debt, rolling it over on a periodic basis. It also includes an article about the Mexican economy and the fact that in their credit crunch, loans are today almost impossible to get; and, if you can get them, they are ranging at the 50-percent level.

The reason I bring that up is this is a country that is in deep trouble today just for contemplating default. This country stepped in and helped prevent that and still, just because they flirted with default, today it is almost impossible to get a loan in that country.

We would be, by this action here that is being brought about by the freshman Republicans and others who are irresponsible, in my view, about how they want to conduct our public policy debate, are courting this kind of disaster.

We are about to move to a point where our U.S. bonds, which are the best bonds you can get anywhere in the world, which pay the lowest interest rates because of their security and lack of risk, will fall into the category of almost junk bonds. Here we are, a country that theoretically has learned about the perils of junk bonds, having come through our S&L crisis, we understand that these kinds of high yield bonds we call junk bonds, pay a premium, because of the risk involved, because of the potential for default.

It is a lesson we have got to remember as we continue to do our business in this Congress. Hopefully, the effort that Mr. KENNEDY is leading and Mr. BENTSEN and others to get this Congress to adopt a clean debt limit extension, what we mean by that is to deal with the credit rating of this country without encumbering it with any other extraneous activities, any other legislation that ought to be dealt with in separate vehicles.

We think, and I think Members of the Republican Party honestly agree with

us, that if we know what is good for our country, we will act precipitously today, tomorrow, next week, whenever we can possibly get the attention of the leadership of this institution to guarantee that we do not allow ourselves to slip into default and to provide long-term detriment, additional cost to us as individuals and as taxpayers and as a Nation.

We need to sign this discharge petition. We need to bring our Republican colleagues of good will, who are willing to be independent and stand up for what is right for this country, to join us so that we can have sanity reign here and so that we are not going to find extortion and blackmail on something as fundamental to this country as the extension of that debt limit occurring.

Remember, we have written the checks. It is a question of whether we are going to cover those drafts when they come to the bank. I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for taking the time to give the American people and our colleagues a better understanding of something that I think we never really entertained, never thought was possible, until just recently when we began to see just how far irresponsibility was leading the minority, the majority party in the direction of bringing about a real financial disaster for this country.

Ms. DELAURO. I want to thank my colleague from California for just outlining what it is all about. I want to thank my other colleagues who joined with us this afternoon, and I just want to say that the issue is credit rating, the credit rating of the United States.

□ 1400

When you hear the words "debt limit, debt extension," put that aside. Credit rating, that is what this is about, and whether or not we are going to say that the United States will continue to have the best credit rating in the world, which it currently has.

I would just say to you that we do have people, we have a group of people in this House that are willing to do harm to the credit rating of the United States by defaulting on our debt. This would be for the first time in this Nation's history. They are prepared to do this, and even have talked about this in terms of a strategy for holding the President hostage, for blackmailing the President to try to get something from him on the issue of the budget.

We have put to rest the issue of the balanced budget. The President has laid one on the table. It is now my Republican colleagues who are walking away from the balanced budget that the President has put down, which they asked for.

What I am begging the leadership, the Republican Gingrich leadership of this House to do, listen to Wall Street when they say what difficulty we will

be in in the world if this happens to the United States; listen to Main Street; listen to the working men and women of this country, who will see their adjustable rate mortgages on their homes go up \$1,200 as my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, has said. Credit card payments, because the interest rates will go up, will be higher. Towns and cities and States will find, and school districts and water districts, that their bonds will be in difficulty. That is all the result of tampering with the credit rating of the United States. It will have a disastrous effect on the United States and on the people of this country.

We cannot let this happen. What we need to do is to send the President of the United States a clean debt limit credit rating bill, so that in fact we can continue on as the great Nation that we have been, and that our Founding Fathers sought for us.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we don't pass a debt limit extension and the country defaults on the national debt, the result will be devastating.

The Republicans don't believe Treasury Secretary Rubin when he warned of default. Instead, they have resorted to a dangerous game of chicken with our Nation's economy.

If we do default on the national debt, it will have an adverse effect on so many people. Social Security and veteran benefit recipients may not receive checks. Interest rates would rise dramatically, affecting home, car, and student loans. Bond prices would fall dramatically, causing people to sell in fear of this.

First, the Republicans held Government employees hostage in their attempt to get the President to cave in to their extreme balanced budget plan. And now, they are fooling around with the possibility of defaulting on the debt.

They just never learn that their extreme bullying tactics just aren't going to work.

We can't afford to default on the national debt. We need a clean debt limit extension.

VOTING BALLOTS PRINTED IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF GOVERNMENT EXCESS

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to another example of Government excess. In the spirit of so-called multiculturalism, the Federal Government has mandated since 1965 that voting ballots and materials be printed in dozens of languages other than English. Today there are some 375 voting districts across this country that are required to print ballots in foreign languages.

In a classic example of an unfunded mandate gone amok, politicians in Washington are forcing States and localities to provide multilingual ballots without providing the funds to implement the ballots. This Don Quixote

mandate, the legislation that has caused this mandate is the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Under the law, counties must provide multilingual voting information and ballots in the language of any minority groups with more than 10,000 eligible voters in that county.

In the real world, these services should not be needed at all. Voting rights are extended to citizens of this country, and one needs to demonstrate some fluency in English to become a U.S. citizen, so why all of these ballots. In other languages other than English? In practice, this requirement for citizenship has been unenforced, but that does not change the facts. By law, English is the requirement for citizenship in this country. We should not be providing Government services, in direct contradiction with the spirit, if not the letter, of the law's requirement.

Moreover, these services are expensive, as well as unnecessary. It might surprise supporters of multilingual ballots to know that very few people actually request such special treatment. By and large multilingual ballots are rarely requested, and even less often used, even when they are provided. That is what makes these costs and their cost to the local taxpayers all the more shocking.

Election officials in Alameda County, CA, told me recently that they spent almost \$100,000 to produce ballots in Spanish and Chinese for the entire country, yet only 900 were ultimately requested. You can do the math. The taxpayers of Alameda County spent over \$100 for every multilingual ballot that was actually used in that June 1994 election. This appears to be a trend.

The last election in Los Angeles saw ballots printed in six languages other than English. Among them were Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Korean. It cost the city government over \$125,000 to prepare the materials. Yet, and listen to this, only 927 ballots were used. Los Angeles spent over \$135 for each voter the city helped.

Even small communities are not immune. Long Beach spent a relatively modest \$1,026 preparing multilingual materials for its eligible voters when only 22 requests came in. The township spent over \$280 per multilingual voter. As a frustrated election official told me recently, "This is a lot of money to help a few people." That official could not be more right.

These ballots have other, more serious costs associated with them, too. Providing these special services creates the fiction that newcomers to this country can enjoy the full benefits of citizenship without the language of the land, which is English. How can a citizen cast an informed ballot in a foreign

language when most candidates' platforms, stump speeches, and media coverage are in English? Exercising one's rights of citizenship involves more than just casting a vote. It means making a thoughtful decision regarding an issue or a candidate.

Multilingual voting ballots give individuals the right to vote without granting the power to cast an informed vote. The logical extent of the argument behind the multilingual ballots is to provide these services in all the languages spoken in the country. After all, why should we privilege one linguistic minority over another? Should we not provide news reports and election coverage in all these languages, so these citizens have access to all the information they need to cast an informed vote? The simple and obvious answer is that we cannot. There are 327 languages spoken in the United States today. We cannot provide these services in all of these languages. What is more, we should not.

CALLING FOR A MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN TAIWAN AND THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it is said that in history, great conflicts begin more often from miscalculation than by purposeful design. Even in our own time, it is said that the Korean war may have begun by the unfortunate statement of Mr. Avenuees that the defense perimeter of the United States began in the Sea of Japan, and not the 38th parallel.

A few years ago the United States Ambassador to Iraq suggested to Saddam Hussein that in a dispute between Kuwait and Iraq, the United States would regard the matter as an internal problem in the Arab world. Today in the straits of Taiwan a foundation may be being laid for a similar misunderstanding.

I take the floor today, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this institution, in the hope that the leaders of our country, our great allies in the People's Republic of China, come to some mutual understanding of events that are taking shape even as we speak between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

Only weeks ago the Peoples Republic fired missiles into the airspace and the shipping lanes around Taiwan. It is now openly being discussed what further actions, including military measures, might be taken. The leaders in Beijing are displeased with comments or activities of President Li after the Taiwanese elections.

It is the policy of the United States Government to have formal diplomatic

relations with the People's Republic and to recognize it as the sole legitimate Government of China, but the Taiwan Relations Act is infinitely more complex. It also permits, and indeed, in my judgment, provides a responsibility for the United States Government to continually reassess our role and obligations if the security situation of Taiwan were to deteriorate.

I recognize that the relationship between Beijing and Washington is one of the cornerstones of world peace. It is one of this Nation's most important economic, cultural, and security relationships. I want it to be strong and I want it to be sound. But I also recognize, and history bears witness, the United States keeps its obligations, recognizes its relationships, and meets the needs of its friends.

I trust and I hope that Beijing in the coming months will act responsibly, retain the commitment that any dispute it might have with the people on Taiwan and the question of the larger China is resolved peacefully, responsibly, and diplomatically. But simply because Members of this institution and the larger U.S. Government are committed to good relations with Beijing, simply because we want good political relationships, increased investment and trade, simply because of the progress of all these years, they should not put aside that this is still a nation that keeps its obligations, defends the weak against the strong, and holds democratic governments with pluralistic governments in a singular and special category.

This is, after all, not the Taiwan of 20 years ago. There is a free press, a pluralist democracy, and now, a popularly elected President. That does not negate aspects of, or in its totality, the Taiwan Relations Act. It is simply an attempt to make an effort on my own part to communicate with the leaders in Beijing to let them know that the firing of the missiles was not only wrong, but threatening military action is irresponsible.

However they may calculate it, whatever their advisers may say, at the end of the day, in spite of all the investment and all the hopes for good relations with China, the world will not watch a military incursion, a renewal of hostilities, or even irresponsible acts that threaten the peace.

So I hope each in our private ways, parties to this potential dispute, will again renew their commitment to peace and ensure that our actions remain responsible, but that all parties at the end of the day recognize that the United States will not witness the forceful end of the Government of Taiwan.

TRAVEL HABITS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is recognized for 40 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Commerce Department has made news. But it's not news about any new trade deals it won for American business. It's for the travel habits of the Secretary of Commerce. It seems that the Secretary has a penchant for travel, one that has cost the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars.

In fact, the current Secretary's travel costs have increased by over 145 percent from that of his predecessor. One can only assume he is using the same travel agency as the Secretary of Energy.

This weekend, the Los Angeles Times reported that the Department of Commerce's own inspector general was sharply critical of Secretary Ron Brown's travel expenses, noting that "His spending levels are particularly striking since he took over the job from a Republican administration that was often under fire for incurring excessive travel costs."

The Los Angeles Times goes on to add, "Brown, a former chairman of the Democratic Party, was accused by his critics of using his travel budget to gain favor with political allies and party contributors, many of whom have been invited to accompany the secretary on his extensive foreign trips."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Los Angeles Times article.

The article referred to is as follows: [From the Los Angeles Times, Jan. 22, 1996]

AUDIT CITES TRAVEL COSTS OF COMMERCE SECRETARY (By Sara Fritz)

WASHINGTON.—Under Commerce Secretary Ronald H. Brown, travel expenses for the secretary's office have risen at least 145% over those of a well-traveled GOP predecessor, while many of Brown's aides are improperly using government credit cards for personal purchases, according to a confidential audit report obtained by The Times.

The report by the Commerce Department's inspector general also sharply criticizes Brown for supplementing his escalating travel budget with millions of dollars that Congress intended for other purposes.

In addition, it questions the Commerce Department's practice of paying in advance the expenses of nongovernment workers who travel as "consultants" for the administration. It notes that more than \$360,000 in travel advances to these private citizens have never been repaid.

The report, which generally calls into question Brown's financial management of the Commerce Department, comes to light in the wake of the controversy over excessive travel spending by Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, whose penchant for numerous and expensive foreign trips was detailed by The Times.

Brown is already under investigation by a court-appointed independent counsel on a variety of charges unrelated to his travel expenditures—most of them involving his personal finances.

His spending levels are particularly striking since he took over the job from a Republican administration that was often under fire for incurring excessive travel costs. In particular, the extensive travels of former Commerce Secretary Robert A. Mosbacher, who served in the Bush administration, were often questioned by Democrats in Congress.

Like Mosbacher, Brown, a former chairman of the Democratic Party, was accused by his critics of using his travel budget to gain favor with political allies and party contributors, many of whom have been invited to accompany the secretary on his extensive foreign trips.

Carol Hamilton, Brown's press secretary, said the increased spending reflects the secretary's determination to be more of an activist than his predecessors in promoting the interests of American business.

"The Brown Department of Commerce is a far more activist Commerce Department, particularly in terms of export promotion," she said.

At the same time, she said, the department has taken steps to clamp down on the misuse of credit cards and to eliminate other problems cited by the auditors.

Judging from individual expense reports filed by Brown and his traveling companions, which also were obtained by *The Times*, the Commerce secretary's costs have risen in part because he makes numerous domestic and foreign trips. But records also show that he adds to the cost by taking along a sizable entourage of advisors and security personnel, along with an advance team whose tasks include arranging for hotel accommodations and ground transportation.

Overall, according to the audit, travels by Commerce Department employees cost the taxpayers nearly \$68 million in 1994, exceeding the budget set by Congress by about 55%. One Commerce Department agency alone, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—which helps pay for Brown's trips—exceeded its travel budget by \$22 million in 1994.

Auditors found that the secretary and his office staff spent nearly \$1.4 million from their own budget on travel during 1994, nearly 1½ times more than the \$552,389 spent in 1991 by Mosbacher and his aides.

In addition, auditors found, the secretary has supplemented his travel budget with hundreds of thousands of dollars drawn from other agencies within his department, including NOAA, the International Trade Administration and the Economic Development Administration.

For example, the report says the ITA and the EDA transferred funds from their budgets to pay for Brown's trips to Russia in March 1994 and to India in January 1995. Records indicate that NOAA routinely pays for Brown's bodyguards, both on foreign and domestic trips.

As a result of Brown's decision to use other agencies' funds for his trips, auditors were unable to determine precisely how much money the secretary has spent on travel. But the report quotes ITA officials as saying his travel expenditures from their budget reached \$2 million in 1994 alone.

The inspector general's office says the practice of transferring funds between agencies was troublesome, but not illegal. "We found no violation of the letter of the appropriations law," the report says. "But we are

concerned that the transfers weaken the integrity of the budgeting and appropriation process and expend funds in ways not anticipated by Congress."

Hamilton said Brown disagrees with the inspector general's criticism.

The report was first obtained from the Commerce Department by Citizens Against Government Waste, a conservative, Washington-based watchdog group, and the inspector general's office has declined further comment on it.

But on Capitol Hill, where decisions about Brown's travel budget are made, a spokesman for Rep. William F. Clinger Jr. (R-Pa.), chairman of the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, expressed strong dissatisfaction with Commerce Department spending practices.

Brown's travel spending, he said, appears to be "in violation of Congress' power of the purse." Clinger, who also has a copy of the audit report, added that Americans would prefer to have their economic development funds spent on local community projects, not on foreign trips for Brown.

The auditors found widespread abuse of government credit cards within the Commerce Department, including "unpaid charges, use of charge card for personal purchases and automated teller machine advances not related to official travel." Among those issued these credit cards, according to Hamilton, are some nongovernment workers—some of them political associates of Brown—who are hired as consultants to accompany the secretary on his trips, often to make advance arrangements.

Specifically, they identified 293 employees with delinquent accounts and 567 who had used the card for ATM advances or personal charges, such as meals at fancy Washington restaurants, liquor, jewelry, flowers, books and music, online service fees and automobile insurance.

Hamilton described the problem as simply a "bookkeeping issue" and said department administrators have assured Brown that the money was not "inappropriately spent."

When confronted by the inspector general with these apparent abuses of government credit cards, according to the audit report, most agencies within the Commerce Department appear to have made a good-faith effort to ferret out the problem and respond in writing.

But Brown's own office appears to have been less cooperative. The report notes: "The coordinator in the office of the secretary gave us oral explanations for some of the questionable accounts, but told us that because of other pressing duties, she did not have sufficient time to provide written explanations."

At NOAA, the expense account coordinator complained that she could not possibly do a thorough job of monitoring credit card expenditures because she was the only person responsible for 5,000 to 6,000 cardholders.

Although the department subsequently made arrangements with American Express Co. to automatically block retail expenditures made with a government credit card, the inspector general noted that the system was far from foolproof.

The Commerce Department's efforts to collect repayments of travel advances from consultants also have been inadequate, according to the report. As of March 31, 1995, these nongovernment personnel had received 525 advance payments totaling \$360,110 that had never been repaid.

Of the 83 nongovernment workers who traveled with the Commerce Department be-

tween 1992 and 1994, the report says, only two of them repaid their travel advances in full. While most of them made some accounting of their expenditures, however inadequate, nine of them filed no vouchers.

The report says 260 of the advances, totaling \$119,552, were more than a year old and probably uncollectable. Recipients of 367 advances, totaling \$195,861, had ignored four government notices seeking repayment.

Perhaps the hardest criticism leveled in the inspector general's report points to a lack of concern within the Commerce Department about these matters of financial management. "Oversight of travel spending by agencies appears virtually nonexistent beyond the commitment of funds," it concludes.

Earlier this year, 60 of my colleagues and I introduced legislation that would have dismantled the outdated and unnecessary bureaucracy at the Department of Commerce.

The Commerce Department is typical of the old way of Washington thinking that I was sent to challenge. While the Department is supposed to be helping the Nation's businesses, the truth is that business leaders from across the country have indicated their overwhelming support for eliminating the Department.

A Business Week poll of senior business executives taken last year indicated that those business leaders favor eliminating the Commerce Department by a 2-to-1 margin. A survey of business executives in my home State taken by the Detroit Chamber of Commerce found only 6 percent of executives and business owners in favor of keeping the Department as it is.

Yet despite this resounding vote of no confidence from the very people the Department is supposed to be serving, Secretary Brown and his liberal allies continue to defend the Department and justify ever bigger budgets.

If the Department of Commerce were truly the voice for business it claims to be, it would be supporting the things that business wants: a balanced budget and the lower interest rates and stronger economy it will bring; legal reform; and regulatory reform.

Instead, the Department has advocated against all these things, in the mistaken belief that American businesses are looking for a Secretary of Commerce with a lot of frequent flyer miles.

Is it any wonder that the majority of business leaders in this country say get rid of Commerce?

I think I speak from some experience when I talk about dismantling the Commerce Department because I came to Congress from the business world. I started a company from the corner of my living room that went on to provide jobs to over 1,200 families and did business in 52 countries.

During the whole time I ran my company, I never once called on the Department of Commerce for their help, and they never called me to offer any.

And as a businessman, if the vast majority of my customers said they

thought my company was no longer needed, I would think it was time for some major reengineering.

That is precisely what the Department of Commerce faces today. When over two-thirds of the Nation's businesses—the Department of Commerce's customers—say it should be dismantled, it is time for some serious reengineering.

Our Department of Commerce Dismantling Act provides a serious and responsible blueprint for the reengineering of the Department.

It streamlines the beneficial programs of the Department, consolidates the duplicative programs, privatizes the programs better performed by the private sector, and eliminates the unnecessary programs.

□ 1415

One of the other key features to this dismantling act is that we have found a way to consolidate many of the programs. We have 115 different trade programs that my good friend from Florida, Mr. MICA, will talk to us about, that we have consolidated into one office of trade.

If I could yield to my good friend from Florida [Mr. MICA], maybe he could embellish on that, because it was his amendment to this bill that gave us a concept for trading that puts us on a level playing field with all of our major trading partners in this country.

Mr. MICA. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do want to say what a pleasure it has been to work with the gentleman from Michigan and the refreshing viewpoint that he brings to the Congress, and also the background and knowledge. He is not an attorney, I am not an attorney. We both come from a background of business. He has dealt in international trade, knows what he is talking about. I ran a small consulting business that represented big and small firms around the world that was involved in international trade, and we think we have some idea of what is going on out there and what we need to do.

I spoke earlier on the floor to my colleagues about what the President said and what he did not say. One of the things that people were concerned about that I talked to and that I am concerned about is our opportunities for trade. The President talked about global competition. I cannot think of any country, major industrialized country that is more ill-prepared than the United States to deal from a government standpoint in international trade. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] has seen it, I have seen it, and others who have been involved in international trade.

The President did not tell you that the trade deficit that we are facing, that this Nation is facing, is the most staggering from last year in probably

the history of the recorded statistics, that we are going down the tubes, that we are losing jobs, we are losing opportunities for the future. We are losing good-paying jobs because we do not have our act together.

It is easy to stand here and criticize, but in fact, the President and this administration are blocking the proposal that Mr. CHRYSLER and I and others have worked on. It was not an easy task to come up with a reorganization of this Department of Commerce.

Let me tell you how disorganized our trade effort is. There are 11 committees of jurisdiction; Mr. CHRYSLER and I went to at least 5 or 6 of these committees with our dog and pony show to explain what was going on, to say we needed to make a change, we needed to reorganize the Department of Commerce, not just to spend money wildly or in excess, like you have seen the abuses outlined by Mr. CHRYSLER, but in some organized, cohesive fashion.

That is what we propose. That is what is in this budget that we have proposed, and that is what has been sitting on the President's desk and has been sitting for consideration and ignored. Unless these kinds of program changes are made, we will continue to lose our shirts and our pants and our wallets and our opportunity for the future, because we do not have our act together.

Now, that is some of the bad news. Let me tell you, it gets worse. You think about the Department of Commerce. Now, what does the Department of Commerce do? Do they help commerce? Are there a few folks involved?

Let me give you the exact statistics. There are 37,009 employees in the Department of Commerce. Do you know how many are in Washington, DC? 20,199 as of last January, 20,199. Now you think they would all be involved in helping promote commerce. Wrong, wrong again. What they are involved in, 16,000 of them are involved in the Weather Service; 16,000 in the Weather Service. Less than 3,300 are involved actually in trade and commerce and international export promotion. But we have scattered throughout 17, 18 other Federal agencies this responsibility for export promotion, for assistance for finance and for the other things that will help our medium and small businesses compete.

In fact, we propose to bring together trade assistance, trade negotiation, trade promotion, and trade finance. You cannot cut a deal in business unless you have the ability to finance. Our medium and small businesses cannot compete. When you have the right hand not knowing what the left hand is doing and 18 agencies involved in this spending of over \$3 billion in a disorganized fashion, this is what you get, the biggest trade deficit in history.

The White House continues to ignore this, and most of the people here know

nothing about it. They have never been in business. Most of them are attorneys and most of them have been running for office most of their life. This new group has come in and said: We do not want business as usual, we want to conduct international business. We want our people to have good-paying jobs, and we need to get our act together.

But let me tell you. It does not matter if it does not work; they want to continue doing it that way. It does not matter if it is ineffective. They want to continue doing it that way. It does not matter if it is costly, we will spend more money on it. And you see the results of what you get with someone like Mr. Brown running the Agency.

So we have to make some changes. Even in the Weather Bureau, with 16,000 people, you know, they are still there. Let us put our thumb out and see what the weather is, our finger. That is how they did it 10 years ago, not recognizing that there are technology changes, not recognizing that we also have a Weather Service with the Department of Defense and FAA. How about some consolidation? How about some elimination of positions of duplication?

So we propose an organized attempt for this country to get together. The freshmen are called extremists. Well, yes, they are extremists if they want to see your dollars spent properly. Yes, they are extremists if they want to see 2 or 3 people doing the same job that used to take 10. Yes, they are extremists if they see us losing our pants in competition. Yes, they are extremists if they see 30,000 people in the Department of Commerce and 20,000 of them in Washington, DC, right here.

Now, folks, we have to get a grip. This Congress has to get a grip. The American people have to grip and look at what is happening with their money and look at what is happening in the area in which we have the most opportunity for the future.

This country always depended on domestic trade. Now we have to compete in an international arena the President said, and yet they do not have one idea. They will not come forward and accept this well-thought-out, well-negotiated proposal to allow us to compete, to allow us to get our act together, to allow us to give some opportunities for the future.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first things I did as a Member of Congress as a member of the Aviation Committee, I flew out to Washington. I was there because they were laying off over 10,000 employees at Boeing. We cannot allow this to happen. That was one of the few areas where we excel and exceed in exports. Now they are beating our pants off with Airbus and other activities. We are not able to compete.

We have to have a new relationship between business and Government working together to create jobs, to create opportunities, and to compete with

the other guys who are beating our pants off. The Germans, the Japanese, the English, they have been trading with the Europeans for centuries with international markets as part of the nature of things. We have relied on domestic markets. Now we have to change.

Now, this class of freshmen who are not all attorneys, who are business people like Mr. CHRYSLER, have come here. They are bringing their knowledge, their experience, and applying it to an agency like the Department of Commerce. They wanted to do away with four or five agencies. Did you see the parade the other day when they started coming in, the Cabinet members? My goodness, they took up a whole row of the House of Representatives. There is not enough room for the Cabinet to sit at the table anymore.

Even Mr. Panetta, when he was on this floor and a Member of this House, had recommended that we downsize to seven Cabinet members. We are talking about consolidation of one activity, the most important, commerce, commerce and business that pays the bills for all of the rest of it. It pays for welfare, it pays for Medicare. None of this is provided by the tooth fairy; it is provided by the taxpayers, and then we get the funds and we spend them. But we have to have some basis for that, and that basis is business. Our best opportunity for business is export and getting the Department of Commerce together.

I yield back to the gentleman, and I thank him so much for the leadership he and his class has provided, for the abuse you have taken in trying to bring this country into the 21st century as far as business, economic opportunity, and I salute you.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA]. I appreciate the help of the gentleman and his expertise in the area of trade.

Trade is a very important issue to this country, but we need to do it so we can compete on a level playing field with all of our trading partners.

In this Commerce dismantling act that we have passed here in the House, over 7 years the plan will save taxpayers \$7 billion of their hard-earned money, money that will not be going to fund Secretary Brown's worldwide junkets any longer. And just getting rid of the Department of Commerce, which is the mother of all corporate welfare, giving away over \$1 billion a year in the Department of Commerce, if you do not have a Department of Commerce for 25 years, you do not give away \$25 billion of taxpayers' money.

□ 1430

Dismantling the unnecessary and duplicative bureaucracy at the Department of Commerce is a hefty down payment that we can make today on our efforts to balance the budget. If the President is serious about getting rid

of wasteful Government spending, as he indicated the other night in his State of the Union Address, he should join us in this effort to make Government more effective and more efficient.

Certainly, one of my colleagues that has worked extremely hard at that in this 104th Congress is the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK]. He has worked to try to right-size this Government. He has worked to dismantle not only the Department of Commerce but the Department of Energy, the Department of Education, and HUD. I am proud to say that three of those four departments were included in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 in the House bill.

If you want to protect the status quo, then you will continue to do what Alice Rivlin indicated the other day when we met with her and said, well, she was not ready to look at dismantling the Department of Commerce because she wanted to keep it around.

I would like to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK], and let him tell us a little bit about his experiences of trying to right-size Government while trying to eliminate the wasteful spending of a Secretary with the total disregard for the taxpayers' money that he has shown here.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

I want to recognize what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] has been doing. Here is a businessman coming into the Congress. Normally, people would say, well, this would be the type of person that would defend the Department of Commerce, help the Department of Commerce because it is going to deliver goodies back to him or to his organization or people that he knows. Instead, he is going in saying, "Why do we have this Department of Commerce the way it is currently configured and can we not save money and help the American people and help the American taxpayer in the process?" I think that is a very worthy goal and objective and something that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] has really put forward.

Mr. Speaker, the other night I was really attracted to be very supportive of the President's statement in the State of the Union where he said at the outset, "The era of big Government is over." The era of big Government is over. It is over.

He said that, and he said that we have got to get on past this point in time. I was very appreciative of him saying that, that the era of big Government was over. And I anticipated that shortly thereafter in the speech, the State of the Union, that he would call for the elimination of the Department of Commerce as an indication that the era of big Government is over and here is something we can do without and we can save \$7 billion in doing this, \$7 bil-

lion. We can cut corporate welfare in the process of doing this, as well, and we can deal with some of these issues of excessive travel expenditures in the process, too. We can show a smaller, more focused, more limited Federal Government.

We can do as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] has talked about previously as well, consolidate our trade functions. Instead of 19 different agencies and entities doing trade promotion, get it into one, and we can have an effective, focused force in international trade that will help us, although I think the biggest help we can do to help ourselves in international trade is negotiate good treaties, have less regulation, have less litigation, have less taxation and a balanced budget to cut interest rates by 2 percentage points, and if we could get the Federal Government as a smaller percentage of the gross national product, that is going to do more than anything else to help us promote international trade and get our balance of payments.

I would be happy to yield back to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I just want to remind the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] also of the Freedom to Farm Act. That is the one we need to get through, too.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Yes, to be able to allow farmers to decide themselves what they want to plant rather than somebody that is planning for this out of the centralized bureaucracy in Washington telling my dad and my brother what they can plow on their farmland in Linn County near Parker, KS. They sit out there now and they go, "Now who is telling me that I have got to plant this many acres of corn and this many acres of wheat," and they are saying, "Well, OK, I will go along because that is what the system is."

But you have got to question, is that really the way it should be decided? Should the marketplace not send those signals and then individually decide in that system? And they would much rather do that.

I would say, as well, there are a number of very good things done by the Department of Commerce that we keep. Patent and Trademark Office, you have to keep that and you want to keep that. The National Weather Service does a very good job. I think we could probably do some more with some increase in technology, but they do an excellent job as well, and there are other things within that agency that do a good job.

But it is also well known about the political nature of many of the appointments within the Department of Commerce. There are problems that it has had recently, and we have seen these recent reports about the Secretary in the Department of Commerce.

I think overall, as a statement of faith and as a statement of commitment from the President of the United States and this Congress, that the era of big government is over, we should take this very first step and eliminate the Department of Commerce, keeping the core functions that are good and necessary, eliminating the corporate welfare, getting it out, saving the American people \$7 billion in the process, and showing them a smaller, more limited, more focused Federal Government.

I would be happy to yield back to my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER], who has brought this debate thus far with a great deal of difficulty.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK]. The gentleman mentioned the era of big government is over, and it is true the President of the United States said that three times in his speech.

This is the same President that wanted to give us the biggest health care, national health care program, in the history of this country, gave us the biggest tax increase in the history of this country, and then presented a balanced budget to us on January 6 which he could have just as easily presented to us on December 15 and we would have had no Government shutdown. So we ask ourselves, Who shut down the Government? Only the President, the President that could have submitted that budget when the law that he signed said he would. So he broke the law, did not keep his word and shut down the Federal Government. That is very easy to understand.

In that budget, \$400 billion went for a bigger government here in Washington, DC. There was also another \$200 billion tax increase. And Bill Clinton has again just demonstrated that he is a tax-and-spend, liberal Democratic President. This, when he is standing there saying out of the other side of his mouth, the era of big government is over.

At this point, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, first let me thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] for the tremendous work he has done looking at wasteful government spending, and, make no mistake, there is a lot of waste.

You are exactly correct that Republicans probably made a mistake when they simply said we want the President as a starting point to give us his balanced budget that balances in 7 years as scored by CBO. So what does he do? He gives us a budget that increases taxes, does not cut spending and said, well, this is it. But do the people of this country really want to continue down that path of more taxes and more spending and more borrowing.

On the Department of Commerce, I think when we have a department that is not necessary and we start appointing political cronies to head up those departments, there is a danger of misuse of their positions.

So I am not only concerned about Secretary Brown's international travels, I am also concerned about his domestic travels. This is an individual who was chairman of the National Democratic Party, who was the major fundraiser for Democrats, who does a political evaluation test for the people that he brings in to make sure that they are partisan Democrats.

I think what happens is not only a waste of taxpayers' money but a misuse of the Department, when instead of appointing the highest qualified individuals, you go to those political patronage jobs who have done the most for your political Democratic Party or for your reelection as President and you say this is the person I am going to bring in to head this Department.

So it is no wonder that there is an abuse of travel. When we investigate this, and I would hope everybody would just take the time to read the Monday, January 22, Los Angeles Times article where it cites the travel costs of the Commerce Secretary that are 145 percent higher than his predecessor, that has evidence of misuse of credit card by the staff of that department. Here is not only the head of the Department but essentially a whole department that should be wiped out, eliminated from the Federal Government. The useful functions of that Department can well be accomplished by other agencies and other departments at much lesser cost.

We have got a problem in this country, and it is about time we face it. It is about time that every individual, say, at least under the age of 50 years old, better start looking at this Federal budget, they better start looking at the ramifications that this overspending and overtaxing and overborrowing is going to have on their future lives. Because if you look at how long Social Security is going to last, the estimates are now that Social Security is going to be broke by the year 2020, that Medicare is actually this year spending out more money than it is taking in. We have made overcommitments, we are overspenders.

Politicians in the past have decided that by promising more and more good things to people, it increases their chances of being reelected. The U.S. American citizens, when they go to the poll every election, better be saying, Is this person going to be doing what is right for my future, my kids' future and our grandkids' future? We are in a big battle now.

I will yield back to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER]. He can yield maybe on this point.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH]. I

appreciate the gentleman's comments this afternoon, and certainly they are very, very well noted.

I yield at this point to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] and the other gentleman from Michigan.

I wanted to say that it is interesting that just this morning I was speaking to a senatorial candidate from Georgia, and he said he started politics in 1974. In 1974 the big issue, when he was running for the State legislature, was let us balance the budget, we cannot have these deficits going on and on forever. He said, finally, after all these years, 17, 18 years later, we finally have a Congress who is doing something about the budget.

When I hear a lot of the folks back home who are bureaucracy brokers and status quo preservers saying, Oh, you can't do this, you can't do that, nobody said it was going to be easy to balance the budget. Nobody said that you could just do it overnight. We did not get in this situation overnight, and we will not get out of it overnight.

I always think it is kind of like dismantling an old white-elephant kind of house, one board at a time and maybe 1 year at a time. Perhaps we underestimated how quickly we could turn this government around. But we got used to borrowing money. Back in the days of Lyndon Johnson, we got used to borrowing money. It got so bad that by 1969, we said good-bye to our last balanced budget, and since then we have just been comfortable year after year of borrowing money.

While that would terrify our constituents back home, our moms and dads running households, to us it is not as terrifying because we have always been able to print more money. But I am glad that this Congress is taking a critical, crucial step. I wanted to just support what the gentleman from Michigan was saying in that regard.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

□ 1445

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and my other colleagues that have come out to talk about the scandal at the Department of Commerce and our meager attempts to try to reorganize one agency in this huge bureaucracy. I talked about 37,000 employees in the Department of Commerce, and 20,199 just in Washington, DC.

Here we are trying to balance the budget, we are trying to make some tough choices. It is not any fun to tell people they are going to get less, or the increases will not be as much, or some programs have to be eliminated. But then you have the responsibility, and I serve on the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight,

charged with looking at investigations and audits of these Federal agencies, and then these are the reports that we get about the Department of Commerce that Mr. CHRYSLER is highlighting today. Listen to this. Here is what these 20,000 people are doing in the Department of Commerce just in Washington.

This audit specifically identified 293 employees with delinquent accounts. They had Federal Government credit cards within the Department of Commerce, including unpaid charges and use of credit cards for personal purchases, even with ATM's—293 employees had delinquent accounts. Now listen to this; 567 had used the card for ATM advances for personal charges for meals at fancy Washington restaurants, liquor, jewelry, flowers, books, music, on-line service fees, we do not know what that is, and automobile insurance.

Would not all of my constituents in the Seventh District of Florida like to have one of these handy cards? This is not just a few folks; this is 567.

Now, we came, we looked at the Department of Commerce, and we saw disorganization. We saw 20,000 people out of 36,000 just here in Washington, DC. We saw us losing our shirt and pants and economic opportunity in the international trade arena, and we tried to reorganize it. We proposed that and got slammed in the face. We have been ignored.

Then we have the President come here and talk about global competition, and no one is less prepared than the United States of America to compete in this global market.

So here is what is going on. These are the choices we have to make. These are the choices Americans have to make, and we have got to do something about it. We wanted to change much more. We acceded to one department, and this is what the people are getting for their money. Their money is being wasted. We are not competing.

You heard Mr. BROWNBACK. The answer that the gentleman gave is true. We can do more for business with a balanced budget. We can do more to promote business with less taxation, less litigation, less government regulation. Those are all part of our agenda here, what we have tried to do in a sensible, responsible, commonsense business fashion.

But people do not want to listen to that. They want to stand up and say the Republicans are hurting the elderly, environment, and education. It sounds good and gets on a bumper sticker, but it does not jibe with the facts.

These are the facts, that this department and other departments are out of control, that this Federal bureaucracy is out of control. When you have 350,000 Federal employees within just a few miles of my speaking distance from the

floor of the House of Representatives, that is what this argument is about.

These freshmen have come here from business, from every walk of life, and they do not care whether they get re-elected. That is the difference here. They do not care whether they get re-elected. They came here to get this country's finance in order. They came here to get this Government in order. That is what they care about. They do not care about the next election, they care about the next generation.

When you see this country, the threat of our debt carrying us into a lower credit rating on the international market, when you see the President talking about responsibility with pension funds, while Secretary Rubin, the Secretary of the Treasury, is rocking the shreds that are left of our Federal employees' retirement funds. It is a pitiful state of affairs for this country, for this Congress, and for the future of any American.

So I thank the gentleman. I get a little bit wound up on this, but I care too, and I know the gentleman cares, and that is why we came here. It does not matter whether we come back, because others will come to this job. It has to be done. It must be done, and it will be done for the future of this country.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman and appreciate those words. The gentleman mentioned 37,000 employees in the Commerce Department. Two-thirds of those employees were deemed nonessential during the first Government shutdown, 24,000 employees. My legislation only reduced it by one-third, or about 12,000 employees, which says we are not extreme, just conservative. The extreme position is when you want to protect the status quo, and we are here to change it.

To that point, I would sure like to yield some time to my good friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Michigan. As we are gathered here on the floor to have a little straight talk, I think it is very interesting again to recall the words of our Chief Executive, who stood here at the podium 2 nights ago and who said the days of big government are over.

Well, maybe there is a word we should insert there, because I think what the American people want to know is that the days of big spending government are over. For how could the President make that assertion 2 nights ago, and be here in this Chamber with his Cabinet officers, including two of the biggest spenders the executive branch has ever seen? If not the biggest spenders, certainly two of the most well traveled Cabinet secretaries this country has ever seen?

I exchanged pleasantries with Secretary O'Leary. Much as been made, and, indeed, the record of her travels has been chronicled for all in this free society to see. And apart from recogni-

tion of those problems, the White House has turned a deaf ear. Of course, this White House, goodness knows, has problems of its own.

Then Secretary Brown. It is almost as if the receptionist at the Commerce Department could make a recording that rhymes: "Mr. Brown is out of town." That in itself would not be so bad, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, but Mr. Brown is out of town, and he is on your expense account, you, the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in here, all of the American people who pay their taxes, who play by the rules, are financing trips that need some oversight, expenditures that this Congress should take a very real look at, and, again, not questioning the sincerity of the service, but instead looking at the evidence, the compelling evidence.

A few years before we got here there was criticism of another Secretary of Commerce who served under a Republican President, and previous Congresses chose to investigate that Secretary of Commerce. And yet expenditures for the current Secretary of Commerce are some 145 percent above his Republican predecessors. Now, I realize in this town, and given the kind of quirky mathematics employed by the liberals inside the beltway, they will probably try to say that is a cut. But it is an increase, and it is to the credit of the gentleman from Michigan that he has brought it to our attention and a credit to the fact that it has not gone on his credit card, but has been brought to the attention of the American public.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Now more than ever it is time to dismantle the Department of Commerce.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 20 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House.

Mr. Speaker, former Prime Minister Rabin made it very clear that he felt that politicians, elected officials, were elected by adults to represent the children, and that is in fact what our responsibility ultimately is, to represent the children and to leave this country a better place than we found it.

When I was elected in the statehouse in 1974, really at the end of the Vietnam war, our national debt was \$430 billion. In the 22 years since the end of the Vietnam war, our national debt has grown to \$4.9 trillion. We have seen a tenfold increase since the last really extensive war. So we fought the Revolutionary War, we fought the war with the pirates, we fought the War of 1812,

we fought the Civil War, we fought the Spanish-American War, we fought World War I, we fought World War II, we fought the Korean war, we fought the Vietnam war, and our national debt was about \$430 billion.

Admittedly those dollars bought more in past years, but since then our national debt has grown to \$4.9 trillion.

I was elected to the statehouse, and I looked at Congress with some awe, that it is an amazing place. It is a magnificent opportunity to serve in Congress. But I looked as a State legislator and said I have to balance our State budget in Connecticut. I cannot let it be unbalanced.

I understand when times are bad you might have a year or two when you want to generate economic activity and get out of a recession, but you would not just have this systematic deficit spending that has added tenfold to our national debt.

When I was elected in 1987, I vowed that the most important thing would be to save our country from bankruptcy. Not to "balance the budget," but, no, to save it from bankruptcy, to not mortgage this country so that our children would not have a country.

I became part of an effort that the gentleman from Ohio [JOHN KASICH] started in 1989, at least that is the first time I remember voting for one of his major deficit reduction bills, and there were 38 of us that voted for it. Each year that number kept increasing.

We have three main objections as this Republican majority: We want to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget; we want to save our trust funds from bankruptcy, particularly Medicare from insolvency, as it is going now to bankruptcy in the year 2002, 7 years from now, now 6 years from now; and, third, we want to transform this caretaking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society.

Now, on the first area, getting our financial house in order, as a Member of Congress, I vote on one-third of the budget. I do not vote on entitlements, unless we make a proactive effort to change. What comes out of the Committee on Appropriations is one third of the budget. When I was in the statehouse, it was basically 100 percent of the budget, except for the debt issue. So we vote only one-third of the budget.

Gramm-Rudman focused on one-third of the budget. You control the budget by appropriations, but it was only one-third. Then entitlements kept growing so that they are now half of our budget.

What we are looking to do, this is the first Congress, and Wednesday are doing something that Leon Panetta, the Chief of Staff, the former head of the OMB, but then the former chairman of the Committee on the Budget said we have to do, that we will only get a handle on our budget and get our

financial house in order if we look to control the growth of entitlements.

So I take tremendous pride in being part of an effort with my colleagues on this side of the aisle, who have been willing to take on every special interest to represent the children to get our financial house in order so that we do not have such large debt. And this debt is consuming 42 percent of all of our savings.

Now, what does that mean? It means that when people save money for new plant and equipment, to have it be invested in this country, 42 percent of it gets taken away to fund our national debt. So what are we doing? We are cutting some discretionary programs. We are doing that. We are downsizing Government. We are looking to have the Commerce Department not be a department anymore, to downsize and reduce the number of departments and become more efficient and not have 11 layers of decision makers within our departments; but to reduce that, like we have in the private sector.

But when I hear the word "cut," it applies to some things and not others. We are not cutting the earned income tax credit. We are not cutting the school lunch program. We are not cutting the student loan program. We are not cutting Medicare and Medicaid. Maybe we should in some instances be cutting some programs. We are not. We are allowing them to grow. They are going to grow and grow and grow, but we are trying to slow their growth.

The bottom line to this is what the earned income tax credit is is a payment that the Federal Government makes to the working poor. We are going to continue that, but it is not going to go to married couples without children, it is not going to go to single people. And we ultimately are going to cap it so it does not go to people making incomes of \$35,000 or more. We are going to allow the earned income tax credit to grow from \$19 to \$25 billion.

□ 1500

The School Lunch Program is to grow from \$5.2 to \$6.8 billion. The Student Loan Program is to grow from \$24 to \$36 billion; that one really gets me. We are getting student loans. They are growing by 50 percent. Only in this place and in this city, when you cut the growth and allow it to continue to grow by 50 percent, do people say you are spending less.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAYS. Yes, I will yield briefly.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I am so glad to see my friend from Connecticut here, because once again he returns to the key point in this debate. We are trying to realize budgetary savings, not by eviscerating programs but by reducing the rate of growth.

I cannot help but note with great interest when our friend who visited two

nights ago, the gentleman who lives in the big White House at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, talks about budgetary savings, he is talking about the same type of exercise, yet he remains unchallenged on that by our friends on this side. Yet that curious mathematical exercise, where increases are called cuts, runs rampant in this institution; and I salute my good friend from Connecticut for once again bringing it to our attention.

I would like to inquire of my friends from Connecticut, because this is something that intrigued me: In the latest budget our President has offered us, he himself talked about the days of big Government being over; but as I understand it, his plan calls for some \$200 billion in higher taxes and some \$350 billion in additional spending over and above the real savings that you have labored so hard for to try and right-size this Government. That, to me, is especially confounding, and I am wondering why the reports of, dare I say it, budgetary neglect or overspending are not really chronicled in the White House budget offer. It is very curious what transpires inside this beltway with the representations of certain budgetary exercises.

Mr. SHAYS. The gentleman has asked a very important question, and I would like to get into that issue; but what I first want to do is be very clear about what we are doing, because I am not all that clear about what the President is doing.

I am clear about what he is saying in terms of his message, and I want to compliment the President on a few issues. And the gentleman is welcome to stay, but I want to go through a few key points; and I might have time at the end that we would have this type of analysis of the President's presentation.

We are not cutting the earned income tax credit; it is growing. The Student Loan Program is growing. The student lunches are growing. Student loans are growing by 50 percent. Every student is going to get the same amount of loans under our plan as they would get under the President's plan.

There is a difference. We are saying, with the students in that period of when they graduate to when they get a job, and we allow a 6-month, what they call grace period, interest free, we are going to have that interest paid by that student, but we are going to allow that interest to be amortized during the entire repayment of the loan. It amounts to \$9 more a month. It is a movie theater and popcorn. It is a pizza. It is something that we are asking students to do. They will still have all the loans, but it is \$9 more a month, and that is because we do not want the taxpayer to pay that.

We are saving, admittedly, \$4 billion in the next 7 years, the taxpayers are. Medicaid is growing from \$89 to \$127

billion. Medicare is growing from \$178 to \$289 billion.

Medicare is the one that really gets me. Medicare is growing at 7.2 percent more a year, and we did it by not increasing copayments and not increasing the deduction or increasing the cost of the premium to the beneficiary. We leave it at 31.5 percent. The taxpayers will pay 68.5 percent. We left it at 31.5 percent. Under existing law, it would have dropped to 25 percent.

Why would we ask the taxpayers to pay even more? We want to be at 31.5 percent. As health care costs go up, 31.5 percent is going to be slightly higher, but the taxpayers are going to pay slightly higher at 68.5 percent, because they pay the balance of it.

The bottom line is, we are looking to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget, and we are doing it by cutting some programs in discretionary spending and slowing the growth of entitlements, which are 50 percent of the budget. They are on automatic pilot, and we are looking to change that, and we are doing it for our children.

Now, when we get to Medicare, in particular, we know it is starting to go insolvent. What does that mean? This year, more money is going out of the Medicare Part A fund that pays for our hospitals than is coming in; and in the seventh year, all of it is out of the fund; there is no money left. Then the only way we pay for Medicare Part A is, the money goes into the fund and it immediately disappears and it will not be enough to pay for all the costs of Medicare Part A.

So we are looking to restore \$132 billion of funds to put into that system, to slow the takeout and to provide the funds to be in that system until the year 2010. And when I think about this, I am thinking about Medicare, it is growing at 7.2 percent a year. Per beneficiary, it is \$4,800 to \$7,100. And I am going to say it again: Only in this place, when you spend so much more, do people call it a cut. It is a 49-percent increase to beneficiaries.

Let me go through one last part. When we get to this third part, we want to get our financial house in order. We want to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from bankruptcy. Transforming this caretaking, social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society is a very big part of what we are about. Instead of giving people the food, we want them to learn how to grow the food. Instead of giving them the food, we are giving them the seed to grow the food. We are looking to make people responsible.

This gets me to the President's presentation. The President gave a speech that Ronald Reagan, for the most part, would have been proud to give, and I would be. He talked about personal responsibility. He talked about downsizing Government, making it

smaller. He talked about what we have been fighting for during this last year. And I want to be respectful of the President, because he was respectful of us and he is our President.

To his credit, he said that this Republican Congress is trying to do some heavy lifting and get our financial house in order. He acknowledged that, and in the end, he acknowledged what we have done with congressional accountability and the gift ban and lobby disclosure. He said it happened under this Congress, and I consider that a positive and honest statement.

I also believe in a lot of what he said about cherishing our children and our family, and dealing with crime and dealing with education issues, and the need, in fact he scolded Congress on the environment, and I happen to agree with his scolding of Congress on that one issue. The pendulum is too far this way, and unfortunately, I think too many of us on our side of the aisle want to go too far the other way. We may have an honest disagreement on that, but that is democracy.

But the bottom line is, I wrestle with this, 12-year-olds having babies. I wrestle with 14-year-olds selling drugs. I wrestle with 15-year-olds killing each other and 18-year-olds who cannot read their diplomas. I wrestle with 24-year-olds who do not have a job, not because jobs do not exist, but because those McDonald's jobs are dead-end jobs.

My dad, bless his heart, would have said to me, Son, how many hours are you working there? I would have said, 10. He would have said, Son, it just increased to 12 or 15. No job is a dead end, because it teaches you to come to work on time and to get up in the morning and to be of service. And it teaches you that you get something in return.

And so I just make this point, that if we succeed in balancing the budget, if we succeed in saving our trust funds, but we do not transform this social and corporate welfare state into an opportunity society, we have ultimately failed. And I say that as a moderate.

I say, as someone who recognizes that some of what Government has done, and some of what I have voted to have Government do, has failed.

Could I ask the Speaker how much time we have left. I want to make sure I am thoughtful of my colleague who has joined me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman has 5 minutes left.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, sometimes a liberal is the person who sees someone drowning out 50 feet from the pier and runs to the end of the pier and grabs 100 feet of rope and throws this excess rope. The rope is dangling around the person, and finally it is taut and ready to be pulled in, and that liberal takes the rope, drops it, and says, I have done my good deed and on to the next.

I have criticism of conservatives if they take this position: They see someone drowning 50 feet out and they take 25 feet of rope and say, Here, I will throw 25 feet of rope. You swim halfway, and I will meet you and pull you in.

They may need 50 feet of rope, but they may need something more, and I believe this side of the aisle has not taken that view. It has taken the view that we need not only give people the seed, but show them how to grow the food. But we do not necessarily give them the food indefinitely.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend offers an interesting analogy, and what I have often said, despite some of the labels and names that have been bandied about this Chamber, what difference does it make if an idea is called conservative or liberal or whatever, if it makes sense? The notion being this: that if we are able truly to empower the individual, if we are able to make sure that society has a safety net instead of a hammock, then that should be our goal.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Connecticut for his diligence in looking at budgetary issues and acknowledging, while sometimes we may not see completely eye to eye on every item that comes down the pike, certainly there is a broad consensus within this new majority to address the problems.

But even as we had our friend from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue join us the other night and say that the days of big government were over, I was intrigued by the statement that followed that. On one occasion he said, "But we cannot fend for ourselves," or words to that effect. And I believe that we have to be very careful of that type of blanket statement, for what it does is contradict the previous statement.

For it is not the role of government to step into every home, to step into every situation; to say, Washington calling, and we are here to provide you certain safeguards, or we are here to step in and intervene in every avenue of your life. Of course not.

The notion is this: that for society's poorest, that for society's sickest, that for society's weakest, government can exist to help make sure that rights are enforced, that individual liberties are not taken away; but we must remain ever vigilant that the same government who works to empower us with those rights does not in the process take away a person's well-being, both mentally and financially.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman points out, there is a tremendous balance in that whole effort. The bottom line is, the President talked about personal responsibility, and that is where it is at.

I would like to close by making this point. I know there are a number of Members of Congress who are not running again. Some of them happen to be moderate Members. And the news media said they are not running again because this is no longer a fun place or that this is no longer a nice place. And I just want to take a little bit of a different view of that issue.

Mr. Speaker, my view is, very frankly, this is not a fun place anymore. Why would it be a fun place? Because we are doing heavy lifting. There is nothing fun about having to confront the elderly and the young and every other special interest group and say, We are going to have to do some things differently to save this country from bankruptcy. It is not a fun place.

But what bothers me is that some of the people who are leaving were here as this country went down into a deep hole of debt, and now that we are in this deep hole of debt and we have to get out of this deep hole of debt, at least stop the deficits, they are quitting. So I contend that they may be quitting, not because this is not a fun place anymore because people are not nice, but because we have to do heavy lifting.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, we are doing heavy lifting. This is an epic battle. We are not going to necessarily agree with our colleagues on the other side. We should continue this battle and fight it out.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MEETS THE TEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, we have heard since the election of November last, and all of last year, that the goal of the Republicans in Congress was a 7-year, CBO-scored, balanced budget. And the challenge over the last several months apparently was to get the President of the United States to agree to put on the table a 7-year, CBO-scored, balanced budget.

The President of the United States has done that. He has met that test. CBO has scored that budget. There is some \$700 billion in savings in that proposal sufficient to balance the budget in these 7 years; and yet we now find that rather than take those savings and balance the budget, the Republican majority would rather end the negotiations. So those negotiations have been ended when there is \$700 billion in cash sitting on the table that all they have to do is walk in and pick it up and walk out, and the American taxpayers get all the benefits that we have all talked about from balancing the budget.

□ 1515

Rather than do that, apparently now there is an idea afoot that what we will have is a downpayment, a downpayment on the deficit. I have been here 20 years, and I have only seen one downpayment on the deficit that lowered the deficit. That is what President Clinton did 2 years ago when the deficit was over \$250 billion, and today it is \$167 billion. All the other downpayments on the deficit never quite got around to lowering the deficit.

So right as we are on the eve of a balanced budget, we find ourselves in the unusual position of the people who claim to have been the strongest proponents of that balanced budget, and I do not think there is any question that they have done everything to move this Congress toward a balanced budget, they now walk away from the negotiations because it is not everything that they could have had.

Rarely in negotiations, whether it is in business or sports, in your family or in the Congress, do you get your sway on everything. And so we are talking about \$700 billion in savings sitting on the table, waiting for somebody to pick it up. It is \$297 billion in discretionary cuts, \$124 billion changes in Medicare, \$73 billion in interest savings, \$67 billion in other mandatory spending changes, \$59 billion changes in Medicaid, corporate subsidies and compliance, \$56 billion and \$41 billion in welfare changes. This is a lot of money, my colleagues. This is the largest deficit reduction that we have seen. But now we are going to turn it down because it is not perfect? Because it is not exactly apparently what the majority wanted?

We can still make these changes in Medicare. We can have a separate vote on this floor. We can have a separate vote on this floor on medical savings accounts, make them part of it, either in or out. But we do not have to hold up the changes necessary to get the largest entitlement program in the country under some control.

We can make changes and we can still discuss whether Medicaid is going to have nursing home standards or it is not going to have nursing home standards, whether it is going to be an en bloc entitlement or a personal entitlement. We can have those debates afterwards. We can spend this whole year debating that subject. But we can get the budgetary savings, we can get the deficit reduction now while it is real. That is when it is important.

We know that essentially, that essentially we would dramatically change, under the coalition welfare bill that was passed, that was voted on in this Congress, I believe every member of the Democratic Party voted for, dramatically restructures welfare as we know it in this country, dramatically restructures your ability to stay on

welfare forever without meeting your responsibilities to try to find a job and to go to work, substantially changes your obligations if you are going to receive taxpayer dollars. The requirements of going to work, the requirements of time limits on welfare, all of that can be achieved and \$41 billion in savings at the same time. But we are going to turn it down because it is not exactly what the Republicans wanted in their bill.

This is incredible. This is incredible that we would be here on this eve, and now we are going to back up and we are going to create some kind of stopgap budget reduction legislation with a tax cut, and we are going to sort of give some kind of partial savings.

I just find that when we see that the President of the United States has come this far and is this willing to make these kinds of concessions and these kinds of changes, changes that are needed in each and every one of these programs, that somehow the Republican majority in this Congress will not give the American people those savings, those savings that will bring the budget to balance, those savings, as one of the previous speakers in the well said, will provide for reductions in interest rates on home mortgages, on credit cards, on student loans, and all of the things that America borrows for, that will provide real money in the pockets of working families in this country, is now going to be turned down by the Republican majority.

MAJOR RULING IN ENFORCEMENT OF GATT AGAINST UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I find it interesting that the gentleman that just spoke on the Republicans not wanting to get to a balanced budget and not negotiating, the very gentleman that spoke voted against the first balanced budget act this country has seen in 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to me that the first ruling of the World Trade Organization in enforcement of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade was against the United States. Many people had predicted that that would happen if we in fact gave up our sovereignty to the World Trade Organization as far as our international trade is concerned.

The World Trade Organization argued that the Clean Air Act, one of the most important environmental laws that we have, unfairly discriminated against foreign oil refiners whose fuel cannot meet our clean air standards. It was predicted that this was going to happen, but everyone ignored this prediction saying it would not happen. It

has happened now. Everyone said it could not, but it has.

Rather than target the harsh and blatantly protectionist regulatory regimes of our major competitors, the World Trade Organization has now predictably chosen to target U.S. environmental laws. This ruling gives major competitors against the United States a huge bonus while overturning U.S. laws written to protect the health of our citizens in one fell swoop.

And as unbelievable as all this sounds, our executive branch of Government, the President, has not decided whether to appeal this ruling. It is outrageous. This decision should be appealed immediately and, further, we should withdraw from the World Trade Organization, and we should use our contributions to reduce our deficit.

We should give significant and clear consideration to a repudiation of the last GATT treaty. Congress and the American public have clearly and consistently supported clean air standards and set an example for the world of the importance of the clean air environment. Are we now going to let the World Trade Organization thwart the will of the American people and overturn American laws? Are we going to let foreign arbiters of the World Trade Organization now dictate to this Congress, to the U.S. Congress what laws we can and cannot pass? I for one will not stand by while foreign judges of the World Trade Organization rule on the validity of the American environmental and labor laws. I will not surrender our sovereignty to the World Trade Organization, nor should we.

American business and manufacturers have invested billions of dollars in complying with the Clean Air Act. It is not correct, it is not right, it is not fair for foreign competitors that have not been faced with the kind of investment that our businesses have been faced with to import into the United States to the disadvantage of U.S. companies who have complied with our laws.

I say that we should not have any special breaks for foreign oil companies, if they cannot meet our environmental requirements, and that we should say no to the World Trade Organization or to any foreign organization telling this government what we will or will not do.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for the remarks he just made.

I represent a district that has a very substantial amount of refining as part of the economic makeup of our district. It has been that way for many years in northern California. Those refiners, based upon these Federal laws, have invested billions of dollars in clean fuels projects at each of these refineries and

have had to make that decision. As the gentleman knows, they were very uneasy about making that decision because the question was, what would the market be for the gasoline and would the consumer pay more for these clean fuels. They went ahead and did that on these assurances.

Now we find out that people who were on the same notice in Venezuela and elsewhere, they could have made this investment in their refineries to meet this market but they have chosen instead to go to the World Trade Organization and to challenge this legislation, to get it overturned so they can continue to sell a product into the market that undermines the decisions that this Congress made about the health and safety of our citizens.

I want to thank the gentleman very much for his remarks. I would join him. We have tried to get others in the Congress to understand that this is just the beginning of the assault on a number of environmental health and safety laws where this Congress has made a determination about those benefits for the American people that can be undermined by foreign competitors who want to continue to challenge them as though they are indirect trade tariffs when in fact they are not. They are health and safety laws for the benefit of the people of this country.

Mr. COBURN. The other thing that we ought to pay attention to is, this is the beginning. It is not just going to be on environmental laws. It is going to be on every other law that this Congress has passed that the World Trade Organization is going to try to subvert and undermine the laws that this very Congress passed for the well-being and benefit of this country.

We should stop it now before it continues, and we should appeal. And we should force, through a resolution of this Congress, the President to ask for an appeal of this ruling.

Should we not get that, then we should do the legislatively responsible thing to reverse our participation in the World Trade Organization.

ON THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. This is the time, Mr. Speaker, that we talk about what action is going to take place on the floor of this Chamber later today, because quite frankly, it is critical that we pass this continuing resolution today, whatever we call it, to avoid another partial Government shutdown. A partial Government shutdown leads to a massive Government slowdown. This is something we can ill afford.

The previous two shutdowns cannot be repeated. They were devastating to Federal employees, to contractors, to

their families, to the local economy, universities, researchers, and the entire American public. The previous two partial Government shutdowns, as I mentioned, have resulted in a massive slowdown and an erosion of confidence in Government.

A longer-term solution is still necessary. Agencies cannot make long-term spending decisions without long-term appropriations. Vendors with long-term contractors cannot be paid. It may be unwilling or unable to continue on a month-to-month basis. Contractors, Federal employees and their families remain very anxious about their future.

Etymologically, the word "disease," if you look at the Oxford English Dictionary, comes from the words "absence of ease." There is really an absence of ease out there in our country, a disease, so to speak. This is something that we in Government can correct.

I hope that this continuing resolution, whether we call it the balanced budget down payment act or whatever, that will come up today will be the first step in increased cooperation to resolve the issues surrounding the remaining appropriations bills and a balanced budget agreement, not the first in a series of continuing resolutions that we are going to revisit every month or every 6 weeks.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to compromise on the provisions that are keeping these bills from being passed. Of course I ask the President to engage fully in coming up with a balanced budget. We must find a real solution to end the disruption we have caused in the lives of our Federal work force. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, today will be the day.

STATEMENT ON CUBA TRIP

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, my recent visit to Cuba has been the subject of some controversy. Some of my colleagues, who have surprisingly never even talked to me about the trip, have cynically tried to characterize my views and the trip as insensitive to human rights and pro-Castro.

Mr. Speaker, that is a blatant distortion of the truth.

My position on Cuba is the same as that put forth by the conference of Catholic Bishops. My position is also the same as Cuba's Catholic Cardinal, Cardinal Jaime Ortega.

I might add, as well, that my position is the same as many of Cuba's leading dissidents—including Elizardo Sanchez, Martha Beatriz Roque, Vladimiro Roca, and Rene Gomez Manzano, just to name a few.

Are these people, some of whom have spent time in Cuban jails, insensitive

to human rights? Are these people pro-Castro?

Their position, and my position, is that we can best encourage human rights reforms and begin a transition to a more democratic Cuba through increased relations and not by more isolation. They, like me, oppose the so-called Helms-Burton bill.

Mr. Speaker, I realize my public position on Cuba makes me the target of a very well-financed lobby here in the United States. But, let me say clearly and sincerely, I believe in my heart that I am advocating what is best for the courageous people who live on that island and who yearn for a day when human rights and freedoms are truly respected.

MOAKLEY STATEMENT ON CUBA TRIP

WASHINGTON.—Congressman Joe Moakley released the following statement from his office today on his recent trip to Cuba:

"I traveled to Cuba for two basic reasons—first, to try to create an atmosphere in which relations between the U.S. and Cuba could be improved; and, second, to find ways to support ordinary Cuban people.

My trip was hosted by the ABC Forum on Cuba, a non-profit organization dedicated to educating U.S. citizens on issues related to Cuba and to supporting the activities of NGO's promoting human rights and helping the Cuban people.

Our delegation consisted of 23 participants ranging from business leaders to NGO's like the Boston-based Oxfam America.

I met with a variety of people while in Cuba—including top Cuban government officials, church leaders, dissidents, NGO's, foreign diplomats, U.S. officials.

I even had the chance to visit a small group of farmers who are working with Oxfam on a project to increase agriculture production for sale on the open market. These farmers and all the ordinary people I had the chance to meet, were excited to talk with our delegation and candid about their hopes for closer ties with people in the United States.

In addition, my aide Jim McGovern and I had a 2 hour private meeting with Cuban President Fidel Castro. After which, the Cuban leader met with our entire group for another 2 hour session. I told President Castro that we are at a crossroads in terms of U.S.-Cuba relations. The United States Congress is nearing final action on the so-called Helms-Burton Bill which, if signed into law, will strengthen the current economic embargo and end any possibility for improved relations anytime in the near future.

I told President Castro that there must be more movement in Cuba with regard to human rights and economic reforms—and urge him to act now. He seemed responsive and pledged to give my request very serious and immediate consideration.

We also had an excellent meeting with Jamie Cardinal Ortega—the Roman Catholic Cardinal in Cuba. His Eminence told us that the official position of the Catholic Bishops was against the US embargo for humanitarian reasons. He also was very clear about his continued concerns regarding human rights abuses that currently exist in Cuba.

On a related matter, I raised with the Cuban leadership my hope that they would invite Pope John Paul II to visit Cuba during his visit to the Caribbean later this year.

My trip began and ended with important meetings with Cuban dissident groups. While

these people suggested that the difficulties in Cuba run much deeper than the economic hardships, a majority of those we meet expressed opposition to the Helms-Burton legislation.

One of the things that stunned me the most about my trip is the explosion of independent entrepreneurship. There are roughly 208,000 independent family businesses operating in Cuba. This entrepreneurship is allowing people greater personal freedom from government controls. When people are no longer dependent on the government for their jobs, they are freer from economic coercion. I got the sense that the Cuban government recognizes that these small businesses are necessary for the country's economic viability and are accepting the political space that they create.

In fact, Caritas (a Catholic charitable organization in Havana) described its plans to establish training programs to help these fledgling businesses succeed. Michael Ryan, President of ABC Forum on Cuba, which organized the trip said: "It was great to see our group get excited about helping support the Cuban people, particularly in their efforts to form small businesses and independent NGOs. A number of our participants expressed a real desire to support these efforts after we concluded our trip."

The European Union is about to hold talks with the Cubans on closer economic ties—and is using this opportunity to urge the Cuban government to improve its human rights record. The United States could have ten times more leverage with Cuba than the Europeans if we got serious about improving relations. Right now the embargo leaves us completely out of the picture. I'm afraid if we let Helms-Burton become law, we will lose an important opportunity to improve the situation in Cuba. Of all the meetings I had, there was consensus on one thing—that the future of Cuba will be decided by Cubans on the island. The degree to which we can encourage positive change will depend on whether or not we defeat Helms-Burton.

[From the Boston Globe, Jan. 23, 1996]

OUR BAN IN HAVANA (By H.D.S. Greenway)

HAVANA.—"Socialismo O Muerte"—Socialism or Death—say the graffiti scrawled on the walls of this once grand, now crumbly Caribbean capital. But as communists the world over have found, their "socialism" means a death of sorts: stagnation and decline, a slow demise of ambition and incentive and the equality of shared poverty.

There are only five countries left that call themselves communist: China and its three abutters in Asia—North Korea, Vietnam and Laos—and then Cuba. In all, to varying degrees, the communist leaders recognize the inadequacy of their economic system, but all want to cling to political power. With some justification they can point to the death of their great progenitor, the Soviet Union, as an example of what can happen when the reins of political power are suddenly dropped. In short, they want to eat the cake of capitalism without ingesting political freedoms.

All the ambiguities of this approach are evident in Fidel Castro, the last of the founding fathers of postwar communism. All the others—Mao Zedong, Kim Il Sung, Ho Chi Minh—are dead, but Fidel remains. To some, America's most enduring bete noire is a Latin David to our gringo Goliath; to others he is an irredeemable tyrant.

Nine US presidents have tried to do him in—by invasion, assassination, economic em-

bargo—but he lives on "to remind us of our failures," as US Rep. J. Joseph Moakley put it.

For 30 years Castro had a free ride, strutting the world's stage as a symbol of independence to a world emerging from colonialism but in fact a kept man, his bills paid by the Soviet Union. After the demise of his patron, Castro and his economy went into a free fall, bottoming out in 1993.

In desperation, Castro and his lieutenants have planted the first, few seeds of a free-market economy here. The Yankee dollar is now a legal currency in Cuba alongside the peso. Joint ventures with foreigners are beginning to bear fruit, especially in the tourist industry. Some 208,000 Cubans are permitted to work in the private sector, but the state still remains supreme, and a gulf is widening between those who work in the dollar economy and those left behind in a land of unconvertible pesos.

Small, private restaurants called "paladares" are springing up in people's homes, but the law allows no more than a dozen tables, and all the cooks and waiters must be family members because it is still illegal for one Cuban to hire another. Thus is entrepreneurship on the one hand encouraged while the other hand suppresses it.

Last week Moakley led a delegation of inquiry here of which I was a member. We talked to Castro, aging now but still in command. He is trying to probe for weak spots in the mortar of the embargo that the United States has imposed. Moakley, in turn, was trying to squeeze human rights concessions from Castro, concessions that Moakley could use back in Washington to defeat the Helms-Burton bill, sponsored by Sen. Jesse Helms of North Carolina and U.S. Rep. Dan Burton of Indiana, which would put even more restrictions on doing business with Cuba.

It seemed evident in conversations with Castro and his ministers that Cuba isn't going back on the meager reforms they have instigated. Castro said the changes are irreversible. But Cuba's leaders are afraid of moving forward too fast. Castro and his lieutenants appear to have no clear vision but are making policy up as they go along.

Listening to Castro—his famous beard now gone gray—I was struck by how much the world had changed and how much Fidel has been bypassed since the heady revolutionary days of 30 years ago. Fidel Castro no longer presents the United States with the mortal threat of Russian missiles 90 miles offshore. His expeditionary forces no longer rampage through Africa, spreading socialismo and death. Nor are his agents stirring up trouble in the hemisphere. Che Guevara and the revolution he represented lie in an unmarked Bolivian grave.

In an era when the United States is helping North Korea with nuclear power, scrambling for investment in China and no longer involved with embargoing Vietnam, the present restrictions on trade with Cuba seem somewhat anachronistic. Castro may have suffered from the U.S. embargo, but he has also benefited enormously by having someone other than himself to blame for Cuba's economic inadequacies, able to wrap himself in the nationalist flag against the big bully of the North.

In the long run, communism in Cuba is doomed. Both the United States and Cuba have a convergence of interest in seeing that the transition is smooth and the landing is soft. A breakdown of order on the island would bring another vast armada of Cubans fleeing to our shores, and that would be destabilizing to both countries.

The best way to ensure a soft landing is to defeat counterproductive legislation such as the Helms-Burton "Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act," which would threaten our allies that do business in Cuba and tie even more restrictions on the present embargo. The bill will not help Cuba's transition to a market economy and could only retard the very forces of freedom and openness the United States wishes to encourage. The embargo is strict enough without additional baggage and should be used as a bargaining chip to nudge Cuba into the democratic and human rights reforms that will one day set its people free.

HAVANA, January 19.—Cuban dissidents have met a visiting U.S. congressman in public, the first time in years such a meeting has taken without interference from the authorities, one of dissidents said on Friday.

Elizardo Sanchez told Reuters he and other dissidents met visiting Democratic Representative Joe Moakley of Massachusetts for several hours in the state-owned Hotel Nacional.

Sanchez, leader of the Cuban Committee for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, said he was surprised the dissidents had been able to hold a meeting in public without problems. Meetings with members of Cuba's small and illegal opposition groups generally take place in dissidents' homes or foreign embassies.

We are not bothered (by officials) either entering or leaving (the hotel)," Sanchez said, adding that the group discussed issues such as proposals in Congress to toughen the longstanding U.S. embargo against communist-ruled Cuba.

Moakley, who also met the dissidents on Tuesday at the house of the senior U.S. diplomat in Cuba Joseph Sullivan, is on a fact-finding mission that included talks with President Fidel Castro on Wednesday night.

Moakley said on Thursday he found Castro flexible on the congressman's suggestion that if there were some change on the island it might help defeat moves to toughen the embargo.

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTINGS

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

Mr. FALCOMAEGA. Mr. Speaker, now that it's almost certain that President Chirac of France will be making a state visit to our Nation's Capital next week to meet with President Clinton and the leadership of the Congress, this will be a sad occasion for me, Mr. Speaker, and the millions of peoples throughout the world and through representation of leaders of some 168 countries throughout the world who have earnestly pleaded with President Chirac not to break the moratorium on nuclear testing. And yet despite all this, President Chirac of France in defiance of global consensus on raising tensions and suspicion, and even to promote again the extension and proliferation of nuclear weapons testing and development, France has already now exploded five nuclear bombs to improve its nuclear delivery capabilities with its long-distance missiles.

It might interest my colleagues that French Government officials—and they're masters of these ploys—a few leaks here and some leaks there—some critical points that President Chirac is going to shove right at our noses at the joint session of Congress next Thursday.

First, a warning to Republican leaders and the President that closing our Government down will have serious economic consequences not only to France but to Europe and other regions of the world.

Second, that the United States contributes too little in foreign aid to Third World countries.

Third, that the United States should live up to its global responsibilities, whatever that means.

Fourth, that United States contributions to the crisis in Bosnia is not enough, but at the same time, France expects to play very prominent, if not, the leading role as far as Europe is concerned relative to Bosnia.

And fifth, France does not want any nation of the world to criticize its current nuclear testing program, because France does not trust the United States involvement with Europe's security needs for the past 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to my colleagues that what we're going to get from President Chirac next week is not the eloquence of Marquis de Lafayette, but the ghost of Charles de Gaulle II.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the January 24 New York Times for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]
POSSIBILITY OF DEFAULT STARTS TO WORRY
EUROPE, ESPECIALLY FRANCE

(By Craig R. Whitney)

PARIS, January 23.—The possibility that the deficit-cutting impasse between Congress and the Clinton Administration could start causing the United States Government to default on its debt next month has begun to sink in on European leaders, and the French are anxious to avoid the turmoil that could result.

President Jacques Chirac, who will visit Washington next week, is prepared to warn in a speech to a joint session of Congress that default would upset economies around the world and deeply undermine the American global position, French officials said today.

Congressional Republicans have threatened to refuse to raise the national debt limit unless the Clinton Administration agrees to their agenda for cutting the Federal deficit. If the Administration refuses to give in and fails to find other ways of coming up with money, the Government could start running out of money to pay obligations due on March 1.

At this point, some European leaders are said to be beginning to feel like onlookers at a political game whose players appear little concerned about the chaos a default would cause in international currency and bond markets.

Some see a situation comparable to that in 1975, when Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany felt compelled to warn President Gerald R. Ford that letting New York

City go bankrupt could send economic shock waves around the world, which was still fragile from the effects of a sudden rise in oil prices.

Mr. Chirac told the Senate majority leader, Bob Dole, and Speaker Newt Gingrich during his last visit to Washington in the summer that the United States gave too little foreign aid to developing countries, and French officials say that he plans to deliver the same message to Congress in an address planned for Feb. 1.

"We hope that Congress will be disposed to let the United States live up to its global responsibilities," one official here said.

Mr. Chirac will tell Congress, French officials say, that Europe, with about the same size economy as the United States, gives three times as much to developing countries—\$31 billion, compared with less than \$9 billion last year from the United States.

"Where is America and its traditional generosity, where is its desire to help reshape the world?" asked one French policy maker.

Mr. Chirac is also likely to use his visit to tell both Congress and the Administration that France will insist on reshaping the NATO alliance to reflect changes since the end of the cold war, according to officials in Brussels and Paris.

Mr. Chirac has reintegrated France into some NATO military structures that it left in 1966, but officials say he did so to push for the creation of a stronger European defense arm within the alliance. "We need to be able to deal with crises like Bosnia even if the United States doesn't want to become involved," an official said.

Mr. Chirac may also tell Washington that American plans to contribute \$600 million to the reconstruction of Bosnia over the next three years are inadequate. European estimates of the total cost run to \$3.7 billion. "Don't think that the Europeans will be the only ones paying for Bosnian reconstruction," Mr. Chirac said in a recent interview, adding that the Europeans expected the United States to pay about the same as they will—about one third.

American officials have responded that the United States committed 20,000 soldiers to the NATO peacekeeping force that began moving into Bosnia last month, a larger contingent than any of its allies.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1719

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY) at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2880, THE BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2880) and that it shall be in order at any time to consider the bill in the House; that the bill be debatable for not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]; that all points of order against the bill and against its consideration be waived; and that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to the final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I simply want to take this reservation in order to observe that, unlike so many episodes which the public has seen lately in the Congress where divisions among us have caused great turmoil and consternation both on the floor and throughout the country, both sides of the political aisle have worked very hard and very intensively with a great deal of involvement of people on both sides of the aisle in order to assure that we can overcome major differences and keep the Government open.

I would simply, in continuing my reservation, make the point that there are some items in the proposition which the gentleman from Louisiana is about to bring to the House with which I have strong disagreement; for example, the reduced level of funding for education and a number of other items in the bill. But I think the overriding need of the country is for us to overcome our differences, or at least manage to live with those differences, especially since this is a CR of short-term duration, with the exception of a couple of items in the bill.

So I would simply say that I want to congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana for the way he has handled this difficult task. I am pleased to say that the White House, while they certainly do not agree with every provision in this bill, as I do not, they have signed off on this as a short-term compromise. I very much appreciate both the way they have handled things and the way the gentleman from Louisiana and other Members on both sides of the aisle have handled this.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield to me, before he withdraws his reservation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to say that I appreciate his state-

ment, and I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation over the last few days.

They have been hectic; this has been an incredibly tense negotiation, but the fact is that with the help of the gentleman, both sides of the aisle have come together, along with Members of the other body, and have crafted a compromise to keep the Government open for the next 45 days, one which meets the needs of satisfaction or of best desires of no side completely satisfactorily, but one which represents, I think, the finest of legislative endeavor in that we are able to understand each other's differences and reach agreement in some fashion of compromise, not only among ourselves, but with the White House. Frankly, in view of where we started, I am somewhat amazed.

But I think this also provides the seeds for a long-term solution which will provide us a continuity of Government throughout the rest of the year. At least it is a first step. We will have to judge that when this continuing resolution or this targeted appropriation cycle is over. But at any rate, I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation and yield back to him.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Continuing my reservation, I would simply observe that we do not have to endorse every provision in this proposal in order to endorse the fundamental idea that the Government ought to stay open to continue to provide services to our tax-paying citizens.

I would simply observe that this has been an immense amount of consultation with a tremendous number of people. I think this morning we were at draft number 32. I do not know what number it is now, but whatever number it is, I am glad it is the last one.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but I would like to ask the chairman if he would tell me, not having had the opportunity to read the entire bill, does the bill contain any of the provisions of the line-item veto in this bill? Does it contain those provisions?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, I would advise the gentleman that this Balanced Budget Down Payment Act, I, as we have called it, has no language whatsoever dealing with the line-item veto, but that the line-item veto, as the gentleman does know, has passed the House of Representatives and in a much different form has passed the U.S. Senate, and is awaiting resolution in conference.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I would say to the gen-

tleman that that conference not having reached a resolution, many of us here are concerned that in the middle of the 1996 process, as this body and the other body continue to identify areas of spending with which we disagree and seek to reduce or eliminate funding, we believe that it is just as important to allow the President to identify funding to attempt to cut as well through the line-item veto.

I would simply note that on Tuesday evening, the President called upon the Congress to pass the line-item veto, at which a supermajority of both Democrats and Republicans gave him a standing ovation. I would call upon this body to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I will not object, because I do understand the importance and necessity of keeping the Government operating, of having this continuing resolution. But if we are going to continue week after week or month after month passing additional continuing resolutions, I would certainly hope that the majority would include the line-item veto provisions in the next continuing resolution so that we could give that to the President and allow him to do the same thing we are attempting to do in reducing spending.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield further, I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I especially appreciate him not making an objection.

I would point out to the gentleman that as a long-standing proponent of the line-item veto myself, I look forward to a speedy resolution of that issue in the conference, but that I would, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, rather not include it in the appropriations process, because I think it is a little astray of what we are trying to do. We often find that we take on a little bit more than we can carry, and then we try to chew it and have to spit it out.

So, I appreciate the gentleman's position. I certainly agree in principle with his position, and I hope that that matter will be resolved before long.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's position is certainly understandable. The concern, however, is that it certainly was a major platform in the Contract With America. It passed this body with overwhelming support. The President supports it, yet the 1996 appropriation process is virtually through, and the line-item veto does not apply to it. So we would like to develop a way to get it applicable to the 1996 process, and that is the purpose for trying to put it on the appropriations bills or continuing resolutions so that we could involve the President, give this President the authority now to start cutting that kind of pork-barrel spending.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield one last time, I would simply point out that he is absolutely on point. However, I

might add that, as the gentleman knows, for this year and in years past we have continued to appropriate within the discretionary budget limits which are being reduced more and more and more. The fact is that this Congress, since the 104th Congress was sworn in, has saved the American taxpayer, within the discretionary portion of the budget, some \$20 billion under what we would have spent in original fiscal year 1995 level, and another \$22 to \$30 billion below that level in fiscal year 1996 already.

So we are on that glidepath toward a balanced budget, but the gentleman is correct. A line-item veto would enhance our ability to do so, and I appreciate his position.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and, if I may, engage the distinguished chairman in some discussion.

I hope I do not have to object, and I certainly commend everybody involved in what seems to be some progress in establishing or reestablishing a tradition of some bipartisan give and take and inclusiveness in this difficult process.

□ 1730

I have been relying on a three-page document prepared, I assume, by the Committee on Appropriations staff that summarizes this 60-plus page bill which we have just gotten, and therefore need to be able to rely on the summary.

Mr. Speaker, a couple of things here concerns me. Down at the bottom of this first page, the summary recites essentially a 75-percent floor on certain specific items, including, for instance, the Advanced Technology Program. While earlier in the summary it is recited as the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations, we will be at the level that had been agreed to in the conference that was ultimately vetoed. My concern is the possible inconsistency or conflict between those provisions.

Is the body to understand that that 75-percent floor supersedes contrary provisions that were in the conference report, which as to ATP was at a much lower level?

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would say it is a 75-percent cap as opposed to a floor. With that acknowledgment, I would say that the provisions of this particular legislation that we pass today do not affect programs that were addressed in targeted appropriations or in previous appropriations bills except for a few instances.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, it is not that point, but the apparent internal inconsistency between the 75-percent cap and the other language in this legislation that prescribes funding levels for the Commerce Department in accordance with the earlier rejected conference report or the earlier vetoed conference report. In that conference report, for instance, the ATP program was funded at substantially lower levels than the 75 percent. I want to make sure the 75 percent controls.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, this funding would be more than what was in that conference report. The gentleman is correct that while we provide for the conference levels of funding for most programs, several of those programs which were terminated or slated for termination, such as the one the gentleman mentioned, would be brought up to a 75-percent cap by virtue of this legislation.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, just in trying to reconcile the text of this 60-plus pages with the summary, I notice that, for instance, on page 18-E of the bill, we address the question of a partial repeal of a provision recently enacted in the Lobbying Reform Act that is not mentioned in the summary.

I am just wondering if the chairman would indicate whether there are any other changes in permanent law similar to this one, which I happen to be familiar with, which are included in the bill but not itemized in the summary, so that Members can be fully informed of permanent law changes?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would say to the gentleman the only ones that were inserted were done so at the last minute in the process of negotiations between the House, Senate, and White House. There are a few, and I intend in my opening statement to identify those. Frankly, they are not of major significance, but I will touch on them.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing on my reservation and with respect to this particular point, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the approach that we are taking in correcting this problem with section 18 of the Lobbying Reform Act that this Congress recently passed and the President signed. I think Members have become aware of the difficulty in implementing that particular provision with respect to some of the organizations organized under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code and the prohibitions in section 18 against any such organization that receives a contract or a loan or award from the Federal Government engaging in any lobbying activities.

This bill, as it is presented to the House, is a partial remedy to the prob-

lem that we now know is created by section 18, in that it deletes contracts from the scope of the section 18 prohibition.

It seems to me that with the 140,000-plus 501(c)(4) organizations, that include all manner of civic organizations, housing associations, organizations of local governments, a lot of different organizations that may get from time to time a Federal grant or loan or contract, that to address only the ability of contracts of Government and not these other 501(c)(4)s to be able to fully engage in their legitimate rights to talk to us about problems facing the Nation or in legislation is unfortunate, and that we simply ought to deal with the entire scope of the difficulties that exist under section 18.

As it is, we are responding to the understandable concerns and legitimate concerns, particularly of the Blues and some HMO's who are in a particularly difficult situation. I understand that, and we ought to solve their problem. But we ought to solve the entire problem, not just the problem of people who have a lot of resources and a lot of wealth and influence around this place. We should get at all of the 501(c)(4) issue.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I would only say to the gentleman there are lots of problems we could have dealt with in this bill. We dealt with those most exigent problems we felt needed to be dealt with in order to resolve anomalies that, frankly, were hanging out there that would cause great hardship had we not addressed them.

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions in this area. The gentleman well knows that this problem was brought to our attention when the lobbying bill was moving through the Senate, as a matter of fact, and the cosponsors on the Senate side, Senator SIMPSON and Senator CRAIG, had attempted to correct it at that time.

It is not that we are responsive to a narrow segment of those who are affected by the lobbying bill. It is that this was an area which is in clear conflict because of the unique history of this particular group.

Blue Cross/Blue Shield associations were classified as 501(c)(4)'s back in the 1930's. Usually if you are classified under the Internal Revenue Tax Code as a 501(c)(4), for example, you are tax exempt in your activities. Ironically, in 1986 in the tax bill Congress placed the selfsame organizations in a taxable category, so they are now classified as 501(c)(4)'s, but they are, in fact, paying taxes, so they do not get a tax-free benefit from the classification.

In addition to that, the Blue Cross/Blue Shield associations have been carrying out on a contractual arrangement the financial management servicing for Medicare, 40 percent of the recipients of the Federal Employees Health Benefit Program under the U.S. operation, CHAMPUS, and a number of other areas.

This is a real problem faced now by virtue of a letter, and I would like to place it in the RECORD, and if you have not seen it, I want to share it with the gentleman from Colorado, dated January 16, in which the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, rightly, in trying to carry out the law as written, has sent out notices asking a series of questions, "Please fax immediately to your contract specialist those who are contractees with FEHBP," and question one, "Is the organization tax exempt?" This group would say no.

Question two, "Is the organization considered a 501(c)(4)?" This group would say yes.

What we have here is a situation in which with full knowledge we went ahead and passed a law that would put these people in a very narrow timeframe, in significant jeopardy of continuing to run the Medicare, CHAMPUS, and FEHBP program.

This group means to comply with all of the lobbying disclosure and reporting requirements. This is not an attempt to create a loophole. If people are receiving grants, then that is what we want to focus on. If they are receiving awards, we want to focus on it. But our failure to understand the complexity of the history of certain organizations and the interaction that would be triggered immediately and our inability to carry out needed functions brought about this technical amendment.

I would tell the gentleman if he identifies other groups that fall in the category of 501(c)(4) and are, in fact, taxable and would stop a significant portion of the Federal Government's ongoing contractual obligations and does not fit into this particular amendment, we may have to look at another one. This one is real, it is now, and it needs to be fixed. I commend the chairman for understanding that this is a real problem. A technical correction solves it.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, I appreciate the validity of all of the points the gentleman has just made, but I think he draws the boundaries a bit narrowly on the organizations in this country that have legitimate reason to be concerned.

As it happens Blue Cross/Blue Shield is in a position to follow legislation here very closely. They did that. Their lawyers and lobbyists were able to identify this problem very quickly. But we are realizing the consequences of legislating in haste and without appro-

priate hearings and examination of consequences with regard to section 18 of the Lobbying Act, which was added in the Senate without any hearings and, even as it was working its way through the process, realized it was going to have unintended and unfortunate consequences.

We only are awaiting the further experience of organizations like the National Association of Counties, the National Rifle Association, which I believe has contracts or grants from the Federal Government, and some of their activities, to see exactly how intrusive and violative of the rates of other 501(c)(4) organizations to participate fully in the political life of the country. So it will not just be that nicely drawn narrow category the gentleman identified, but I think we need to be concerned more broadly than that.

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

Mr. SKAGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply say I fully agree with everything that the gentleman has said with respect to this issue. In my view, what you have here is a case of the squeaky wheel getting the grease, which means that the Blues and a couple of other parties are being taken care of because they have raised legitimate objections about how this impacts them. But I think this Congress is remiss in not recognizing there are many other people who may not be as big, but whose proximity to them will be just as big because of the language, which ought not be in the law in the first place.

So I think this is a case here of this proposition being better than the situation that would exist without it, but not nearly as good as it ought to be, because it ought to include everybody who has a similar problem.

I would hope that, upon reflection, the Congress would recognize it has made a mistake in limiting it in the future and to correct it. But for now, I think even though I agree fully with the gentleman, I did not think that that objection would be sufficient to justify bringing down this entire proposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the letter that I indicated from the Senate was dated November 17. It has been more than 3 months. It has been almost a month since the law went into effect. Does the gentleman from Colorado have in his possession a letter from any other organization indicating a failure to carry out a contractual obligation with the Federal Government because of this legislation?

Mr. SKAGGS. No.

Mr. THOMAS. Do you have a letter?

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, continuing my reservation, it has only been a couple of weeks since this law became effective. I think the gentleman as-

sumes a level of alacrity across the country which is unrealistic in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, having made these points, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make inquiry, and I thank the gentleman from Louisiana and the gentleman from Wisconsin. I know that the work that was done was to assure that we did not shut the Government down. I think we need to accept that responsibility.

Can the gentleman help me as I try to answer some of the questions regarding this impact on my constituents? There is a section on page 10 that indicates a prohibition against no new grants and it lists health and human services, and particularly refers to National AIDS Program, homeless service grants. There is a whole litany, the youth gang substance abuse.

My inquiry is that this does not shut them down; what you are saying is that they cannot activate, and I want this to be my understanding, not put words in your mouth, they cannot activate any new grants, but they can carry on their business? Is that my understanding?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. Actually it goes a little bit beyond that. They can actually engage in providing grants up to 75 percent of previous monthly levels. So the fact is they cannot only service old grants, but they can engage in current activity up to 75 percent of previous limits.

□ 1745

This is a change put in the bill in just the last few minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. They can carry on current business and provide new grants at a 75-percent level that would include youth gangs, substance abuse, child welfare.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. There is a lengthy list, and we will make that a part of the RECORD.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I noticed in reference to NASA, as the gentleman well knows, they are engaged now in a series of space explorations and research, and, in fact, were preparing for such during the Government shutdown. There seems to be on page 2931, and I have no problem with assisting any of our sister States, some transfer of dollars, \$10 million to Mississippi, but that is not going to impair any further, ongoing,

present explorations that are proposed now for NASA in the coming months and impinge on any safety factors for NASA?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield further, she is correct, and this measure will free up an additional \$40 million for NASA; so they are actually better off because of this provision.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am so concerned and I have two last questions.

There was an Executive order recently to deal with increased utilization of the Border Patrol coming from the State of Texas and obviously concerned with drug influx and other problems. The Department of Justice not being funded, do we have concern, or is there any way that that will not be negatively impacted, or are we in jeopardy?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield further, I would advise the gentlewoman that the Department of Justice is funded at the conference level, and, in fact, most law enforcement authorities were already provided for in the targeted for appropriation under the bill that we passed early in January. So actually the Border Patrol would have been taken care of by the last bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If we pass the CR, but as you have indicated, that is protected and covered?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Not only covered through the term of this bill, but through the end of the fiscal year by virtue of what we did earlier.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, lastly there were several riders in the VA-HUD bill, and, of course, we do realize that even though we are concerned and want to make sure that the Government stays open, there are still levels of disagreement on many of these pieces of legislation and, obviously, the appropriation process. Are these riders still in this CR that we might have some disagreement, particularly relating to the environment and relating to HUD in particular?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentlewoman would yield, I would advise the gentlewoman that the VA-HUD bill is funded at the conference level, but under last year's terms and conditions. So the restrictions and guidance language in the conference report would not apply.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Would not be included?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Right.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana. I think that we are all trying to move to the point of resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2880, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

THE BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, I

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the bill (H.R. 2880) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of H.R. 2880 is as follows:

H.R. 2880

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 including the authority and conditions provided in emergency supplemental appropriations Acts for fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities, except for those projects and activities provided for in Public Law 104-91 and Public Law 104-92, including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act) which were conducted in the fiscal year 1995 and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority would be available in the following appropriations Act as passed each House, excluding conference reports:

The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996; and

The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996:

Provided, That whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted in these Acts is greater than that which would be available or granted under current operations, the pertinent project or activities shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate.

(b) Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an Act listed in this section as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this Act, is different from that which would be available or granted under such Act as passed by the Senate as of the date of enactment of this Act, the pertinent

project or activity shall be continued at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the House or the Senate, whichever is lower, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided,* That where an item is not included in either version or where an item is included in only one version of the Act as passed by the House as of the date of enactment of this Act, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

(c) Whenever an Act listed in this section has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this Act, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the one House at a rate for operations not exceeding the current rate or the rate permitted by the action of the one House, whichever is lower, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995: *Provided,* That where an item is funded in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and not included in the version passed by the one House as of the date of enactment of this Act, the pertinent project or activity shall not be continued except as provided for in section 111 under the appropriation, fund, or authority granted by the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 102. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 103. No appropriations or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during the fiscal year 1995.

SEC. 104. No provision which is included in an appropriations Act enactment in section 101 but which was not included in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 1995 and which by its terms is applicable to more than one appropriation, fund, or authority shall be applicable to any appropriation, fund, or authority provided in this title of this Act.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period of which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this Act.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this title of this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this title of this Act, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) March 15, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 107. This title of this Act shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in this title of this Act shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 108. Expenditures made pursuant to this title of this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 109. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 101 of this Act that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 106(c) of this Act.

SEC. 110. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 111. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 106, whenever an Act listed in section 101 as passed by both the House and the Senate as of the date of enactment of this Act, does not include funding for an ongoing project or activity for which there is a budget request, or whenever an Act listed in section 101 has been passed by only the House or only the Senate as of the date of enactment of this Act, and an item funded in fiscal year 1995 is not included in the version passed by the one House, or whenever the rate for operations for an ongoing project or activity provided by section 101 for which there is a budget request would result in the project or activity being significantly reduced, the pertinent project or activity may be continued under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 by increasing the rate for operations provided by section 101 to a rate for operations not to exceed one that provides the minimal level that would enable existing activities to continue. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this title of this Act bears to 366. For the purposes of this title of this Act, the minimal level means a rate for operations that is reduced from the current rate by 25 percent.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 106, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 101 or section 111 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, the rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366.

Provided, That the first sentence of section 112 shall not apply except to furloughs that exceed one workday per pay period for the affected workforce during the period of January 26, 1996 through March 15, 1996.

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except sections 106 and 111, for those programs that had high initial rates of operations or complete distribution of funding at the beginning of the fiscal year in fiscal year 1995 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, similar distributions of funds for fiscal year 1996 shall not be

made and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this title of this Act that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 114. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 106, any distribution of funding under the Rehabilitation Services and Disability Research account in the Department of Education may be made up to an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operation for this account provided by this title of this Act as the number of days covered by this title of this Act bears to 366.

SEC. 115. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, the rate for operations of the following projects or activities shall be only the minimum necessary to accomplish orderly termination:

Child Development Associate Scholarships in the Department of Health and Human Services;

Dependent Care Planning and Development in the Department of Health and Human Services;

Law Related Education in the Department of Education;

Dropout Prevention Demonstrations in the Department of Education;

Aid for Institutional Development—Endowment Grants in the Department of Education;

Aid for Institutional Development—Evaluation in the Department of Education;

Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native Cultural Arts;

Innovative Projects in Community Service in the Department of Education;

Cooperative Education in the Department of Education; and

Douglas Teacher Scholarships in the Department of Education.

SEC. 116. COMPENSATION AND RATIFICATION OF AUTHORITY.—(a) Any Federal employees furloughed as a result of a lapse in appropriations, if any, after midnight November 13, 1995, until the enactment of this Act shall be compensated at their standard rate of compensation for the period during which there was a lapse in appropriations.

All obligations incurred in anticipation of the appropriations made and the authority granted by this title of this Act for the purposes of maintaining the essential level of activity to protect life and property and bring about orderly termination of Government functions are hereby ratified and approved if otherwise in accord with the provisions of this title of this Act.

SEC. 117. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 106, upon enactment of this Act any new grants or contracts for the following programs shall be made at a level act to exceed a rate of 75 percentum of prior monthly awards:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration:

Health Resources and Services: Trauma Care; Health Care Facilities.

Assistant Secretary for Health:

Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health: National Vaccine Program; Health Care Reform Data Analysis; National AIDS Program Office.

Health Care Financing Administration:

Program Management: Essential Access Community Hospitals.

Administration for Children and Families:

Children and Families Services Program; Youth Gang Substance Abuse; Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect; Child Welfare Research; Social Services Research;

Homeless Service Grants; Community Schools (crime trust fund).

Administration on Aging:
Aging Services Programs: Pension Counseling; Federal Council on Aging; White House Conference on Aging.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Education for the Disadvantaged: State School Improvement.

School Improvement Programs: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities: National Program; Women's Educational Equity.

Bilingual and Immigrant Education: Bilingual Education Support Services.

Higher Education: Faculty Development Fellowships; School, College, and University Partnerships.

RELATED AGENCIES

Corporation for National and Community Service: Domestic Volunteer Service Programs, Operating Expenses: Senior Demonstration Program.

National Education Standards and Improvement Council.

SEC. 118. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or this Act, upon enactment of this Act the Secretary of each cabinet level department other than State, Defense, Ambassador to the United Nations, and Central Intelligence shall not obligate a total amount of funds for their individual official travel expenses for fiscal year 1996 that would be greater than 110 per centum of the average total amount of the individual official travel expenses of the relevant departmental secretary for the fiscal years 1990 through 1995.

SEC. 119. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of this title of this Act, the maximum Pell Grant for which a student shall be eligible under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, during award year 1996-1997 shall be at least \$2,440.

SEC. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the first proviso under the heading "Education for the disadvantaged" in title III of H.R. 2127, as passed by the House of Representatives, shall take effect upon enactment of this Act.

SEC. 121. 501 FIRST STREET SE., DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) DISPOSAL OF REAL PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Architect of the Capitol shall dispose of by sale at fair market value all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the parcel of real property described in paragraph (9), including all improvements to such real property. Such disposal shall be made by quitclaim deed.

(2) HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION.—The Architect of the Capitol shall carry out this section under the direction of the House Office Building Commission.

(3) PROCEDURES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the disposal under paragraph (1) shall be made in accordance with such procedures as the Architect of the Capitol determines appropriate.

(4) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the child care center of the House of Representatives should remain in operation during the implementation of this section.

(5) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The deed of conveyance for the property to be disposed of under paragraph (1) shall contain such terms and conditions as the Architect of the Capitol determines are necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(6) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—All proceeds from the disposal under paragraph (1) shall

be deposited in the account established by subsection (b).

(7) **ADVERTISING AND MARKETING.**—The Architect of the Capitol shall begin advertising and marketing the property to be disposed of under paragraph (1) not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(8) **LOCAL ZONING AND OCCUPANCY REQUIREMENTS.**—Until such date as the purchaser of the property to be disposed of under paragraph (1) takes full occupancy of such property, such property and the tenants of such property shall be deemed to be in compliance with all applicable zoning and occupancy requirements of the District of Columbia.

(9) **PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.**—The parcel of real property referred to in paragraph (1) is the approximately 31,725 square feet of land located at 501 First Street, SE., on square 736 S, Lot 801 (formerly part of Reservation 17) in the District of Columbia. Such parcel is bounded by E Street, SE., to the north, First Street, SE., to the east, New Jersey Avenue, SE., to the west, and Garfield Park to the south.

(b) **SEPARATE ACCOUNT IN THE TREASURY.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a separate account which shall consist of amounts deposited into the account by the Architect of the Capitol under subsection (a).

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—Funds in the account established by paragraph (1) shall be available, in such amounts as are specified in appropriations Acts, to the Architect of the Capitol for—

(A) payment of expenses associated with relocating the tenants of the property to be disposed of under subsection (a)(1);

(B) payment of expenses associated with renovating facilities under the jurisdiction of the Architect for the purpose of accommodating such tenants; and

(C) reimbursement of expenses incurred for advertising and marketing activities related to the disposal under subsection (a)(1) in a total amount of not to exceed \$75,000.

Funds made available under this paragraph shall not be subject to any fiscal year limitation.

(3) **REPORTING OF TRANSACTIONS.**—Receipts, obligations, and expenditures of funds in the account established by paragraph (1) shall be reported in annual estimates submitted to Congress by the Architect of the Capitol for the operation and maintenance of the Capitol Buildings and Grounds.

(4) **TERMINATION OF ACCOUNT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of settlement on the property to be disposed of under subsection (a)(1), the Architect of the Capitol shall terminate the account established by paragraph (1) and all amounts remaining in the account shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States and credited as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO FURNISH STEAM AND CHILLED WATER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to furnish steam and chilled water from the Capitol Power Plant to the owner of the property to be disposed of under subsection (a)(1) if the owner agrees to pay for such steam and chilled water at market rates, as determined by the Architect of the Capitol.

(2) **AUTHORITY LIMITED TO EXISTING FACILITIES.**—The Architect of the Capitol may furnish steam and chilled water under paragraph (1) only with respect to facilities which, on the date of the enactment of this Act, are located on the property to be disposed of under subsection (a)(1).

(3) **PROCEEDS.**—All proceeds from the sale of steam and chilled water under paragraph (1) shall be deposited into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States and credited as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act except section 106, such sums as necessary are hereby appropriated for all projects and activities funded under the account heading "Office for Civil Rights" under the Office of the Secretary in the Department of Health and Human Services at a rate for operations not to exceed an annual rate for new obligational authority of \$16,153,000 for general funds together with not to exceed an annual rate for new obligational authority of \$3,314,000 to be transferred and expended as authorized by section 201(g)(1) of the Social Security Act from the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund and the Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund.

SEC. 123. Activities necessary to effect the following program eliminations and transfers of selected functions are funded under the terms and conditions and at a rate of operations, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-402) on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 1977), as passed by the House of Representatives on December 13, 1995:

All projects and activities under the account heading "Public Development" under the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;

All projects and activities under the account heading "Mines and Minerals" under the Bureau of Mines in Department of the Interior;

All activities related to the transfer of functions from the Bureau of Mines under the account heading "Management of Lands and Resources" under the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior;

All activities related to the transfers of functions from the Bureau of Mines and from the National Biological Service under the account heading "Surveys, Investigations, and Research" under the United States Geological Survey in the Department of the Interior; and

All activities related to the transfer of functions from the Bureau of Mines under the account heading "Fossil Energy Research and Development" in the Department of Energy.

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, the appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to the preceding section shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in that section, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) September 30, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 106, such amounts as may be necessary are hereby appropriated to effect the sale of Weeks Island oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve under the terms and conditions and at a rate of operations provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-402) on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 1977), as passed by the

House of Representatives on December 13, 1995.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, such amounts as may be necessary are hereby appropriated under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing, at a rate for operations provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-402) on the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, (H.R. 1977) as passed by the House of Representatives on December 13, 1995, for the following projects or activities including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act) which are conducted in the fiscal year 1995: all projects or activities of the Indian Health Services, Indian Health Service Facilities Bureau of Indian Affairs, National Park Service, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, notwithstanding any other provision of law, and the Forest Service, notwithstanding any other provision of law, *Provided*, That appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this section shall be available until (a) enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this section, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) March 15, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 127. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act except section 106, projects and activities under the account heading "Salaries and expenses" under the National Labor Relations Board shall be subject to the provisions of section 112 of Public Law 104-56.

SEC. 128. None of the funds made available by Public Law 104-91 may be used for—

(1) the creation of a human embryo or embryos for research purposes; or

(2) research in which a human embryo or embryos are destroyed, discarded, or knowingly subjected to risk of injury or death greater than that allowed for research on fetuses in utero under 45 CFR 46.208(a)(2) and 42 U.S.C. 289g(b).

For purposes of this section, the phrase "human embryo or embryos" shall include any organism, not protected as a human subject under 45 CFR 46 as of the date of enactment of this Act, that is derived by fertilization, parthenogenesis, cloning, or any other means from one or more human gametes.

SEC. 129. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBITION OF GRANTS FOR 501(c)(4) ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGING IN LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 18 of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 is amended by striking "award, grant, contract, loan, or any other form" and inserting "award, grant, or loan".

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 on the date of the enactment of such Act.

SEC. 130. No funds appropriated under this or any other Act shall be used to review or modify sourcing areas previously approved under section 490(c)(3) of the Forest Resources Conservation and Shortage Relief Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-382) or to enforce or implement Federal regulations 36 CFR part 223 promulgated on September 8, 1995. The regulations and interim rules in effect prior to September 8, 1995 (36 CFR 223.48, 36

CFR 223.87, 36 CFR 223 Subpart D, 36 CFR 223 Subpart F, and 36 CFR 261.6) shall remain in effect. The Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior shall not adopt any policies concerning Public Law 101-382 or existing regulations that would restrain domestic transportation or processing of timber from private lands or impose additional accountability requirements on any timber. The Secretary of Commerce shall extend until September 30, 1996, the order issued under section 491(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 101-382 and shall issue an order under section 491(b)(2)(B) of such law that will be effective October 1, 1996.

SEC. 131. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, an additional \$2,000,000 is hereby appropriated for the National Park Service, Park Service construction for repair of flood damage to the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for projects or activities, except for those projects and activities provided for in Public Law 104-91 and Public Law 104-92, including costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act) at a rate for operations provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference, House Report 104-378, on the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 2076), as passed the House of Representatives on December 6, 1995, notwithstanding section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, section 313 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (Public Law 103-236), and section 53 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, the rate for operations only for program administration and the continuation of grants awarded in fiscal year 1995 and prior years of the Advanced Technology Program of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the rate for operations for the Ounce of Prevention Council, Drug Courts, Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment and for the Cops on the Beat Program may be increased up to a level of 75 per centum of the final fiscal year 1995 appropriated amount: *Provided further*, That, under the previous proviso, no contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by the previous proviso as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366: *Provided further*, That any costs incurred by a Department or agency funded under this subsection resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions resulting from this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such Department or agency: *Provided further*, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out the preceding proviso is provided in addition to authorities provided elsewhere in this subsection: *Provided further*, That funds to carry out the preceding two provisos shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with established re-

programming procedures: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, the amount of funds obligated or expended by the Legal Services Corporation shall not exceed an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations available to the Legal Services Corporation as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, funding provided for Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing Incentive Grants, with the exception of funds available to States for incarceration of criminal aliens and the Cooperative Agreement Program, shall be withheld, pending enactment of revisions to subtitle A of title II of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, so as not to impinge upon final funding prerogatives: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, sufficient funds shall be provided to continue the Office of Inspector General of the United States Information Agency, to be derived from funds otherwise available to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of State.

DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

(b) Such amounts as may be necessary under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995 for continuing projects or activities, except for those projects and activities provided for in Public Law 104-91 and Public Law 104-92, including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees (not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act) at a rate for operations provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference, House Report 104-384, on the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 2099), as passed the House of Representatives on December 7, 1995: *Provided*, That Senate amendment 63 shall be disposed of in the manner passed by the House on December 7, 1995, as if enacted into law: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, the rate for operations for the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, and the Office of Consumer Affairs may be increased up to a level of 75 per centum of the fiscal year 1995 level: *Provided further*, That, under the previous proviso, no new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by the previous proviso as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366: *Provided further*, That the penultimate proviso under the heading "General Operating Expenses" and sections 107 and 109 under the heading "Administrative Provisions" in the Department of Veterans Affairs are effective to the extent and in the manner, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-384) on the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 2099), as passed by the House of Representatives on December 7, 1995.

SEC. 202. Unless otherwise provided for in this title of this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds

made available and authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act shall be available until (a) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this title of this Act, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provision for such project or activity, or (c) March 15, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 203. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this title of this Act.

SEC. 204. Expenditures made pursuant to this title of this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 205. Appropriations made by section 201 shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 206. No provision in the appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1996 referred to in section 201 of this Act that makes the availability of any appropriation provided therein dependent upon the enactment of additional authorizing or other legislation shall be effective before the date set forth in section 202(c) of this Act.

SEC. 207. Appropriations and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing herein shall be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 208. Public Law 104-92 is amended by repealing Title II and by inserting in section 101(a) after the paragraph ending with "under the Railroad Retirement Board;" the following paragraphs: "All activities, including administrative and beneficiary travel expenses of all veterans benefit programs, necessary for the provision of veterans benefits funded in the Department of Veterans Affairs under the headings "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", "Veterans insurance and indemnities", "Guaranty and indemnity program account", "Loan guaranty program account", "Direct loan program account", "Education loan fund program account", "Vocational rehabilitation loans program account", "Native American veteran housing loan program account", and "Administrative provisions, SEC. 107" to the extent and in the manner and at the rate of operations, notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-384) on the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 2099), as passed by the House of Representatives on December 7, 1995;

All payments to contractors of the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs for goods and services that directly relate to patient health and safety to the extent and in the manner and at the rate for operations, notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-384) on the Departments of Veterans Affairs and

Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 2099), as passed by the House of Representatives on December 7, 1995."

SEC. 209. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 202, the amount made available to the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the heading Salaries and Expenses, shall include, in addition to direct appropriations, the amount it collects under the fee rate and offsetting collection authority contained in Public Law 103-352, which fee rate and offsetting collection authority shall remain in effect during the period of this title of this Act.

SEC. 210. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 202, funds for the Environmental Protection Agency shall be made available in the appropriation accounts which are provided in H.R. 2099 as reported on September 13, 1995.

SEC. 211. Public Law 104-91 is amended by inserting after the words "the protection of the Federal judiciary" in section 101(a), the following: "to the extent and in the manner and", and by inserting at the end of the paragraph containing those words, but before the semicolon, the following: " Provided, That, with the exception of section 114, the General Provisions for the Department of Justice included in Title I of the aforementioned conference report are hereby enacted into law".

SEC. 212. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall convey, without reimbursement, to the State of Mississippi, all rights, title and interest of the United States in the property known as the Yellow Creek Facility and consisting of approximately 1,200 acres near the city of Iuka, Mississippi, including all improvements thereon and also including any personal property owned by NASA that is currently located on-site and which the State of Mississippi requires to facilitate the transfer: *Provided*, That appropriated funds shall be used to effect this conveyance: *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 in appropriated funds otherwise available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be transferred to the State of Mississippi to be used in the transition of the facility: *Provided further*, That each Federal agency with prior contact to the site shall remain responsible for any and all environmental remediation made necessary as a result of its activities on the site: *Provided further*, That in consideration of this conveyance, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration may require such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems appropriate to protect the interests of the United States: *Provided further*, That the conveyance of the site and the transfer of the funds to the State of Mississippi shall occur not later than thirty days from the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 213. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act except section 202, projects and activities under the account heading "Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality" shall be subject to the provisions of section 112 of Public Law 104-56.

SEC. 214. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act, except section 202, whenever the rate for operations for any continuing project or activity provided by section 201 for which there is a budget request would result in a furlough of Government employees, that rate for operations may be increased to the minimum level that

would enable the furlough to be avoided. No new contracts or grants shall be awarded in excess of an amount that bears the same ratio to the rate for operations provided by this section as the number of days covered by this resolution bears to 366: *Provided further*, That the first sentence of section 214 shall not apply except to furloughs that exceed one workday per pay period for the affected workforce during the period of January 26, 1996 through March 15, 1996.

TITLE III—FOREIGN OPERATIONS EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 301. Such amounts as may be necessary for programs, projects, or activities provided for in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1996 (H.R. 1868), at a rate for operations and to the extent and in the manner provided for in the conference report and joint explanatory statement of the Committee of Conference (House Report 104-295) as passed by the House of Representatives on October 31, 1995, as if enacted into law, notwithstanding any other provision of this title of this Act: *Provided*, That Senate amendment numbered 115 shall be disposed of as follows, as if enacted into law:

In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate in amendment numbered 115, insert the following:

AUTHORIZATION OF POPULATION PLANNING

SEC. 518A. Notwithstanding section 526 of this Act, none of the funds made available in this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance pursuant to section 104(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act or any other provision of law, or funds made available in title IV of this Act as a contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) may be obligated or expended prior to July 1, 1996, unless such funding is expressly authorized by law: *Provided*, That if such funds are not authorized by law prior to July 1, 1996, funds appropriated in title II of this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for obligation and expenditure in an amount not to exceed 65 percent of the total amount appropriated or otherwise made available by P.L. 103-306 and P.L. 104-19 for such activities for fiscal year 1995, and funds appropriated in title IV of this Act as a contribution to the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) may be made available for obligation and expenditure in an amount not to exceed 65 percent of the total amount appropriated or otherwise made available by P.L. 103-306 and P.L. 104-19 for a contribution to UNFPA for fiscal year 1995: *Provided further*, That, pursuant to the previous proviso, such funds may be apportioned only on a monthly basis, beginning July 1, 1996 and ending September 30, 1997, and such monthly apportionments may not exceed 6.67 percent of the total available for such activities: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, funds appropriated by this Act for the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 1997.

SEC. 302. Unless otherwise provided for in this title of this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act shall be available until (a) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this title of this Act, or (b) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act by both Houses without any provi-

sion for such project or activity, or (c) September 30, 1996, whichever first occurs.

SEC. 303. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this title of this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for any program, project, or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this title of this Act.

SEC. 304. Expenditures made pursuant to this title of this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

TITLE IV—HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 401. During fiscal year 1996, the Secretary of Housing, and Urban Development may manage and dispose of multifamily properties owned by the Secretary, including the provision for grants from the General Insurance Fund (12 U.S.C. 1735c) for the necessary costs of rehabilitation and other related development costs and multifamily mortgages held by the Secretary without regard to any other provision of law.

PUBLIC AND ASSISTED HOUSING RENTS, INCOME ADJUSTMENTS, AND PREFERENCES

SEC. 402. (a) MINIMUM RENTS.—Notwithstanding sections 3(a) and 8(o)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, effective for fiscal year 1996 and no later than October 30, 1995—

(1) public housing agencies shall require each family who is assisted under the certificate or moderate rehabilitation program under section 8 of such Act to pay a minimum monthly rent of not less than \$25, and may require a minimum monthly rent of up to \$50;

(2) public housing agencies shall reduce the monthly assistance payment on behalf of each family who is assisted under the voucher program under section 8 of such Act so that the family pays a minimum monthly rent of not less than \$25, and may require a minimum monthly rent of up to \$50;

(3) with respect to housing assisted under other programs for rental assistance under section 8 of such Act, the Secretary shall require each family who is assisted under such program to pay a minimum monthly rent of not less than \$25 for the unit, and may require a minimum monthly rent of up to \$50; and

(4) public housing agencies shall require each family who is assisted under the public housing program (including public housing for Indian families) of such Act to pay a minimum monthly rent of not less than \$25, and may require a minimum monthly rent of up to \$50.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF CEILING RENTS.—

(1) Section 3(a)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows:

"(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a public housing agency may—

"(A) adopt ceiling rents that reflect the reasonable market value of the housing, but that are not less than the monthly costs—

"(i) to operate the housing of the agency; and

"(ii) to make a deposit to a replacement reserve (in the sole discretion of the public housing agency); and

"(B) allow families to pay ceiling rents referred to in subparagraph (A), unless, with respect to any family, the ceiling rent established under this paragraph would exceed the amount payable as rent by that family under paragraph (1)."

(2) REGULATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, by regulation, after notice and an opportunity for public comment, establish such requirements as may be necessary to carry out section 3(a)(2)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended by paragraph (1).

(B) TRANSITION RULE.—Prior to the issuance of final regulations under paragraph (1), a public housing agency may implement ceiling rents, which shall be not less than the monthly costs to operate the housing of the agency and—

(i) determined in accordance with section 3(a)(2)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as that section existed on the day before enactment of this Act;

(ii) equal to the 95th percentile of the rent paid for a unit of comparable size by tenants in the same public housing project or a group of comparable projects totaling 50 units or more; or

(iii) equal to the fair market rent for the area in which the unit is located.

(C) DEFINITION OF ADJUSTED INCOME.—Section 3(b)(5) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended—

(1) at the end of subparagraph (F), by striking “and”;

(2) at the end of subparagraph (G), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(H) for public housing, any other adjustments to earned income established by the public housing agency. If a public housing agency adopts other adjustments to income pursuant to subparagraph (H), the Secretary shall not take into account any reduction of or increase in the public housing agency's per unit dwelling rental income resulting from those adjustments when calculating the contributions under section 9 for the public housing agency for the operation of the public housing.”

(d) REPEAL OF FEDERAL PREFERENCES.—

(1) PUBLIC HOUSING.—Section 6(c)(4)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437d(c)(4)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) the establishment, after public notice and an opportunity for public comment, of a written system of preferences for admission to public housing, if any, that is not inconsistent with the comprehensive housing affordability strategy under title I of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act;”

(2) SECTION 8 EXISTING AND MODERATE REHABILITATION.—Section 8(d)(1)(A) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(d)(1)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) the selection of tenants shall be the function of the owner, subject to the provisions of the annual contributions contract between the Secretary and the agency, except that for the certificate and moderate rehabilitation programs only, for the purpose of selecting families to be assisted, the public housing agency may establish, after public notice and an opportunity for public comment, a written system of preferences for selection that is not inconsistent with the comprehensive housing affordability strategy under title I of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act;”

(3) SECTION 8 VOUCHER PROGRAM.—Section 8(o)(3)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(3)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) For the purpose of selecting families to be assisted under this subsection, the public housing agency may establish, after pub-

lic notice and an opportunity for public comment, a written system of preferences for selection that is not inconsistent with the comprehensive housing affordability strategy under title I of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act.”

(4) SECTION 8 NEW CONSTRUCTION AND SUBSTANTIAL REHABILITATION.—

(A) REPEAL.—Section 454(c) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 1437f note) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) [Reserved.]”

(B) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal tenant selection preferences under the United States Housing Act of 1937 shall apply with respect to—

(i) housing constructed or substantially rehabilitated pursuant to assistance provided under section 8(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (as such section existed on the day before October 1, 1983); or

(ii) projects financed under section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959 (as such section existed on the day before the date of enactment of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act).

(5) RENT SUPPLEMENTS.—Section 101(k) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (12 U.S.C. 1701s(k)) is amended to read as follows:

“(k) [Reserved.]”

(6) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) UNITED STATES HOUSING ACT OF 1937.—The United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 6(o), by striking “preference rules specified in” and inserting “written system of preferences for selection established pursuant to”;

(ii) in the second sentence of section 7(a)(2), by striking “according to the preferences for occupancy under” and inserting “in accordance with the written system of preferences for selection established pursuant to”;

(iii) in section 8(d)(2)(A), by striking the last sentence;

(iv) in section 8(d)(2)(H), by striking “Notwithstanding subsection (d)(1)(A)(i), an” and inserting “An”;

(v) in section 16(c), in the second sentence, by striking “the system of preferences established by the agency pursuant to section 6(c)(4)(A)(ii)” and inserting “the written system of preferences for selection established by the public housing agency pursuant to section 6(c)(4)(A)”;

(vi) in section 24(e)—

(I) by striking “(e) EXCEPTIONS” and all that follows through “The Secretary may” and inserting the following:

“(e) EXCEPTIONS TO GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may”;

(II) by striking paragraph (2).

(B) CRANSTON-GONZALEZ NATIONAL AFFORDABLE HOUSING ACT.—Section 522(f)(6)(B) of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 12704 et seq.) is amended by striking “any preferences for such assistance under section 8(d)(1)(A)(1)” and inserting “the written system of preferences for selection established pursuant to section 8(d)(1)(A).”

(C) HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1992.—Section 655 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13615) is amended by striking “the preferences” and all that follows up to the period at the end and inserting “any preferences”.

(D) REFERENCES IN OTHER LAW.—Any reference in any Federal law other than any

provision of any law amended by paragraphs (1) through (5) of this subsection to the preferences for assistance under section 6(c)(4)(A)(1), 8(d)(1)(A)(1), or 8(o)(3)(B) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (as such sections existed on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) shall be considered to refer to the written system of preferences for selection established pursuant to section 6(c)(4)(A), 8(d)(1)(A), or 8(o)(3)(B), respectively, of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended by this section.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—In accordance with section 201(b)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the amendments made by subsection (a), (b), (c), (d), and (f) of this section shall also apply to public housing developed or operated pursuant to a contract between the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and an Indian housing authority.

(4) This section shall be effective upon the enactment of this Act and only for fiscal year 1996.

SECTION 8 FAIR MARKET RENTALS, ADMINISTRATIVE FEES, AND DELAY IN REISSUANCE

SEC. 403. (a) FAIR MARKET RENTALS.—The Secretary shall establish fair market rentals for purposes of section 8(c)(1) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, that shall be effective for fiscal year 1996 and shall be based on the 40th percentile rent of rental distributions of standard quality rental housing units. In establishing such fair market rentals, the Secretary shall consider only the rents for dwelling units occupied by recent movers and may not consider the rents for public housing dwelling units or newly constructed rental dwelling units.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE FEES.—Notwithstanding sections 8(q) (1) and (4) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, for fiscal year 1996, the fee for each month for which a dwelling unit is covered by an assistance contract under the certificate, voucher, or moderate rehabilitation program under section 8 of such Act shall be equal to the monthly fee payable for fiscal year 1995: *Provided*, That this subsection shall be applicable to all amounts made available for such fees during fiscal year 1996, as if in effect on October 1, 1995.

(c) DELAY REISSUANCE OF VOUCHERS AND CERTIFICATES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a public housing agency administering certificate or voucher assistance provided under subsection (b) or (o) of section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, shall delay for 3 months, the use of any amounts of such assistance (or the certificate or voucher representing assistance amounts) made available by the termination during fiscal year 1996 of such assistance on behalf of any family for any reason, but not later than October 1, 1996; with the exception of any certificates assigned or committed to project-based assistance as permitted otherwise by the Act, accomplished prior to the effective date of this Act.

REPEAL OF PROVISIONS REGARDING INCOME DISREGARDS

SEC. 404. (a) MAXIMUM ANNUAL LIMITATION ON RENT INCREASES RESULTING FROM EMPLOYMENT.—Section 957 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act is hereby repealed, retroactive to November 28, 1990, and shall be of no effect.

(b) ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE.—Section 923 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 is hereby repealed, retroactive to October 28, 1992, and shall be of no effect.

SECTION 8 CONTRACT RENEWALS

SEC. 405. (a) For fiscal year 1996 and henceforth, the Secretary of Housing and Urban

Development may use amounts available for the renewal of assistance under section 8 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, upon termination or expiration of a contract for assistance under section 8 of such Act of 1937 (other than a contract for tenant-based assistance and notwithstanding section 8(v) of such Act for loan management assistance), to provide assistance under section 8 of such Act, subject to the Section 8 Existing Fair Market Rents, for the eligible families assisted under the contracts at expiration or termination, which assistance shall be in accordance with terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a) and except for projects assisted under section 8(e)(2) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (as it existed immediately prior to October 1, 1991), at the request of the owner, the Secretary shall renew for a period of one year contracts for assistance under section 8 that expire or terminate during fiscal year 1996 at the current rent levels.

(c) Section 8(v) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary may extend expiring contracts entered into under this section for project-based loan management assistance to the extent necessary to prevent displacement of low-income families receiving such assistance as of September 30, 1996."

(d) Section 236(f) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-1(f)) is amended:

(1) by striking the second sentence in paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The rental charge for each dwelling unit shall be at the basic rental charge or such greater amount, not exceeding the lower of (i) the fair market rental charge determined pursuant to this paragraph, or (ii) the fair market rental established under section 8(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 for the market area in which the housing is located, as represents 30 per centum of the tenant's adjusted income."; and

(2) by striking paragraph (6)."

EXTENSION OF HOME EQUITY CONVERSION MORTGAGE PROGRAM

SEC. 406. Section 255(g) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715z-20(g)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "September 30, 1995" and inserting "September 30, 1996"; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking "25,000" and inserting "30,000".

FHA SINGLE-FAMILY ASSIGNMENT PROGRAM REFORM

SEC. 407. (a) FORECLOSURE AVOIDANCE.—Except as provided in subsection (e), the last sentence of section 204(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1710(a)) is amended by inserting before the period the following: "And provided further, That the Secretary may pay insurance benefits to the mortgagee to recompense the mortgagee for its actions to provide an alternative to the foreclosure of a mortgage that is in default, which actions may include special foreclosure, loan modification, and deeds in lieu of foreclosure, all upon terms and conditions as the mortgagee shall determine in the mortgagee's sole discretion, within guidelines provided by the Secretary, but which may not include assignment of a mortgage to the Secretary: And provided further, That for purposes of the preceding proviso, no action authorized by the Secretary and no action taken, nor any failure to act, by the Secretary or the mortgagee shall be subject to judicial review."

(b) AUTHORITY TO ASSIST MORTGAGORS IN DEFAULT.—Except as provided in subsection

(e), section 230 of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1715u) is amended to read as follows:

"AUTHORITY TO ASSIST MORTGAGORS IN DEFAULT

"SEC. 230. (a) PAYMENT OF PARTIAL CLAIM.—The Secretary may establish a program for payment of a partial claim to a mortgagee that agrees to apply the claim amount to payment of a mortgage on a 1- to 4-family residence that is in default. Any such payment under such program to the mortgagee shall be made in the sole discretion of the Secretary and on terms and conditions acceptable to the Secretary, except that—

"(1) the amount of the payment shall be in an amount determined by the Secretary, not to exceed an amount equivalent to 12 of the monthly mortgage payments and any costs related to the default that are approved by the Secretary; and

"(2) the mortgagor shall agree to repay the amount of the insurance claim to the Secretary upon terms and conditions acceptable to the Secretary.

The Secretary may pay the mortgagee, from the appropriate insurance fund, in connection with any activities that the mortgagee is required to undertake concerning repayment by the mortgagor of the amount owed to the Secretary.

"(b) ASSIGNMENT.—

"(1) PROGRAM AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may establish a program for assignment to the Secretary, upon request of the mortgagee, of a mortgage on a 1- to 4-family residence insured under this Act.

"(2) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may accept assignment of a mortgage under a program under this subsection only if—

"(A) the mortgage was in default;

"(B) the mortgagee has modified the mortgage to cure the default and provide for mortgage payments within the reasonable ability of the mortgagor to pay, at interest rates not exceeding current market interest rates; and

"(C) the Secretary arranges for servicing of the assigned mortgage by a mortgagee (which may include the assigning mortgagee) through procedures that the Secretary has determined to be in the best interests of the appropriate insurance fund.

"(3) PAYMENT OF INSURANCE BENEFITS.—Upon accepting assignment of a mortgage under a program established under this subsection, the Secretary may pay insurance benefits to the mortgagee from the appropriate insurance fund, in an amount that the Secretary determines to be appropriate, not to exceed the amount necessary to compensate the mortgagee for the assignment and any losses and expenses resulting from the mortgage modification.

"(c) PROHIBITION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW.—No decision by the Secretary to exercise or forego exercising any authority under this section shall be subject to judicial review.

"(d) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Any mortgage for which the mortgagor has applied to the Secretary, before the date of enactment of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, for assignment pursuant to subsection (b) of this section as in effect before such date of enactment shall continue to be governed by the provisions of this section, as in effect immediately before such date of enactment.

"(e) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—No provision of this Act, or any other law, shall be construed to require the Secretary to pro-

vide an alternative to foreclosure for mortgagees with mortgages on 1- to 4-family residences insured by the Secretary under this Act, or to accept assignments of such mortgages."

(c) APPLICABILITY OF AMENDMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (e), the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only with respect to mortgages insured under the National Housing Act that are originated before October 1, 1995.

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall issue interim regulations to implement this section and the amendments made by this section.

(e) EFFECTIVENESS AND APPLICABILITY.—If this Act is enacted after the date of enactment of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995—

(1) subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section shall not take effect; and

(2) section 2052(c) of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 is amended by striking "that are originated on or after October 1, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "that are originated before, during, and after fiscal year 1996."

This Act may be cited as "The Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, I".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognized the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], my colleague and the distinguished ranking member on the committee, for working closely with me to make sure that we had a bill that would not only pass this House, but will pass the other body and go to the President and, in fact, will be signed into law so the Government can continue.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased that although this was a hard-fought negotiation, it is one that we can all go back to our respective constituencies and be proud of. And I hope, that it will also lead to a long-term solution, so that we do not have to close down the Government or send more agency employees out to the streets while we conduct our business.

The fact is that seven appropriations bills have been signed into law for the current fiscal year, fiscal year 1996. In addition, the District of Columbia has authority to use local funds through September 30, so all of the programs under those seven bills and the District of Columbia are virtually funded.

We hope to come before the Congress within the next week and pass a District of Columbia bill. So the District of Columbia with provision for a portion of the Federal payment in this bill, but for the purposes of the remaining five appropriations bills, they are covered in one fashion or another by

this Balanced Budget Downpayment Act.

Mr. Speaker, the activities in two appropriations acts are provided for through March 15. That is the operative date at the level of funding specified in the respective fiscal year 1996 conference agreements, but under the terms and conditions provided for, as I pointed out to the gentleman from Texas, in the applicable fiscal year 1995 Appropriations act. They are the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary; and the VA-HUD bills.

The Foreign Operations bill, which has passed this House on numerous occasions in one form or another, is likewise provided for in its entirety through September 30, not March 15, at the level specified in the conference agreement and under the terms and conditions of that agreement as if enacted into law.

Funding for population planning activities, or funds made available to the U.N. Population Fund, are not made available for expenditure unless authorized prior to July 1, 1996. If an authorization is not enacted by that date, then no more than 65 percent of the current rate may then be obligated.

In addition to those three bills, the activities in the following two appropriations bills, the Labor-HHS and Education bill and the Interior and related agencies bill, are provided for also through March 15, but at a level of funding that is the lower of either the House-passed, the Senate passed, or fiscal year 1995 current rate, but under the terms and conditions provided for in the applicable 1995 Appropriations Act.

Programs that were terminated or would be severely impacted may be funded at a rate of operations not to exceed 75 percent of the current rate. That is a 75 percent cap.

In addition, the following programs are funded at levels not to exceed 75 percent of the current rate of operations. They are re specifically picked out. Those are AmeriCorps, ATP, Cops on the Beat, Ounce of Prevention Council, Drug Courts, Community Development Financial Institutions, and the Office of Consumer Affairs.

The bill would provide a restriction that would prohibit excessive travel by Cabinet-level Secretaries, except State, Defense, CIA, and the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, for obvious reasons involving national security. That level would be arrived at by computing 110 percent of the average of travel expenditures made by the Secretaries of those Departments between the years 1990 and 1995.

Let me stress, even though only certain bills are covered in this Balanced Budget Downpayment Act, I, the fact is the travel of all of the Secretaries, all of the Cabinet Secretaries, other than State, Defense, CIA, and U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, will

actually be covered by this provision. So if their travel expenditures exceed 110 percent of the mean of Secretarial travel between 1990 and 1995, they could well be in trouble and would be told by the U.S. Congress through this provision to stop traveling. I would like to restate that. They could be, and they will be.

Section 128 of the bill prohibits the use of funds for embryo research, and the bill also increases the maximum Pell grant award to at least \$2,440 per individual.

I would like to pause on that. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is keenly concerned about this. I would like to tell the gentleman and any others that are concerned about it that we have reached an agreement that can be confirmed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], that the \$2,440 per individual is a figure that is not intended by the administration to be exceeded unless there is agreement among all of the parties on both sides, Democrat and Republican, with the White House, and with the Department of Education.

That was emphatically repeated to us, the gentleman from Wisconsin and to myself, within the last hour. And I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is here, and I would like to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin for his understanding on that conversation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the gentleman is correct. We had conversation with the President's chief of staff, Mr. Panetta, and he indicated although the administration certainly would like to go above the \$2,440 level which is presently in the bill, and they want the flexibility for that to be considered, that they in fact have no intention of proceeding with any number that is higher than the one stipulated in this proposal, unless it is mutually agreed upon.

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

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that if we do not have it in blood, we have to understand that any time we go up 100 bucks in a Pell grant, and we have already raised it higher than it has ever been in the history of Pell grants, we are talking about \$300 million. If we go up \$200, we are talking about \$600 million-plus, and that has to come from every other education program, and we have already lost in many other education programs.

Now, when the gentleman says "the parties have to agree," does it come back through committee? What does that mean?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would say to the gentleman that in our conversations and Mr. Panetta, he swore to us that

the administration would not raise the level per pupil under the Pell grants without the joint agreement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, myself, the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman's counterpart on his committee and counterparts in the Senate.

That is basically the tenor of the conversation I got. And I might add that even the \$2,440 per individual which we have provided in this bill and has been provided in the conference report is \$100 per individual more than was provided in any previous year. So we have gone up. On Pell grants we will actually expend a tremendous amount more money in the aggregate sense than has ever been provided before in previous years. So nobody can say we are cutting Pell grants.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think that sooner or later in this place somebody has to trust somebody, and while we certainly did not have a long conversation, because we did not have the time to give him, there was a time squeeze on people today, it was very clear and explicit that there would have to be widely reached understanding before any number other than \$2,440 would be pursued by the administration. Obviously, knowing Mr. Panetta's integrity, he certainly intends to live up to that agreement.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I just want to make sure. I want to make very, very sure that we are thoroughly convinced that the administration understands that they will not publish anything above \$2,440, unless they have the permission of those who are negotiating this issue.

Mr. OBEY. That was absolutely my understanding.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is my understanding as well, I would tell the gentleman.

Moving right along, Mr. Speaker, the bill directs the Architect of the Capitol to sell a House office building that has been declared excess and enacts into law \$1.2 billion in legislative savings from the various housing programs under the VA-HUD appropriations bill, as shepherded by the distinguished and very capable gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS].

It provides for the sale of 7 million barrels of oil from the strategic petroleum reserve, which results in increased Federal revenues of \$100 million. There are additional program terminations; in addition to those eight programs that were terminated by an earlier continuing resolution, House Joint Resolution 122, there are 10 programs which I will incorporate in the RECORD which are terminated by this act.

Finally, as was pointed out in one of the reservations of objection to the previous unanimous consent request, the bill proposes to freeze new grant

activities at a level not exceed 75 percent of the prior monthly rate for the duration of this continuing resolution for various activities which will be made part of the RECORD. I might add, those activities all come under the Labor and Health and Human Services appropriations bill and, therefore, are already capped at 75 percent funding at the very most, but this would mean on a monthly basis the grants would be frozen at 75 percent of that.

I would point out that with respect to the Interior bill, all programs in the Interior bill will, in fact, be funded at the lowest of the low levels, with the exception of the Park Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Forest Service, The Indian Health Services, and Indian Health Service Facilities, which will be funded at conference levels.

□ 1800

The recent C&O Canal flood damage will be repaired to the tune of \$2 million. Programs not at conference levels but at 75 percent include the Cops on the Beat, ATP, Drug Courts, GLOBE, Community Development Financial Institutions Fund, and Office of Consumer Affairs. The NLRB and the Council of Environmental Quality get special rates as well.

There is changed furlough language. The previous continuing resolutions provided enough funding so that we did not have to furlough people. We did not lay people off. Obviously, in view of the passage of time, one-third of the fiscal year, that language is outdated.

We are reducing many agencies and departments by 5 percent, at least 5 percent of their funding. And unless we begin to start to lay off people or furlough them, if necessary, then any savings that we might have received by virtue of the cuts become moot because everybody is still on the job. So it is important that we, in a methodical and careful way, allow the administration to go forward and start to tell those people that they can no longer afford to be carried.

I have to tell Members that the fact is, though, that we have been doing that in a workable fashion. The programs managed by the agencies and departments should not be penalized because we have not been doing it in the past and, therefore, they should not have to double up their efforts to furlough people or RIF people for the second quarter or second third of the year. Instead, we have a reasonable formula arrived at in consultation with the minority and with the administration which allows for a methodical approach in those RIF's or furloughs. So no agency, no department is unduly damaged by this provision.

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier, at this point, I would like to insert a summary of the bill.

H.R. 2880—BALANCED BUDGET DOWNPAYMENT ACT, I

BACKGROUND

Seven Appropriations bills have been signed into law for the full fiscal year; in addition the District of Columbia has authority to use local funds through September 30th.

Numerous "targeted appropriations" have been funded through previous continuing resolutions.

LEVELS OF FUNDING PROVIDED IN THIS ACT

The following two Appropriations Acts are provided for, through March 15th, at a level of funding specified in the respective FY 1996 Conference agreements but under the terms and conditions provided for in the applicable FY 1995 Appropriations Act:

COMMERCE—JUSTICE—STATE & THE JUDICIARY—VA—HUD

The Foreign Operations Appropriations Act is provided for, through September 30th, at the level specified in the Conference agreement and under the terms and conditions of that agreement. Funding for population planning activities or funds made available to the UN Population Fund are not available for expenditure unless authorized prior to July 1, 1996. If an authorization is not enacted by that date, then no more than 65 percent of the current rate may be obligated.

The following two Appropriations Acts are provided for, through March 15th, at a level of funding that is the LOWER of either the House passed, Senate passed, or FY 1995 current rate but under the terms and conditions provided for in the applicable FY 1995 Appropriations Act. Programs that were terminated, or would be "severely impacted" may be funded at a rate of operations not to exceed 75 percent of the current rate:

LABOR—HHS & EDUCATION—INTERIOR & RELATED AGENCIES—ACTIVITIES FUNDED AT SPECIFIC LEVELS

In addition, the following items are funded at levels not to exceed 75 percent of the current rate of operations:

Americorp, ATP, Cops on the Beat, Ounce of Prevention Council, Drug Courts, Community Development, Financial Institutions, and the Office of Consumer Affairs.

RESTRICTION ON CABINET TRAVEL

The bill provides a restriction that would prohibit excessive travel by cabinet level Secretaries (except State, Defense, CIA & the U.S. Ambassador to the UN) that exceeds 110% of the average of travel expenditures between 1990 and 1995.

LIMITATION ON EMBRYO RESEARCH

Section 128 of the bill prohibits the use of funds for embryo research.

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The bill increases the maximum Pell Grant award to \$2,440 per individual.

The bill directs the Architect of the Capitol to sell a House Office building that has been declared excess.

The bill enacts into law \$1.2 billion in legislative savings from various housing programs in the VA—HUD appropriations bill.

The bill provides for the sale of 7 million barrels of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which results in increased federal revenues of \$100 million.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM TERMINATIONS

In addition to the eight programs that were terminated by an earlier continuing resolution (H.J. Res. 122), the following 10 programs are terminated by this Act:

Child Development Associate Scholarships in the Department of Health and Human Services; Dependent Care Planning and Development in the Department of Health and Human Services; Law Related Education in the Department of Education; Dropout Prevention Demonstrations in the Department of Education; Aid for Institutional Development—Endowment Grants in the Department of Education; Aid for Institutional Development—Evaluation in the Department of Education; Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native Cultural Arts; Innovative Projects in Community Service in the Department of Education; Cooperative Education in the Department of Education; and Douglas Teacher Scholarships in the Department of Education.

FREEZE GRANT FUNDING

The bill proposes to freeze new grant activities at a level not to exceed 75% of the prior monthly rate for the duration of this continuing resolution for the following activities:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Health Resources and Services Administration: Health Resources and Services: Trauma Care, Health Care Facilities.

Assistant Secretary for Health: Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health: National Vaccine Program, Health Care Reform Data Analysis, National AIDS Program Office.

Health Care Financing Administration: Program Management: Essential Access Community Hospitals.

Administration for Children and Families: Children and Families Services Program: Youth Gang Substance Abuse, Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect, Child Welfare Research, Social Services Research, Homeless Service Grants, Community Schools (crime trust fund).

Administration on Aging: Aging Services Programs: Pension Counseling, Federal Council on Aging, White House Conference on Aging.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Education for the Disadvantaged: State School Improvement.

School Improvement Programs: Safe & Drug Free Schools & Communities: National Program Women's Educational Equity.

Bilingual and Immigrant Education: Bilingual Education Support Services.

Higher Education: Faculty Development Fellowships, School, College and University Partnerships.

RELATED AGENCIES

Corporation for National and Community Service: Domestic Volunteer Service Programs, Operating Expenses: Senior Demonstration Program, and the National Education Standards and Improvement Council.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to urge support for this proposition.

As I said earlier, this is a result of a great deal of bipartisan work with many people involved, and no one who I know agrees with every single recommendation in the bill. I do not. I know the gentleman from Louisiana does not.

But I think by passing this bill we will all meet our higher obligation to keep the Government functioning

again for at least the next 45 days, and in the case of at least one bill before us, the foreign operations bill, it will dispose of that bill for the entire year.

I am happy to report to the House, despite deep divisions which normally accompany the issue, we have with the assistance of many people on both sides of the aisle reached agreement on the family planning/abortion cluster of issues, which so often accompany that bill. And we have managed to reach common ground even though we have many differing views about how those issues ought to be handled.

I think we have found a solution which is acceptable to everyone. I would point out there are some concerns about programs such as LIHEAP, which will undoubtedly be raised by the gentleman from Vermont, but I simply want to say that I would urge support. We have had a lot of acrimony over the past several months in this House. This bill should not be an occasion for that acrimony today because it is a reasonable compromise.

I do want to say, however, that I think there are several serious problems with it. I do have strong disagreement with the fact that this level will in fact mean that we are funding education at \$3.1 billion less than we were funding it last year. If that were to remain the case for the entire year, it would mean that we would be eventually placing a great additional burden on local property taxpayers, and I do not believe that we ought to be doing that.

I would point out that whether we are talking about school-to-work programs or title I or professional development programs or safe and drug-free schools or Gallaudet University or vocational education, I do not believe that we should be funding these programs at a level which is this low. I hope that we can get agreement down the line to change that.

I do not want to shut down the Government over that. I do not want to shut the Government over that because I do not believe in holding my breath and turning blue every time I lose an argument. But I do think that this is an issue that the House needs to make a choice on. I should announce, therefore, that the distinguished minority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], will be offering in his recommittal motion a proposition which would return these education programs to the 1995 fiscal year level, which means in essence that it would eliminate the \$3.1 billion reduction which we have in these education programs.

Mr. Speaker, I know the President is concerned about that reduced level of funding; certainly we are on this side of the aisle. I know a great many other Members, including Senator KENNEDY, are concerned about it on the Senate side. I would urge support for that recommittal motion when it is offered by

the distinguished minority whip. But no matter how that motion goes, I would then urge support for this bill in the interest of demonstrating to the American people that, if we disagree on some basics, we can also agree on some fundamentals. That is what we are supposed to be able to do in a legislative body.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman if he could withhold. I thought the gentleman had a question of me. I will be happy to yield him time. I do not want to be stuck in a triangular colloquy. I agree with the gentleman's concern on the program, the concerns which he has raised.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Department of Education will be funded at the House-passed level, except for those programs that were not funded by the House, in which case they will be funded at 75 percent. According to my calculations then, that means that, if we were to extend this CR for the rest of the year at that rate of funding, that would be a \$3.1 billion cut from 1995.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING] knows that we forward fund education, so these dollars are for the school year 1996-97, the school year starting in September. By next month, school districts will be starting to write their budgets for that school year. How in the world will they know how much money they will have when they are threatened with a possible \$3.1 billion cut? Will this require in some States like Michigan, where they have to pink slip teachers at a certain time if they feel there will not be enough money, will this require certain States to pink slip teachers?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer what it will require in specific States. Let me simply say that I agree with the concerns the gentleman expresses. I do not believe that these are the appropriate levels at which education ought to be funded. I think it will cause a great deal of turmoil at the local level.

Keep in mind that, while the Federal Government only provides a small share of the overall education budget, it provides a very high percentage, well over 50 percent, in virtually all districts, of the cost of meeting the education needs of children who are served by title I. I think that is going to be a big hole in those local school budgets, and that is something that the Con-

gress ought to do something about. I know the President very badly wants to see that changed.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is important then that we support the Bonior amendment to recommit to restore those funds, at least to the 1995 level for education.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree.

Mr. KILDEE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

As the chairman knows, I am particularly concerned with the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program. It has been very cold in my part of the country, and during earlier CR's there have been disruptions in funding for this vital program.

The administration has released \$810 million to the States, but I am concerned that the flow of funds to the States could again be disrupted. Generally I would like to know whether this CR will affect the full commitment of funds to the—funds of LIHEAP—to the States. Specifically, is it the chairman's understanding that under the current bill before the House, funds for LIHEAP will be allocated to the States and be available for distribution to the States in the normal fashion?

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

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], I would say that it is my understanding and his that the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS], chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me. I certainly will not take the 2 minutes.

I did, as the chairman may have noted, stand, thinking about being recognized during the objection opportunity that we had earlier. It certainly was not my intention to object.

The reason for my considering doing that was because, as the chairman has indicated, a significant portion of my own VA-HUD bill is within this short-term appropriations. The process that we went through in our subcommittee to begin the pattern of reducing spending was a very, very difficult process,

of which I am very proud. I am particularly proud of the Members who themselves had to make many a sacrifice by way of cutting back that spending.

It is important to note that we were among those who actually went about terminating some programs, the most difficult of processes. The concern that I want to express here as I praise both my colleague and my ranking member for the difficult process they have been through is the fact that this bill does for a short-term period reverse some of those very difficult decisions, a process that is not very helpful to the committee's work. I want, beyond praising the committee, to have others around here at a higher level than those of us in the committee to know that we intend to look very carefully when we come toward March 15 regarding any similar pattern.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides funding for the departments and agencies under the jurisdiction of the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee until March 15 or the enactment of the regular appropriations act.

The funding amount for each appropriation account will be the level agreed to in the conference on H.R. 2099. Exceptions are being made for the Corporation for National and Community Service and the community development financial institutions fund which are being continued at 75 percent of the 1995 appropriation levels.

The departments and agencies are expected to administer the programs and activities consistent with the directions contained in the 1996 statement of the managers and other relevant legislative history.

The approved major construction projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs are those referenced in the conference report.

Further, it is intended that under section 107 of the VA's administrative provisions that the general operating expenses appropriation be reimbursed from the insurance funds for the entire fiscal year's administrative costs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I have a concern here.

The new majority wanted to dispose of property and real estate at 501 First Street. It came through the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and it was handled in the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development.

I notice now that this property, the conveyance and sale of it, is in this continuing resolution. I am certainly not going to try and obstruct this particular measure but I would like to say this. This sets a precedent, and the subcommittee had, in fact, placed into that particular language that there would be a net gain from the sale of this and it would not cost the people of

the United States money to convey property for the sake of getting rid of it.

Second of all, the welfare of those children in that day care center would, in fact, be addressed and handled properly in an orderly fashion. I would like to state that the welfare of those children has not been addressed in the sense of the Congress situation in here and the language relating to the fact that there shall be a net gain from the sale of this has also been removed.

I want to state that this is not the way to set a precedent for the types of action that has been taken by the new majority. I supported the sale of this transaction, but I believe that the language that has been removed is not in the good interest of precedent-setting policy in the handling of real estate by our committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

□ 1815

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the language, we worked hard to get the appropriate language in this bill. The language simply authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to consummate the sale under the direction of the House Office Building Commission, but it does not create the sale. We do not consummate the sale in the language of this bill. It leaves that judgment yet to the leadership of the House. Frankly, we think it is good language that still leaves the option open whether it is right to sell property or not. We are not selling property in the language in this bill.

□ 1815

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

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

Mr. GILCREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is some concern. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and I sat through the hearings. We sat through both markups.

I know there are some reservations about the cost of marketing. That is still limited at \$75,000. There is some concern about the profitability of this sale. With new estimates, I give the gentleman assurances that when this building is sold there is going to be a profit to the Federal Government, there is going to be a \$300,000 savings on annual maintenance to the Government, and you can be firmly assured that the day care center will be retained.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to accept that and hear that from the subcommittee Chair, but I think for the sake of precedents, we should have had that type of defining language clearly delineated.

I will not oppose it, and I will support the measure without any further

obstruction here, but I think that was a very important precedent-setting transaction.

I commend the majority for looking toward those savings, but we could have done that, I think, with better language from the authorizing end that would have been included in the appropriators' language.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have contained the entire foreign operations bill in the appropriations cycle for 1996 in this bill, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the distinguished chairman of that subcommittee.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], as well as the staff, for reaching this agreement and including our bill in the resolution. I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my chairman for yielding me time to address the foreign operations portion of the bill before us. As my colleagues know, the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations conference report was approved by the House of Representatives nearly 3 months ago by a bipartisan vote of 351 to 71. Working together with all of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and I might add, with a great deal of help from the gentleman from Wisconsin, we were able to fashion a bipartisan bill. It is significantly below the administration's request levels, yet I believe we were very fair in determining how those cuts were apportioned. It wasn't easy but we did it.

I would like to emphasize three things for my colleagues. First, The conference report cited in this bill is the identical language passed by the House last October. There have been no changes in the agreed upon conference report language. Second, let me just remind my colleagues of some key facts. At \$12.1 billion, it is nearly 19 percent below the President's requested level and 11 percent below the fiscal year 1995 levels. At the same time, the bill provides \$500 million for child survival and disease prevention programs, with child survival activities funded at \$25 million over the fiscal year 1995 level. We also provide the traditional amounts for Israel and Egypt. Prime Minister Rabin's tragic death reinforces the need for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. In this respect, the subcommittee's bipartisan support for Middle East Peace Process is reflected in the conference report agreement.

But we did have one issue which was not so easy to resolve. It was the question of abortion funding and the Mexico City policy. This issue is of critical importance to me, therefore I was very disappointed that the Senate did not accept the House-passed language on this issue the very first time we sent it to them. But that is the nature of the Congress.

After months of hard work an agreement has been reached on a formula which strongly supports the House position and the authorizing committee's responsibility for this issue. The language in the bill before you is a critical

two-part formula—it delays obligation of international population planning funds until July 1, 1996, unless an authorization is enacted prior to then. After July, if an authorization is not enacted, 1996 population funds will be limited to 65 percent of the 1995 level and available for obligation on a monthly basis over 2 years at a rate no greater than 6.67 percent of the total amount available under this limitation. The intent of this provision is to give the authorizers and the administration an incentive to come to agreement promptly on the issue of Mexico City and abortion.

To help understand this concept, let's assume that for every dollar for population planning activities in 1995, 75 cents would be available in 1996 under the terms of the continuing resolution that we have been operating under. Under the 1996 conference agreement, family planning activities would get approximately 81 cents on the dollar, compared to 1995, if an authorization is enacted into law. This would be the same level as other development assistance activities, assuming all programs are treated equally, except for child survival programs which will increase over the 1995 level. However, if an authorization is not enacted into law, the proposal would generate 65 cents to the dollar over the 15 months that the funds would be available for obligation.

These funds would become available at the rate of a little over 4 cents per month over these 15 months. That way the administration will not obligate and expend all the funds at once, which would remove any incentive for opponents of the Mexico City policy to negotiate in good faith on the authorization bill. At the same time, funds will continue to flow even in the absence of an agreement on Mexico City.

I think this 65-cents-to-the-dollar solution is the best outcome either side could hope for; it provides an "in-cent-tive" for both sides, and makes good "cents."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, to answer those who have concerns that agriculture is not addressed in this bill, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding time to me. I know it is typical that you yield to members of the Committee on Appropriations, so I appreciate the opportunity to speak to this.

When the gentleman talks about wanting to run over here and objecting to this bill, I came over here on pretty quick notice when I heard this was coming up. I heard that negotiations had broken down in trying to get agriculture authorization onto this bill.

It is very disturbing to me that, first of all, we had to go through this because the President vetoed the bill. We are now operating under the 1949 act because the President vetoed the bill. We hear that, over in the other body today, the majority leader, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], wanted to bring up authorization language for agriculture, farmers that are talking to their bankers as we speak, making planting decisions, talking to their suppliers, and that there is one Mem-

ber of the other body sitting over there dragging his feet, objecting to this coming up, objecting to the negotiations so we could put this on this bill and calm the fears of many farmers out there that are trying to dig up someplace in their attic or basement a copy of the 1949 act.

Mr. Speaker, it would be one thing to shut down the Government, I suppose, on some farmer's whim because they are having a difficult time understanding the 1949 act, if it was not for the fact that we know that the leadership in the House, in a bipartisan fashion, are working to figure out a way to deal with this problem possibly as soon as next week.

But we have got to, I would say to my colleagues, stress to the minority leader in the Senate, Mr. DASCHLE, who continues to object to this change, continues to object to allowing farmers the kind of confidence that they need when they talk to their lenders, when they talk to their suppliers that they know what they are going to have to deal with next year.

I am not going to object to this. I am going to support it. I urge Members from the farm country to do so. But we have to put pressure on those folks in the other body.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman who was just in the well, a part of the problem is not that it is one Member in the other body. The fact of the matter is it is February, just about, is it not, of 1996. I thought we were supposed to be working on a farm bill in 1995. We were supposed to pass one in 1995. We were supposed to have all of these appropriations bills done in 1995. We have been doing that for years, whether we agreed with the administration or disagreed with the administration. Do you know what we do? We sit down and try to work those matters out.

I want to get to the point I wanted to make and the reason I got up here. You preceded me, and I wanted to address that issue. I want to ask the chairman of my committee, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations now for a dozen years, I will tell Members, I have never seen a procedure or process like this, and I want to ask, who in the world was representing Illinois, New York, New Jersey, California, Texas, Florida, places that have a great need for bilingual education, in this closed meeting that I was not invited to? Who was representing them?

You all cut some bilingual education programs. I just want to say right now, here in public, that as the rhetoric becomes more harsh about immigrants in America, it is strange to me that these are the very programs we are going to be cutting are the ones that integrate immigrants into our society.

Districts like I am honored to represent need these kinds of programs. I understand that there are huge cuts in this continuing resolution.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, from the gentleman's question, that he is concerned about the funding of education in America, is that correct, by the U.S. Congress?

Mr. COLEMAN. Let me tell you what I understood happened: that you froze the new grant activities for support services for bilingual education.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I know the gentleman has paid attention. He knows that the Labor-Health-Education bill has passed the House of Representatives as long ago as July 1995, I would remind the gentleman.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, then why in the world, I understand when you pass authorization bills, but I understand, though, that you have frozen some of the programs or made cuts in some of the programs for bilingual education? True or false?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Does the gentleman want an answer to his questions?

Mr. COLEMAN. I would like to have an answer to my questions.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield to me to answer the question.

Mr. COLEMAN. I will yield to the chairman so I can get a yes or no answer.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, my answer to the gentleman is that when the Democrats in the Senate will vote this bill through the Senate and we can go to conference and send the bill to the President, then we can get all the funding that the conference will allow.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat, I think we need to pass this bill today. I hope we can keep things as calm as possible, but I do take issue with the description of what has happened to the Labor-Health-Education bill in the Senate that has just been given by my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana.

The situation on the Education appropriation bill is simply this: The bill which was produced, or I mean the 602 allocation, which defines what the spending levels are, that allocation process which defines the ceilings for all 13 appropriation bills, was set so low in that process that the bill that the Senate produced in the committee cannot be brought up on the floor except by unanimous consent, under Senate rules. That is the problem.

The problem is that unanimous consent has been objected to by Members of both parties. That bill has not, as has often been suggested, been subjected to a filibuster. I do not support filibusters on anything except constitutional issues.

But it seems to me important to understand, Mr. Speaker, that what has been holding up the Education appropriation bill in the Senate is the fact that the bill itself exceeds the spending level allocated to it by the Republican leadership in the Senate and, therefore, they cannot get the bill up except by unanimous consent, and there have been objections to that on both sides of the political aisle.

Without getting into a political heat wave here today, I do want to make clear that the record shows accurately what has happened in the Senate, and that is why we will be supporting the Bonior motion to recommit, which tries to do what we can on this side to correct that problem.

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is the reason that we ought to be for the Bonior motion to instruct, with language of that kind, so we can address an issue that is of great importance to many Members on both sides of the aisle on issues that are now going to be either defunded or cut so dramatically that we cannot carry out those programs appropriately.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, pointed to the cuts in bilingual education. But let me go down the list of the cuts.

I agree with our ranking member, we have to pass this, but some of the cuts, 25 percent for Education 2000: Title I gets 17 percent, safe and drug-free schools, a 25-percent cut. That is what we are talking about.

We are up against the wall because these programs cannot function, and yet they are taking a 25-percent cut because the majority is cutting education funding that 80 percent of the people in our country support.

Mr. COLEMAN. In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me only say to the chairman that he knows and I know that part of the problem has been with the process.

The gentleman from Iowa, if he is still on the floor, I will be happy to yield to him, I understand that he is concerned that we were here at the end of the year, in fact several months, nearly half a year into the new fiscal year. The problem is you have to get these things resolved a lot earlier than this.

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

Mr. COLEMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the state of the history, which, of course, is a Presidential veto, the fact of the matter is we are here today. There appears to be bipartisan support to attach language to make sure we have authorization for agriculture. There is one person over in the Senate who is blocking this.

Mr. COLEMAN. Reclaiming my time, that is the problem that you continue to have with the process. You do not wait until it is the following year after you are supposed to have passed the normal appropriations.

Mr. NUSSLE. We have a President that vetoes everything.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the gentleman from Iowa, if he is still present, that I would have objected if the provision he wants had been in this bill.

I, for one, do not agree with the welfare bill that was tried to be passed, that could not come out of the Committee on Agriculture. They stuck it on the reconciliation package, which the President rightfully vetoed. It is nothing but a welfare bill for big farmers. Farmers get \$120,000 a year and do not even have to farm under that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I did not want to talk about it, but the gentleman brought it up. What I really wanted to talk about is I want the people to know that this bill really is one that I am going to vote for because I see the need for it, but I am going to hold my nose real good when I vote for it, because it smells, it stinks for what it does to education. It is terrible for education.

I want to tell everybody that if you think this is bad for education, which my educators say is bad for education, then if the President had signed their reconciliation package, which they called the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, they would have seen the same cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and everything down the line, just like they are cutting education in this. This is a terrible bill, but it is the only thing we have. That is the only reason I am going to be voting for it. It smells to high heaven. It cuts education.

It means a lot of my students that are in higher education next year are going to have a tough time returning. It means that a lot of kids going out of high school this year are going to have a terrible time being able to get that education next year. It means that many of my elementary and secondary institutions, schools in my district, are not going to be able to have the funds that they need that they have had in the past for necessary programs under title I. I think this should be corrected. That is why I am going to strongly support the motion to recommit.

I ask anybody that is really interested in education to support that mo-

tion. I will return now to agriculture and tell again the gentleman from Iowa, yes, I have been told, I will tell you how it goes up here, folks.

□ 1830

That bill was not reported out of the Committee on Agriculture because it was a smelly bill, a terrible bill, so they stuck it in the reconciliation.

Now they tell me, I just got word today, that next week on Tuesday we are supposed to bring it up in committee and mark it up, a different bill. I just got a copy of it today, but now my staff tells me this evening that this is not the bill we are going to mark up, we are going to have a different one, we are going to have the chairman's mark when we do it, and I will not see that until Tuesday.

That is the way they work down here. You do not even have an opportunity to read a bill much before you vote on it or act on it. It is terrible.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise in support of the motion to recommit to hold funding of education as the highest possible priority. The American people need assistance in keeping their schools functioning and operating at the best possible level that we could help them attain.

But I want to follow my colleague from Missouri on the issue of agriculture. I heard the gentleman from Iowa commenting earlier about how the Senate minority leader was somehow preventing us from having a farm bill. If there is an example of inability to manage an issue, it has to be on how the new Republican majority in this Congress has mismanaged agriculture.

We are confronted at the moment with a situation where the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. ROBERTS, the chairman of the committee, and Senator DOLE, his close personal friend from Kansas, cannot even agree on a proper approach to deal with the agricultural crisis that is about to occur across this land as people have to make decisions about cropping.

Now, this is ludicrous. We have not been able to get a Republican majority on the farm authorizing committee of the Committee on Agriculture to put together a bill that can attain a majority of their own members.

There is no question we are cutting funding for agriculture subsidies. We have cut 50 percent in the last decade. The question is, are we going to have a soft landing or are we going to have a crash?

Now, the Freedom to Farm bill was unanimously trashed by almost every commodity group in this country. It may have had some supporters among Kansas wheatgrowers, but it did not really go much further than that. And here we have, at the last minute, an attempt to somehow imply that a Democrat in the Senate, in the minority, is

holding up having a farm bill. This is an absolute travesty.

What we face is catastrophe in commodity after commodity, going back to laws that have been on the books for years, but which we have amended essentially in every farm authorization we have enacted. We are going to give, I think probably our only hope, the Secretary of Agriculture the opportunity to run these programs because Congress cannot speak on one of the most fundamental industries that faces disaster here in this country.

Now, what we ought to do is what we have always done, and that is put a farm bill together on a bipartisan basis that can come to the floor, have broad support not only in rural communities, but in urban America where we do for nutrition and for food stamps the right thing, and pass that bill, send it to the President, let it be signed. We will take our budget savings, but we will not create catastrophe in agricultural communities across this country.

The Republicans have failed to manage one of the most important authorizations that comes before this Congress probably every 5 years. They have been unable to put their own majority together, and now they want to throw the blame at somebody else. It is a shameful act.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am just appalled to see what is going on here with the CR, particularly with education, and I do hope that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the majority party will consider the fact that if we do not do something to change the education system in this country, we will be doing more to promote the problems that we already have.

Why should we retreat on education? We have never been fully funded on the State level or in this country for education. Therefore, I think it is criminal to cut these programs such as you have, particularly in areas where there are inner-city children, poor children, disadvantaged children. I would appeal to your sensitivity to human nature.

You have cut title I programs when young students were getting a start in life. You cut Safe and Drug-Free Schools in some of these districts where the drug problem is really, really accelerating instead of decelerating. So you must know them, if you are ever going to have good programs, they must start in schools, they must start with education.

To think that you are going to cut bilingual and immigrant programs when this country has added an influx, particularly in areas such as mine in Florida, the influx of immigrants, they must be educated, and that, I think, you should consider immediately.

The vocational education has been cut. We have so many people who are

jobless in this country. They may not be in your district, but they are in a lot of Members' Districts, particularly those of us who are from urban areas. We need consideration of that.

I see what you are doing where there has been some progress in this country in education programs, and you have cut those programs, and you have labeled them for termination.

Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, you are not listening, but I am saying to you, now is the time to listen up. It may be too late.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time, and I rise only to make two very brief points that I think are very important.

First of all, I did offer a reservation because I was concerned specifically about impacts in the Texas area that were unclear in this very lengthy document that we had seen. But I am rising to support the motion to recommit, even though the first vote of concern is to ensure that this Government never shuts down. It is important that as we stand here, we are also recognizing that we must negotiate. The reason is because, as we look at what is coming out of this CR, we see that there is targeted pain.

Very often I have had the opportunity to talk to experts in education in my district, Alma Allen, for example, and I realize the impact of Federal education dollars. What we are doing here is that we are shutting down education for our States, for many of the dollars that are being cut are impacting programs that are impacted or paid for only by Federal dollars; and that includes our special education, our safe and drug-free schools.

It is important that we vote for the motion to recommit and that we establish that we are going to negotiate and not have this as the final budget for the upcoming year.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I had not expected that there would be a debate on farm policy on this bill today. Let me simply say, as an upper Midwesterner, I think both parties have done a rotten job of dealing with the problems of farmers, certainly dairy farmers in the upper Midwest. I think the existing dairy law has been a joke. I have not voted for farm bills in almost 10 years because they are wildly discriminatory against the region that I represent.

I hope that the new dairy agreement, which has been announced by the Subcommittee on Agriculture, will improve the situation. I remain ready to be convinced and persuaded. I am convinced that the only way we can get a

decent dairy program in this country is if we have a radical reform of the milk marketing order system which plagues this country and should have been abolished a long time ago.

Having said that, I want to make clear that that issue is not involved in this bill. The failure of the Congress to correct that problem is a failure of the Committee on Agriculture; it is not a failure of the gentleman from Louisiana or anyone else on the Committee on Appropriations, because we do not have the authority to deal with that.

I simply want to take the remaining time to discuss the motion to recommit of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. We all want to save dollars, but I think we have a fundamental obligation to, at the same time that we are doing that, do everything we can to try to make the economy grow, and most of all, to try to give working people some greater opportunity than they have had in recent years to raise their own family income by dint of their own hard work.

It is tough out there. You have working families who struggle to pay their bills, who struggle to get a little bit ahead in savings, who struggle to find a way to pay for their kids' education, and through all of life's struggles, I think they understand that education and training is one of the few ways that you can get off the treadmill, that you can make something of yourself and your family through your own hard work.

I think it is a fundamental mistake for this Congress to make things more difficult for those working families. There ought to be a rule which says that if the Congress cannot help somebody on the economic road that they are traveling, that they at least not make things more difficult; and I think Congress does make things more difficult when they do not meet their obligation to strengthen education and training in this country. And that goes for early education, it goes for elementary and secondary, and it goes for higher education.

We have an obligation to help every kid in this country prepare for the economic race that he or she is going to have to run in a very tough world. We have an obligation to help middle-class families find ways to get their kids' college educations and community college and technical school educations, and this bill does not meet that responsibility.

We have to pass this legislation, because if we do not, the Government will once again close down, and that would be an immense tragedy for the people of this country. But I do think it is also necessary to try to improve it. That is what the Bonior amendment, or what the Bonior motion will do in the motion to recommit.

I would urge very strong support for the Bonior motion, which will restore

\$3.1 billion in education funding, and then I would urge that you support this bill so we can meet our basic obligation to govern.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

My friends, the hour is late and this will be the last time I will have a chance to address this bill, because the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], will talk on the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill. If you do, and I suspect the majority will vote for it, it will go to the other body, it will pass, and the President will get it on his desk. He has agreed to the conditions and terms, and he will sign the bill, at least according to my expectations.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriations process for fiscal year 1996 is long overdue. The fact is we have gotten through 7 bills; they have become law. Of the 6 remaining which have not, 3 were voted, 3 are still working their way through the process, and 1 is included here tonight. I think that we could all say we have certainly put enough time into this process.

We have, through lack of agreement or whatever, found that closing the Government was not fun, was not tasteful, and perhaps caused a lot of suffering and hardship for people at an unfortunate time of the calendar year.

□ 1845

We do not want to repeat that experience. That is why I am proud of the committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, in this body and in the other, for finally coming together and working out their differences. There is plenty to complain about in this bill, from the conservative side, from the liberal side, perhaps even in the middle.

The fact of the matter is, the 104th Congress came in here with a mandate. The mandate is to get this country in working order, get this country on a fiscally sound basis, to start putting ourselves on a glidepath toward a balanced budget.

We have worked our way through the entitlements debate. We have not scored so well. Liberals want to spend more, conservatives want to spend less. We have not quite gotten an agreement on the entitlements on the mandatory side of the budget. That is two-thirds of the budget. But on the discretionary side, that discretionary one-third which deals with the cost of running the Government, we have already reaped great savings in the last 13 months. We have saved the American taxpayer \$20 billion in fiscal year 1995 under what was initially appropriated. For fiscal year 1996, we can say with certainty we are going to save them at least \$22 billion and possibly as much as \$30 billion below that same level, de-

pending on our progress with our remaining appropriations action.

We are continuing to make progress. I think today we are making great progress. As I said, we have 6 bills outstanding. One of those bills is included in its entirety, the Foreign Operations bill, the bill chaired by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], who spoke a little while ago. That bill is incorporated in this agreement, which means that this bill, once it has gone through the processes, will be enacted into law and, instead of having 6 bills outstanding, we will have 5.

I want to take this moment to say that that would not have been possible without the valuable services of all of our staff. All of the staff on the Committee on Appropriations have contributed mightily to the progress we have made. It has been the members that have slowed down the process, not the staff. One particular staff member is marking this bill as his last. For 17 years on the Hill, he has worked within the Committee on Appropriations, both on the MILCON and the Foreign Operations bills, worked closely with me and with all the other members. He sits beside the gentleman from Wisconsin. I am talking about Terry Peel. I would ask all of the Members to give Terry Peel an expression of appreciation for his invaluable service.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say that I want to join the gentleman in taking note of Terry's tremendous service to this place. I think Members in both parties who worked with Terry Peel understand that he has really epitomized what the word "service" is all about. He has been of tremendous service to this House. He has been of tremendous service to this country. He has been the "brains" of many of us for years on complicated foreign assistance programs, and he must have an incredible disposition to be able to deal with that bill as long as he has and still smile as regularly as he does and still find the energy to write the plays that he has managed to write the past few years.

I appreciate the time he has taken and I appreciate the time that his wife Ann has allowed him to give us and the country in so doing.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to echo those comments, wish Terry and his wife well in their future endeavors, and I look forward to going to the performances of his plays as well.

Now, my friends, we are coming to the end of the general debate. There have been a few points made about education. The fact of the matter is that some of our friends on the Democrat side emulated what was said about Will Rogers and his relationship to man-

kind. "Will Rogers never saw a man he did not like." The Democrats never saw an education program they did not like. No matter how wasteful, inefficient, redundant, duplicative, or unnecessary, the fact is, they do not want to close any programs, they do not want to end them. They want to create a new program for every idea, every initiative, every whim, every speculation, and, by the way, all the others are great, do not close them, do not merge them, do not try to get any savings or efficiency for the American taxpayer.

I do not know if my colleagues are aware, but there are roughly 256 separate education programs. There are also about 163 job training programs and 47 nutrition programs, et cetera, et cetera.

The U.S. Congress over the last 60 years has done a great deal of good with the American people's money for the American people. The problem is the process has gotten out of kilter. We create so many programs that we run out of good causes. But we do not remember that we are using other people's money. We are taking their money and putting it in a program, creating a bureaucracy, and taking that money and spreading it all over for good causes and getting reelected.

The time has come when the taxpayer is saying enough is enough is enough. After World War II, the average American family paid 5 percent of its income to the Federal Government. Today the average American family pays 25 percent of its income to the Federal Government. If they have their way, it will be 80 percent one of these days, because they do not want to balance the budget, they just want to keep taking the money and spending it.

Now it is time to pare down the bureaucracy. Even the President acknowledges that. In his State of the Union Speech just 2 days ago, he acknowledged that it is time for a smaller Government. In fact, he has suggested to this Congress that we close 36 education programs. They might all have good titles, good names. You can find a lot of constituents for those programs. But when you consider that those constituents are also being served by hundreds of other programs, there is some loss of common sense in the works.

It is time to restore common sense. Now they say that the Labor-Health-Education bill has not worked its way through the process, and it is our fault. We have not adequately funded it. They say we have cut all the programs. The fact is the House of Representatives through the appropriations process passed the Labor-Health bill in late July 1995.

They say it is not being filibustered by the Democrats in the Senate. The fact is I happened to turn on the television to watch the other body, and

say one of the Members stand up and object to the consideration of the Labor-Health bill, the presentation of the bill on the floor of the Senate. That happened. Whether that is a filibuster or not, the bill was not presented, it was not debated, it was not argued, it did not occur, it did not pass.

As we all know about the legislative process, if it does not pass one body, they cannot go to conference. If we cannot go to conference, we cannot present the bill to the President. If they cannot present the bill to the President, he cannot sign it or veto it. So the process is stuck.

What are we doing here? We are simply passing a Balanced Budget Downpayment Act for this month, between now and March 15, to keep most of these programs going. That seems logical. Keep them going so that the Government does not close down, and at the same time let us not spend excessively.

We trim them to about 75 percent of funding. We acknowledge that some people should be furloughed or RIF'd where there is not going to be full funding over the year. And we simply tell the American taxpayer we are making a dent; we are not solving all the problems, but we are making a dent on your behalf.

The people that really need service will get service, but perhaps we will begin to cut back on this unnecessary and wasteful bureaucracy just a little bit between now and March 15, until the regular process can work its way through the system and the Labor-Health bill can be passed and the President can sign his name on it.

I hope that happens. But, in the meantime, I think it is very, very important to pass this bill. Let us quit wasting the taxpayers' money, but let us also quit wasting time debating year fiscal year 1996, because, my friends, within days we are going to be debating fiscal year 1997 and the process is going to start all over again.

So I urge my friends, vote for the bill; vote against the motion to recommit. Let us keep the Government open, let us send this to the Senate, let the Senate send it to the President, and we can go home and have a couple of days off.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2880, a continuing resolution for fiscal year 1996. I join my ranking member for the full appropriations subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] in commending our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working so diligently to bring this much improve measure before us tonight.

While I am glad to see that progress appears to be occurring with respect to a final budget agreement and the remaining appropriations bills, I am certain that no one is more delighted with any progress than the hard-working Government employees, their families, and the millions of individuals and families whose lives have been held hostage over the

last few months since we have been unable to resolve these pressing matters.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies, I have been among the most ardent opponents of the many reductions to critical programs under the subcommittee's jurisdiction, as well as the numerous and harmful riders that were included in the measure. The measure before us does not address all of the areas for which I have concern. It does, however, allow the Federal Government to continue to meet important obligations to our Nation's veterans, to safeguard our environment, provide aid to the homeless, assist families and individuals in purchasing homes, and further our scientific and technological endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is by no means perfect and still requires some major fine tuning. Furthermore, we must not forget that we have to extend the debt ceiling limit to restore financial stability of our Nation's financial markets. Nonetheless, we must do the right thing for this Nation and pass this continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. BONIOR.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, in its present form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BONIOR moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back forthwith with an amendment as follows:

At the end of Title I of the bill insert the following new section:

"RESTORATION FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS
"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act except sections 106, 115, 119 and 120, projects and activities of the Department of Education shall be continued at a rate of operations at the current rate, and under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for the fiscal year 1995. Provided, That section 111 of this title shall not apply to this section notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER, pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR.] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion to recommit.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, this is the ninth stopgap measure that we have had on this floor since that fiscal year began. Let us be clear what this motion to recommit is. It is one of the biggest education votes that you will have in this Congress. Do we make our kids' education a priority, or do we cut it? That is what this vote is all about.

The Republicans have presented us with a resolution that makes deep cuts. It cuts Safe and Drug Free Schools by 25 percent. That is the DARE program. That is the one we all go home and praise to the high heavens. It cuts the School-to-Work Program by 18 percent. That is the new program we adopted to take care of the 70 percent of our kids who do not graduate from college, modeled after the successful program they have in Germany. It cuts title I funding by more than \$1 billion over the year, if you prorated this out over the year per this request. It kicks over 1 million kids off math and reading. It cuts teacher training for special education by 25 percent.

If we go down this road, as my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE] pointed out, this is going to cost about \$3.1 billion. That will be the biggest cut in education in the history of this country. Its effect will be devastating. This is shortsighted. It is a strategy already being felt in communities all over this country.

Now is the time for teacher contracts to be signed, but communities cannot do that because the funding is uncertain. Now is the time for cities to submit their school budget, but they cannot do that because they do not have any numbers to work with.

Now is the time for colleges to award financial aid, but they cannot do that because they have not been told how much they are going to have to offer, and, because of it, families and students all over America are being hung out to dry.

These are the people who work hard, who play by the rules, who pay their bills, and they want a better life for their kids. They want their kids to have some opportunity. We should be standing up for them today. We should not be standing in their way.

Mr. Speaker, the motion to recommit that we offer today will protect our children's education. It will restore funds for School-to-Work, it will restore funds for Safe and Drug Free Schools, the DARE Program. It will restore funds for the Perkins loans, it will restore funds for math and science training, it will restore funds for impact aid and for title I and other things as well. Without this amendment, we will be placing an extra burden on local communities, local schools, and, I might dare say, on local property taxes.

So let me just conclude, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that we should not be cutting education. Republicans could not cut education through the front door, and we should not let them cut it through the back door. This is one of the most important education votes that we will cast in this Congress. I urge my colleagues, vote "yes" on the motion to recommit, and give our kids an opportunity they deserve.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, who has been a stalwart on this issue for many years.

□ 1900

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, education has always had friends on the Republican side of the aisle, and they realize that elementary and secondary education is forward-funded, that this resolution provides money for the school year beginning this coming September.

If this resolution is extended for the rest of the year, there will be a \$3.1 billion cut in education, the largest cut ever. Schools right now, or very soon, will be writing their budgets. They have to know how much money will be available or teachers will be pink-slipped. Programs will be cut.

I ask my friends on that side of the aisle, many of them sitting right there who have been good friends of education, we have worked together in the vineyard of education, I ask my colleagues to set aside partisanship. We have the opportunity to restore those funds to give the school districts some certainty as to their funding.

Please set aside the partisanship. Mr. GINGRICH, Professor GINGRICH, will not punish you for supporting education. Please vote for this motion to recommit.

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

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I respect the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE]. We are on the same committee. I would say, of the 256 educational programs we have, we cannot fund all the programs that really work adequately. Where do we get this free money? We take it from the people that we supposedly send it back to, but we only give it back to them at 23 cents on the dollar after we feed the Federal bureaucracy, and when we do that it is inefficient.

Mr. Speaker, 93 percent of education is funded at the State and local level. We only funded 7 percent of it, but yet take a look. That 7 percent has over 50 percent of the rules and regulations that a State has to follow and over 75 percent of the paperwork. It is not efficient. So what we are doing is reducing it slowly.

I agree we can just chop it off. Because of the economy, we cannot put it all back at the State. You cannot fund a school bond or election for education.

But we have to reduce the waste and the spending. What did we cut? Yes, ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO] on the Committee on the Budget. The President's Direct Lending Program capped at 10 percent cost a

billion dollars more just in administrative fees. So what did we cut? We cut the precious bureaucracy and cut that out.

We took the savings and increased student loans by 50 percent, increased Pell grants the highest they have been, and increased and level-funded the IDEA Program that my colleagues are talking about in special education. It is level-funded. It is not reduced.

And what else? We took the Goals 2000 that has 45 instances that say "States will," and we take that money and we give it back to the States where they are not required to have boards and commissions that report to a Federal bureaucracy here in Washington, DC. We turn that money and give it direct so we can get 77 cents on the dollar into the classroom, not just 23 cents. We need to be more businesslike in our education funding.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services and Education.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, 5 cents out of every \$1 spent on education is spent by the Federal Government. Reductions in Federal education spending in this House bill, H.R. 2127, amount to less than 1 percent of the total money spent on primary and secondary education in the United States.

The sky is not falling. There is no hostility to the Federal role in education. What we intend to do is to spend the money better and get better results for America's children.

Let me quote Alice Rivlin in her 1992 book, "Reviving the American Dream." She says, "Presidential speeches and photo opportunities, national testing and assessments, federally funded experimental schools, even new grants spent in accordance with Federal guidelines can only make marginal contributions to fixing the schools."

What we are attempting to do is to get control over 256 separate programs that even officials in the Department of Education will say are out of control and require huge overhead to administer. These funds do not go to kids, but to directors and staffs in Washington that do nothing to improve education.

Let me talk for a moment about title I. Title I evaluations say they do not appear to be helping close the learning gap. The money is spread, Mr. Speaker, all over our country. The money goes to schools that do not need it. What we need to do with title I is to target the money to the schools with large numbers of disadvantaged children so that we get better results for kids that are most at risk. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program suffers from the same problem. Funding goes everywhere instead of to the schools that most need it. It has never had a national evaluation.

Goals 2000 is really an attempt to use Federal dollars to encourage States to do what they are already doing; and that is, setting up high standards that have to be met by students and teachers alike. We do not need Federal bribery to get that job done.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this motion, with the exception of only two programs, Vocational Rehabilitation and Impact Aid, has no impact whatsoever. Most education programs are forward-funded and the funds allegedly provided in this motion will not be obligated during the continuing resolution period.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the Members to vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Bonior motion to recommit.

I do so on behalf of education. We cannot be a party to causing the State and local turmoil that will ensue—including the issuing of pink slips to teachers across this Nation—if we cut \$3.1 billion out of education—the biggest cut in our history.

Schools must by law send layoff notices to teachers by March or April of the year prior to the next academic year—in this case the 1996–97 school year.

The impact on college students will be no less harmful.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this recomittal motion and save education for children of all ages.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit.

It is the height of irresponsibility for Republicans to hold education programs hostage to their plot to extract radical concessions through budget negotiations.

Governing and politics are about give and take and good faith. Republicans need a lesson in both.

Their failure to support a simple continuing resolution that funds education programs at fiscal year 1995 levels is creating serious problems for schools, teachers and children who have absolutely nothing to do with the budget fight. They are the innocent victims of a drive-by shooting. In this case, it is hard to tell who is driving this car. Is it the Speaker or the 73 Republican freshmen or the Christian coalition?

The devastating cut in title I funding will deny 1.1 million needy children the crucial help they need in reading, writing, math, and critical thinking. Drug abuse and violence prevention programs will be cut for millions of students in nearly every school district in the country. Innovative school to work strategies developed at the local level will be halted. Teachers will be fired, classroom sizes will increase.

With this continuing resolution, the Republicans are turning their backs on public education. Cuts in education are further proof that the Republican Party has not only lost its heart and soul, but has also lost its mind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 222, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

AYES—193

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Oberstar
Ackerman	Gordon	Obey
Andrews	Green	Oliver
Baessler	Gutierrez	Ortiz
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Orton
Barrett (WI)	Hall (TX)	Owens
Becerra	Hamilton	Pallone
Beilenson	Harman	Pastor
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Payne (NJ)
Berman	Hefner	Payne (VA)
Bevill	Heineman	Pelosi
Bishop	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Bonior	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Borski	Holden	Pickett
Boucher	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Browder	Jackson (IL)	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Richardson
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Clay	Johnston	Roemer
Clayton	Kanjorski	Rose
Clement	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Coleman	Kennedy (MA)	Rush
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (RI)	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Sanders
Condit	Kildee	Sawyer
Conyers	Klecza	Schroeder
Costello	Klink	Schumer
Coyne	LaFalce	Scott
Cramer	Lantos	Sisisky
Danner	Leach	Skaggs
de la Garza	Levin	Skelton
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Lincoln	Spratt
Dellums	Lipinski	Stark
Deutsch	Lofgren	Stenholm
Dicks	Lowey	Stokes
Dingell	Luther	Studds
Dixon	Maloney	Stupak
Doggett	Manton	Tanner
Dooley	Markey	Taylor (MS)
Doyle	Martinez	Tejeda
Durbin	Mascara	Thompson
Edwards	Matsui	Thornton
Engel	McCarthy	Thurman
Eshoo	McDermott	Torkildsen
Evans	McHale	Torres
Farr	McKinney	Torricelli
Fattah	McNulty	Towns
Fazio	Meehan	Trafcant
Fields (LA)	Meek	Velazquez
Filmer	Menendez	Vento
Flake	Mfume	Visclosky
Foglietta	Miller (CA)	Volkmer
Ford	Minge	Ward
Frank (MA)	Mink	Watt (NC)
Franks (CT)	Moakley	Williams
Frost	Mollohan	Wilson
Furse	Montgomery	Wise
Gejdenson	Moran	Woolsey
Gephardt	Murtha	Wynn
Geren	Nadler	Yates
Gibbons	Neal	

NOES—222

Allard	Barrett (NE)	Bliley
Archer	Bartlett	Blute
Armey	Bass	Boehert
Bachus	Bateman	Boehner
Baker (CA)	Bereuter	Bonilla
Ballenger	Bilbray	Bono
Barr	Blirakis	Brownback

Bryant (TN)	Greenwood	Oxley
Bunn	Gunderson	Packard
Bunning	Gutknecht	Parker
Burr	Hansen	Paxon
Burton	Hastert	Petri
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	Pombo
Callahan	Hayworth	Porter
Calvert	Hefley	Portman
Camp	Herger	Pryce
Campbell	Hillery	Quillen
Canady	Hobson	Quinn
Castle	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Chabot	Hoke	Ramstad
Chambliss	Horn	Regula
Chenoweth	Hostettler	Riggs
Christensen	Houghton	Roberts
Chrysler	Hunter	Rogers
Clinger	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Coble	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Coburn	Inglis	Roth
Collins (GA)	Istook	Roukema
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Royce
Cooley	Johnson, Sam	Salmon
Cox	Jones	Sanford
Crane	Kasich	Saxton
Crapo	Kelly	Scarborough
Creameans	Kim	Schaefer
Cubin	King	Schiff
Cunningham	Kingston	Seastrand
Davis	Klug	Sensenbrenner
Deal	Knollenberg	Shadegg
DeLay	Kolbe	Shaw
Diaz-Balart	LaHood	Shays
Dickey	Largent	Shuster
Doolittle	Latham	Skeen
Dornan	LaTourette	Smith (MI)
Dreier	Laughlin	Smith (NJ)
Duncan	Lazio	Smith (WA)
Dunn	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Ehlers	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Ehrlich	Lightfoot	Spence
Emerson	Livingston	Stearns
English	LoBiondo	Stockman
Ensign	Longley	Stump
Everett	Lucas	Talent
Ewing	Manzullo	Tate
Fawell	Martini	Tauzin
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Thomas
Flanagan	McCrery	Thornberry
Foley	McDade	Tiahrt
Forbes	McHugh	Upton
Fowler	McInnis	Vucanovich
Fox	McIntosh	Waldholtz
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Metcalf	Walsh
Frisa	Meyers	Wamp
Funderburk	Mica	Watts (OK)
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Weldon (FL)
Ganske	Mollinari	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Moorhead	Weller
Gilchrest	Morella	White
Gillmor	Myrick	Whitfield
Gilman	Nethercutt	Wicker
Goodlatte	Nanner	Wolf
Goodling	Ney	Young (FL)
Goss	Norwood	Zeliff
Graham	Nussle	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—18

Baker (LA)	Hancock	Smith (TX)
Barcia	Hayes	Taylor (NC)
Barton	Johnson, E. B.	Waters
Brewster	Linder	Waxman
Chapman	Myers	Wyden
Clyburn	Serrano	Young (AK)

□ 1925

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Waxman for, with Mr. Linder against. Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. KING, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. McDADE changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DOOLEY, BERMAN, and RUSH changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 371, noes 42, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

AYES—371

Abercrombie	Davis	Hefner
Ackerman	de la Garza	Heineman
Allard	Deal	Herger
Andrews	DeLauro	Hillery
Archer	DeLay	Hobson
Armey	Deutsch	Hoekstra
Bachus	Diaz-Balart	Hoke
Baessler	Dickey	Holden
Baker (CA)	Dicks	Horn
Baldacci	Dingell	Hostettler
Ballenger	Dixon	Houghton
Barr	Doggett	Hoyer
Barrett (NE)	Dooley	Hunter
Barrett (WI)	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bartlett	Dornan	Hyde
Bass	Doyle	Inglis
Bateman	Dreier	Istook
Beilenson	Duncan	Jackson (IL)
Bentsen	Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Bereuter	Durbin	(TX)
Berman	Edwards	Jacobs
Bevill	Ehlers	Johnson (CT)
Bilbray	Ehrlich	Johnson (SD)
Blirakis	Emerson	Johnson, Sam
Bishop	Engel	Johnston
Bliley	English	Jones
Blute	Ensign	Kaptur
Boehert	Eshoo	Kasich
Boehner	Evans	Kelly
Bonilla	Everett	Kennedy (RI)
Bono	Ewing	Kennelly
Borski	Farr	Kildee
Boucher	Fawell	Kim
Browder	Fazio	King
Brown (CA)	Fields (TX)	Kingston
Brown (FL)	Flanagan	Klecza
Brown (OH)	Foley	Klug
Brownback	Forbes	Knollenberg
Bryant (TN)	Ford	Kolbe
Bunn	Fowler	LaFalce
Bunning	Fox	LaHood
Burr	Franks (CT)	Lantos
Burton	Franks (NJ)	Largent
Buyer	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Callahan	Frisa	Laughlin
Calvert	Frost	Lazio
Camp	Funderburk	Leach
Campbell	Furse	Levin
Canady	Gallegly	Lewis (CA)
Cardin	Ganske	Lewis (GA)
Castle	Gejdenson	Lewis (KY)
Chabot	Gekas	Lightfoot
Chambliss	Gephardt	Lincoln
Chenoweth	Geren	Lipinski
Christensen	Gilchrest	Livingston
Chrysler	Gillmor	LoBiondo
Clayton	Gilman	Longley
Clement	Gonzalez	Lowe
Clinger	Goodlatte	Lucas
Coble	Goodling	Luther
Coburn	Gordon	Manton
Coleman	Goss	Manzullo
Collins (GA)	Graham	Markey
Collins (IL)	Greenwood	Martini
Collins (MI)	Gunderson	Mascara
Cooley	Gutknecht	Matsui
Costello	Hall (OH)	McCarthy
Cox	Hall (TX)	McCollum
Cramer	Hamilton	McCrery
Crane	Hansen	McDade
Crapo	Harman	McHale
Creameans	Hastert	McHugh
Cubin	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh
Cunningham	Hayworth	McIntosh
Danner	Hefley	McKeon

McKinney	Quinn	Stockman
McNulty	Radanovich	Stokes
Meehan	Ramstad	Studds
Menendez	Reed	Stump
Metcalfe	Regula	Stupak
Meyers	Richardson	Talent
Mica	Riggs	Tanner
Miller (CA)	Rivers	Tate
Miller (FL)	Roberts	Tauzin
Minge	Roemer	Taylor (MS)
Mink	Rogers	Tejeda
Molinari	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Mollohan	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson
Montgomery	Rose	Thornberry
Moorhead	Roth	Thornton
Moran	Roukema	Thurman
Morella	Roybal-Allard	Tiahrt
Murtha	Royce	Torkildsen
Myrick	Rush	Torres
Nadler	Sabo	Torricelli
Neal	Salmon	Towns
Nethercutt	Sanford	Trafficant
Neumann	Sawyer	Upton
Ney	Saxton	Vento
Norwood	Scarborough	Visclosky
Nussle	Schaefer	Volkmer
Oberstar	Schiff	Vucanovich
Obey	Schumer	Waldholtz
Oliver	Scott	Walker
Ortiz	Seastrand	Walsh
Orton	Sensenbrenner	Wamp
Oxley	Shadegg	Ward
Packard	Shaw	Watts (OK)
Pallone	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Parker	Shuster	Weldon (PA)
Faxon	Sisisky	Weller
Payne (VA)	Skaggs	White
Pelosi	Skeen	Whitfield
Peterson (FL)	Skelton	Wicker
Peterson (MN)	Slaughter	Williams
Petri	Smith (MD)	Wilson
Pickett	Smith (NJ)	Wise
Pombo	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Pomeroy	Solomon	Woolsey
Porter	Souder	Wynn
Portman	Spence	Yates
Poshard	Spratt	Young (FL)
Pryce	Stearns	Zeliff
Quillen	Stenholm	Zimmer

NOES—42

Beocerra	Foglietta	Martinez
Bonior	Gibbons	McDermott
Bryant (TX)	Green	Meek
Clay	Gutierrez	Mfume
Combest	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Condit	Hilliard	Pastor
Conyers	Hinche	Payne (NJ)
Coyne	Jefferson	Rahall
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Rangel
Dellums	Kennedy (MA)	Sanders
Fattah	Klink	Schroeder
Fields (LA)	Latham	Stark
Filner	Lofgren	Velazquez
Flake	Maloney	Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—20

Baker (LA)	Hancock	Smith (TX)
Barcia	Hayes	Taylor (NC)
Barton	Johnson, E. B.	Waters
Brewster	Linder	Waxman
Chapman	Moakley	Wyden
Clyburn	Myers	Young (AK)
Frank (MA)	Serrano	

□ 1941

So the bill was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained, due to pressing personal business during both votes on Thursday, January 25, 1996.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on House Resolution 342, "yes" on the motion to recommit on H.R. 2880, the short-

term continuing resolution, and "yes" on final passage of H.R. 2880.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the distinguished majority leader of the schedule for today and the remainder of the week and next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this last vote marks the end of the legislative business for the week. Members are now free to return to their families and their districts. Next week the House will not be in session on Monday, January 29.

On Tuesday, January 30, there is a possibility of a suspension day. Several items are under consideration, although none have been finalized at this time. Of course, we will consult with the minority and keep Members apprised of any additions to the schedule. Members should be advised, however, that there will be no recorded votes on Tuesday. In fact, we do not expect any recorded votes before Wednesday at 12 o'clock noon.

On Wednesday there is a possibility that we will act on emergency legislation to fund certain farm programs. Because of the President's veto of the Balanced Budget Act which contained farm program funding and reforms, there is a great deal of uncertainty in farm country that need to be addressed. We are working with Members on both sides of the aisle and will continue to do so as this legislation develops.

On Thursday, February 1, there will be a joint meeting of Congress at 11:45 a.m. to receive the President of France. After the joint session, we anticipate bringing to the floor for consideration the President's most recent complete budget submission.

We also plan to consider a sense-of-the-House resolution regarding Medicare, Medigra, and welfare reform, directing the Committee on the Budget to report on a resolution regarding funding levels and policy priorities for these programs. We hope to have Members on their way home by a reasonable hour on Thursday evening.

We will then begin a 3-week district work period, and reconvene the House on Monday, February 26.

Mr. Speaker, I have just one more comment.

□ 1945

This one to my esteemed colleagues from Pennsylvania. I will see you next week with a smile on my face after our

beloved Dallas Cowboys win the Super Bowl.

Mr. BONIOR. I would say to my friend from Texas that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, Mr. KASICH, is a fanatical Steelers fan, as you probably know. I was just wondering if your differences with respect to this football game are the reason why he would prefer that we go ahead with a clean debt ceiling bill, and you have expressed contrary views this past week.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, I have discussed this with Mr. KASICH, and as much as he loves the Steelers, he has not been prepared to bet the budget on it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and my suggestion would be that when you have all of your Dallas fans watching that game on Sunday, thank God they are not playing the Washington Redskins.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, we have 26 teams in the NFL; I am sure we could keep this up for a while.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to discuss, if the gentleman from Texas would be so kind to do so, the statement in here about the farm bill and emergency legislation. What emergency legislation would that be?

I am on the Committee on Agriculture, and I would like to know what we are going to be faced with.

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the inquiry of the gentleman, and I would refer the gentleman to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. As the gentleman from Missouri has pointed out on many occasions, I am not personally an expert on farm policy.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, you have done enough to agriculture programs in your time.

Mr. ARMEY. Pursuant to the recommendations of the gentleman, I have chosen to try as much as possible to leave this work in the hands of the committee. I know the committee and the members of the committee are very concerned.

They are working on it; they are working with Members of the other body, and the details of their work, I am sure, are something that the gentleman can better determine from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, there is a great deal of uncertainty out there among all of the farmers. We have not done a farm bill. There was a welfare bill for big farmers put in the so-called Debt Ceiling Reduction Act that the President vetoed. It is my understanding

that that bill, which the President said was one of the reasons he vetoed the provision on agriculture, one of the reasons he vetoed the bill, is going to be basically the same bill, so I have been told, that the Members want to take up in the Committee on Agriculture; and if that is the case, I do not know why we are doing it, because it will be vetoed again.

Now, I just do not understand why we continue to do legislation down here that is not going anywhere.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield, again let me refer the gentleman from Missouri to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. If in fact you want to have a debate on farm policy or you prefer to have a debate on welfare programs, I think you would better enjoy that debate in the Committee on Agriculture, and I would refer you to that committee.

Mr. VOLKMER. Well, I object strongly that you blame the President for something that needs to be solved right here in this body and with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and with the Committee on Agriculture in the Senate, because that is where the work has not been done, not with the President.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, one other comment to my friend from Texas concerning the concerns that Secretary Rubin has with regard to the possibility of a default by the 1st of March: For 220 years this government has paid its bills, and there is deep concern that our credit rating will in fact be destroyed.

Just yesterday, as the gentleman from Texas knows, Moody's announced they may lower America's credit rating, and of course the impact that will have on homeowners, on mortgage interest rates, on student loans and on automobile loans could be devastating to your constituents and mine. I am just wondering when we will be able to see a clean debt ceiling bill come to the floor of this House.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield further, I thank the gentleman for the question. I do know that the President and the Speaker have discussed this issue by phone and we will continue to work with the White House to determine the time frame for the debt limit extension.

It is also my belief that we can reach an agreement on a suitable downpayment for the balanced budget at that time.

As the gentleman will recall, the President was presented with a debt ceiling extension in November which he vetoed pursuant to the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury assured the President that he could manage affairs without that debt ceiling extension that the President vetoed at that time, and the Secretary of the Treasury has assured us that he can continue to do

so until March 1. In the meantime, we are talking with the White House about the conditions under which we can send forward a debt ceiling increase that also is accompanied by a suitable downpayment on the balanced budget.

Mr. BONIOR. I just wish to advise my friend from Texas and his esteemed colleague on the other side of the aisle that we have filed a discharge petition, and we have Members who have signed it, to bring a clean debt ceiling to this floor. We invite responsible Members of the other side of the aisle who want to make sure that this does not happen to this country, that our credit rating is not besmirched, to join us so that we can bring this bill to the floor and we can get on with the business of this country without the threat hanging over our head that now looms there.

I thank my colleague.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority whip, permitting me to inquire of the distinguished majority leader.

Next Thursday, February 1, is the occasion of the annual National Prayer Breakfast, and traditionally we are accommodated so that we do not have votes in the House before, say, 10:30 or 11 o'clock, because most Members like to participate in this event, which is held off the Hill.

After inquiring of the distinguished majority leader's staff, I am advised that you have allocated for that in the schedule, and I just wanted to confirm that.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We are scheduling no votes before, probably, 12 o'clock on Thursday morning, and I guess I could encourage, and I am sure the gentleman would agree, that it is a wonderful opportunity for all of us to share that time together at the National Prayer Breakfast on Thursday morning. The schedule will surely accommodate that.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at noon tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 343) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 343

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and he is hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. Hayes of Louisiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 344) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 344

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

To the Committee on Ways and Means: Michael McNulty of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a Member of the Committee on International Relations:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
New York, January 24, 1996.

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby resign my position as a member of the House International Relations Committee (HIRC) effective upon ratification by the full House of my membership on the House Ways and Means Committee.

While I look forward to returning to my assignment on Ways and Means, I wish to thank Chairman Gilman, Ranking Member Hamilton, and all the HIRC members for the many courtesies extended to me during my service on that panel.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL R. MCNULTY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENDING AUTHORITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS RELATING TO DELIVERY OF HEALTH AND MEDICAL CARE

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2353) to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities of the Department of Veterans Affairs relating to delivery of health and medical care, and for other purposes, with

Senate amendments thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendments with amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE PRIORITY HEALTH CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS EXPOSED TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES.**—(1) Effective June 29, 1995, section 1710(e)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "after June 30, 1995," and all that follows through "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1996".

(2) Section 1712(a)(1)(D) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995," and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1996".

(b) **DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE AND DEPENDENCE.**—Section 1720A(e) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(c) **PILOT PROGRAM FOR NONINSTITUTIONAL ALTERNATIVES TO NURSING HOME CARE.**—Section 1720C(a) of such title is amended by striking out "September 30, 1995," and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(d) **NEGOTIATED INTEREST RATES.**—Section 3703(c)(4)(D) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(e) **MORTGAGES FOR ENERGY EFFICIENT IMPROVEMENTS.**—Section 3710(d)(7) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(f) **ENHANCED LOAN ASSET SALE AUTHORITY.**—Section 3720(h)(2) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1996".

(g) **AUTHORITY OF LENDERS OF AUTOMATICALLY GUARANTEED LOANS TO REVIEW APPRAISALS.**—Section 3731(f)(3) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(h) **AGREEMENTS FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 3735(c) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(i) **USE OF DATA ON COMPENSATION FOR CERTIFIED REGISTERED NURSE ANESTHETISTS.**—Effective March 31, 1995, section 7451(d)(3)(C)(iii) of such title is amended by striking out "April 1, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(j) **HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.**—Section 7618 of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(k) **ENHANCED-USE LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY.**—Section 8169 of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(l) **AUTHORITY FOR COMMUNITY-BASED RESIDENTIAL CARE FOR HOMELESS CHRONICALLY MENTALLY ILL VETERANS AND OTHER VETERANS.**—Section 115(d) of the Veterans' Benefits and Services Act of 1988 (38 U.S.C. 1712 note) is amended by striking out "September 30, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(m) **DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM OF COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY.**—Section 7(a) of

Public Law 102-54 (38 U.S.C. 1718 note) is amended by striking out "fiscal years 1991 through 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on December 31, 1997".

(n) **AUTHORITY TO MAKE GRANTS FOR ASSISTANCE IN FURNISHING SERVICES AND ASSISTANCE TO HOMELESS VETERANS.**—(1) Section 3(a) of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Service Programs Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-590; 106 Stat. 5136; 38 U.S.C. 7721 note) is amended by striking out "fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995," and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal years 1993 through 1997".

(2) Section 12 of such Act (106 Stat. 5142) is amended by striking out "each of the fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of fiscal years 1993 through 1997".

(o) **HOMELESS VETERANS' REINTEGRATION PROJECTS.**—(1) Section 738(e)(1) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11448(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996";

"(E) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1997".

(2) Section 741 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 11450) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "October 1, 1997".

(p) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as provided in subsections (a)(1) and (i), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on October 1, 1995.

(q) **RATIFICATION OF ACTIONS.**—The following actions are hereby ratified:

(1) The furnishing by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of care and services by virtue of section 1710(a)(1)(G) of title 38, United States Code, during the period beginning on July 1, 1995, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The furnishing by the Secretary of services in noninstitutional settings by virtue of section 1720C of such title during the period beginning on October 1, 1995, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) The use by any director of a Department of Veterans Affairs health-care facility of data on rates of compensation paid to certified nurse anesthetists in a labor market area under section 7451(d)(3)(C) of such title during the period beginning on April 1, 1995, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(4) The furnishing by the Secretary of care for homeless chronically mentally ill and other veterans by virtue of section 115 of the Veterans' Benefits and Services Act of 1988 (38 U.S.C. 1712 note) during the period beginning on October 1, 1995, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(5) The furnishing by the Secretary of work therapy and therapeutic transitional housing by virtue of section 7 of Public Law 102-54 (38 U.S.C. 1718 note) during the period beginning on October 1, 1995, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(6) Grants made by the Secretary to furnish services to veterans under section 3 of the Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Services Programs Act of 1992 (38 U.S.C. 7721 note) during the period beginning on October 1, 1995, and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

House amendments to the Senate amendments:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment to the text of the bill, insert the following:

TITLE I—EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY
SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES UNDER TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) **AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE PRIORITY HEALTH CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS EX-**

POSED TO TOXIC SUBSTANCES.—(1) Section 1710(e)(3) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "after June 30, 1995," and all that follows through "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "after December 31, 1996".

(2) Section 1712(a)(1)(D) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995," and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1996".

(b) **DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE AND DEPENDENCE.**—Section 1720A(e) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(c) **PILOT PROGRAM FOR NONINSTITUTIONAL ALTERNATIVES TO NURSING HOME CARE.**—Section 1720C(a) of such title is amended by striking out "September 30, 1995," and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(d) **NEGOTIATED INTEREST RATES.**—Section 3703(c)(4) of such title is amended by striking out subparagraph (D).

(e) **MORTGAGES FOR ENERGY EFFICIENT IMPROVEMENTS.**—Section 3710(d) of such title is amended by striking out paragraph (7).

(f) **ENHANCED LOAN ASSET SALE AUTHORITY.**—Section 3720(h)(2) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1996".

(g) **AUTHORITY OF LENDERS OF AUTOMATICALLY GUARANTEED LOANS TO REVIEW APPRAISALS.**—Section 3731(f) of such title is amended by striking out paragraph (3).

(h) **AGREEMENTS FOR HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS VETERANS.**—Section 3735(c) of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(i) **USE OF DATA ON COMPENSATION FOR CERTIFIED REGISTERED NURSE ANESTHETISTS.**—Section 7451(d)(3)(C)(iii) of such title is amended by striking out "April 1, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1996".

(j) **HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.**—Section 7618 of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(k) **ENHANCED-USE LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY.**—Section 8169 of such title is amended by striking out "December 31, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITIES UNDER OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.

(a) **AUTHORITY FOR COMMUNITY-BASED RESIDENTIAL CARE FOR HOMELESS CHRONICALLY MENTALLY ILL VETERANS AND OTHER VETERANS.**—Section 115(d) of the Veterans' Benefits and Services Act of 1988 (38 U.S.C. 1712 note) is amended by striking out "September 30, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

(b) **DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM OF COMPENSATED WORK THERAPY.**—Section 7(a) of Public Law 102-54 (38 U.S.C. 1718 note) is amended by striking out "fiscal years 1991 through 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "the period beginning on October 1, 1991, and ending on December 31, 1997".

(c) **SERVICES AND ASSISTANCE TO HOMELESS VETERANS.**—The Homeless Veterans Comprehensive Service Programs Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-590; 38 U.S.C. 7721 note) is amended—

(1) in section 2, by striking out "September 30, 1995," and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1997";

(2) in section 3(a)—

(A) by inserting "(1)" before "Subject to";

(B) by striking out "fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995,"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The authority of the Secretary to make grants under this section expires on September 30, 1997." and

(3) in section 12, by striking out "each of the fiscal years 1993, 1994, and 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "each of fiscal years 1993 through 1997".

(d) HOMELESS VETERANS' REINTEGRATION PROJECTS.—(1) Section 738(e)(1) of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11448(e)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(D) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 1996."

(2) Section 741 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 11450) is amended by striking out "October 1, 1995" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1997".

SEC. 103. RATIFICATION OF ACTIONS TAKEN DURING PERIOD OF EXPIRED AUTHORITY.

Any action taken by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs before the date of the enactment of this Act under a provision of law amended by this title was taken during the period beginning on the date on which the authority of the Secretary under that provision of law expired and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be considered to have the same force and effect as if the amendment to that provision of law made by this title had been in effect at the time of that action.

TITLE II—OTHER PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. CODIFICATION OF HOUSING REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND CHANGES IN THEIR FREQUENCY.

(a) CODIFICATION OF HOUSING RELATED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 3735 the following new section:

"§ 3736. Reporting requirements

"The annual report required by section 529 of this title shall include a discussion of the activities under this chapter. Beginning with the report submitted at the close of fiscal year 1996, and every second year thereafter, this discussion shall include information regarding the following:

"(1) Loans made to veterans whose only qualifying service was in the Selected Reserve.

"(2) Interest rates and discount points which were negotiated between the lender and the veteran pursuant to section 3703(c)(4)(A)(i) of this title.

"(3) The determination of reasonable value by lenders pursuant to section 3731(f) of this title.

"(4) Loans that include funds for energy efficiency improvements pursuant to section 3710(a)(10) of this title.

"(5) Direct loans to Native American veterans made pursuant to subchapter V of this chapter."

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3735 the following new item:

"3736. Reporting requirements."

(b) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The Veterans Home Loan Program Amendments of 1992 (Public Law 102-547; 106 Stat. 3633) is amended by striking out sections 2(c), 3(b), 8(d), 9(c), and 10(b).

SEC. 202. OTHER REPORT REQUIREMENTS.

(a) REPORT ON CONSOLIDATION OF CERTAIN PROGRAMS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to Congress, not later than March 1, 1997, a report on the advantages and disadvantages of consolidating into one program the following three programs:

(1) The alcohol and drug abuse contract care program under section 1720A of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The program to provide community-based residential care to homeless chronically mentally ill veterans under section 115 of the Veterans' Benefits and Services Act of 1988 (38 U.S.C. 1712 note).

(3) The demonstration program under section 7 of Public Law 102-54 (38 U.S.C. 1718 note).

(b) HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than March 31, 1997, a report setting forth the results of a study evaluating the operation of the health professional scholarship program under subchapter II of chapter 76 of title 38, United States Code. The study shall evaluate the efficacy of the program with respect to recruitment and retention of health care personnel for the Department of Veterans Affairs and shall compare the costs and benefits of the program with the costs and benefits of alternative methods of ensuring adequate recruitment and retention of such personnel.

(2) The Secretary shall carry out the study under this paragraph through a private contractor. The report under paragraph (1) shall include the report of the contractor and the comments, if any, of the Secretary on that report.

(c) ENHANCED USE LEASES.—The Secretary shall submit to Congress, not later than March 31, 1997, a report evaluating the operation of the program under subchapter V of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 203. CONTRACTS FOR UTILITIES, AUDIE L. MURPHY MEMORIAL HOSPITAL.

(a) AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into contracts for the provision of utilities (including steam and chilled water) to the Audie L. Murphy Memorial Hospital in San Antonio, Texas. Each such contract may—

(1) be for a period not to exceed 35 years;

(2) provide for the construction and operation of a production facility on or near property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary;

(3) require capital contributions by the parties involved for the construction of such a facility, such contribution to be in the form of cash, equipment, or other in-kind contribution; and

(4) provide for a predetermined formula to compute the cost of providing such utilities to the parties for the duration of the contract.

(b) FUNDS.—A contract may be entered into under subsection (a) only to the extent as provided for in advance in appropriations Acts.

(c) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Secretary may include in a contract under subsection (a) such additional provisions as the Secretary considers necessary to secure the provision of utilities and to protect the interests of the United States.

In lieu of the Senate amendment to the title of the bill, amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain programs and activities, to require certain reports from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes."

Mr. STUMP (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not plan to object, and I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for an explanation of his request.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995 the House passed H.R. 1536, H.R. 1575, H.R. 2289, and H.R. 2353. These bills extended a variety of VA authority for veterans health care and benefits. The other body combined the provisions of these four bills and substituted them in the bill S. 991 as an amendment to H.R. 2353 on January 5, 1996.

We now have been able to work out these compromises on those expiring authorities. This agreement is reflected in the amendments we are asking unanimous consent for now.

The amendment also authorized utility contracts for the Audie L. Murphy Medical Center in San Antonio, TX. Chairman SIMPSON has given his commitment to address the remaining unresolved issues during the second session of the Congress.

We are seeking unanimous consent now because these must be enacted quickly. We hope the Senate will act on it tomorrow so that the expiration of these authorities will not adversely impact veterans depending on the VA for benefits and services. I hope all Members will support this amendment.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2353, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take one moment and thank my colleague and the ranking member on the other side, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], for his help in finalizing these bills.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will be brief.

As the distinguished chairman has indicated, this bill was actually necessary. It was not passed in the first session, it was sent to the Senate. They did not act on it. This will help the veterans to be able to do some wonderful things.

Mr. Speaker, with that brief explanation, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 308 of Public Law 97-449 (49 U.S.C. 308(a)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the Department of Transportation, which covers fiscal year 1994.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 25, 1996.

□ 2000

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HEFLEY). 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.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, tonight I had longstanding plans to be with a very special group of my constituents from Bucks and Montgomery Counties. I was very much looking forward to being there. But tonight's business was far too important to miss.

What we have done tonight is literally make a down payment on balancing America's budget, a project that this side of the aisle has worked on very hard for all of this year. We have not met our commitments. We have not reached the accord that we had hoped to reach with the White House. But what we have done tonight in a bipartisan fashion, with the agreement of the President, is to agree to agree on those things where we do not have a difference of opinion, and we have done that. But our work is still cut out for us.

Mr. Speaker, we must reach accord, we must compromise, we must find a way to reform our entitlements, to reform our Medicare system, to save it from the disastrous bankruptcy to which it is headed. We must transform our welfare system into one that offers not a handout, but a hand up. We must reform our Medicaid system, which is creating financial havoc for all of the States.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we can do this. But it will take a spirit of compromise, the same bipartisan spirit that we evidenced tonight on the floor, Republicans and Democrats working,

the Congress and the President, getting beyond their differences and becoming less entrenched and working in the spirit of compromise. I believe the American people expect that from us. I believe the American people deserve that, and I believe for our children's future we must do that.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not use the 5 minutes, but an important event has happened in our district. When the results were in on the citizens referendum to incorporate Fort Myers Beach into a town, a resident remarked "This is the will of the people. This is democracy in action."

I rise today to salute the new municipality in my district in Florida, to commend the citizens on both sides of the incorporation debate for their sincere interest in bettering their community and to wish the newly elected town council well in its endeavor.

It was more than 20 years ago that my own community of Sanibel, FL, took the same important step into home rule. We felt then, as a majority of Fort Myers Beach residents feel now, that home rule would give residents greater access to and control over the governance of their community. I was proud to have been involved in Sanibel's efforts of democracy in action, and I am proud today of the newest municipality in my congressional district. Fort Myers Beach has always had a distinctive character and charm. Even though we have many beautiful beaches in Lee County, FL, when somebody refers to "the beach" down our way they usually mean Fort Myers Beach. That unique personality will no doubt flourish as the town of Fort Myers Beach sets out on the course to take charge of its own destiny.

I know others in Congress join me in offering a warm greeting to southwest Florida's newest town. Welcome to the town of Fort Myers Beach.

FRENCH NUCLEAR NIGHTMARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, it's me again. At times I feel like I'm out there in the wilderness talking to the birds and the trees—as I have imagined several times that I'm standing on a beautiful sandy beach along any one of those South Pacific islands, taking a long deep breath of that warm salt air, as I observe one of the great wonders of nature—the powerful waves of the ocean pounding the shore.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I have counted at least 20 times I've taken an important matter before my colleagues and to the American people—the matter of French nuclear testing in the South Pacific and specifically in French Polynesia.

Mr. Speaker, in June of last year, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 80, that has numerous cosponsors from both sides of the aisle—including, Mr. GILMAN from New York, Mr. HAMILTON from Indiana, Mr. LEACH from Iowa, Mr. BEREUTER from Nebraska, Mr. BERMAN from California, Mr. SMITH from New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS from California, Mr. ROHRBACHER from California, Mr. ACKERMAN from New York, Mr. KIM from California, Mr. UNDERWOOD from the Territory of Guam, Mrs. MINK from Hawaii, Mr. ABERCROMBIE also from Hawaii, Mr. MARKEY from Massachusetts, Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon, and Mr. MINETA from California.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 80 expresses the sense of the Congress of the United States to recognize the concerns of the peoples of Oceania and to call upon France to stop nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the substantive issues and concerns raised in this resolution, which delineates the environmental risks that France's testing has created for the 28 million men, women, and children who live throughout the Pacific region, which is comprised of 22 sovereign nations and territories. The resolution further calls upon the Government of France, namely President Chirac and his administration, to cease all nuclear testing in the South Pacific.

House Concurrent Resolution 80 holds that:

The Government of France has been conducting nuclear tests over 10,000 miles from Paris on the South Pacific atolls of Moruroa and Fangataufa in French Polynesia;

That since 1966 France has detonated at least 187 nuclear explosions above, on, and under these coral atolls in French Polynesia, including more than 140 underground nuclear tests;

That there is considerable concern among the 28,000,000 people of the 22 countries and territories of Oceania regarding the adverse environmental effects in the region as a result of these nuclear tests;

That the island nations of the South Pacific forum have staunchly opposed France's nuclear testing in the region, applauded France's adherence to a global nuclear testing moratorium since 1992, and strongly deplore and condemn any decision to resume France's nuclear testing in the South Pacific;

That despite France's claim that its nuclear testing program is absolutely safe, there is scientific evidence to suggest both that radioactive leakage has

already occurred at the testing site and that additional, more serious leakage might occur in the next 10 to 100 years;

That there is also concern in the region that the coral atoll, Moruroa, has been subjected to premature and accelerated aging as a result of the testing program, risking the structural integrity of the atoll and increasing the possibility of its disintegration;

That the leaders of France's insular territory, French Polynesia, have stated opposition to resumed nuclear testing, joining fellow Pacific island governments, and it is inherently unfair that they should be used as a test site for France's nuclear explosions;

Therefore, the Congress of the United States should recognize the concerns of the 28 million people from nations and territories of Oceania and call upon the Government of France to cease all nuclear testing at the Moruroa and Fangataufa atolls.

Mr. Speaker, after voice votes of both the House International Relations Subcommittee on the Asia-Pacific and the full Committee on International Relations—the committees unanimously approved the concurrent resolution and forwarded it for floor action. But for some unknown reason, Mr. Speaker, the concurrent resolution is being shuffled somewhere between offices and the floor of the House, and for that unknown reason, this important matter has conveniently been put on hold indefinitely. As a bipartisan measure that has been described as moderate and well balanced, it is shameful that the Republican leadership has chosen deliberately not to bring House Concurrent Resolution 80 to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to share with our colleagues some basic statistical data concerning nuclear testing not only in our country but other countries as well. I honestly believe there is a need for our policymakers and members of the nuclear club—the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia, and the Peoples Republic of China—to thoroughly re-examine the so-called merits—and the dark side—of having nuclear warheads as a deterrent against enemy aggression.

Mr. Speaker, according to the bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, the U.S. nuclear weapons program from 1940 to 1995 in constant U.S. dollars—is estimated to have cost America \$4 trillion. Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker—\$4 trillion. A \$4 trillion stack of \$1 bills would reach the Moon, encircle it, and start part way back. Four trillion dollar bills could paper over every State east of the Mississippi, with enough left over to blanket Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, and most of Iowa.

And, Mr. Speaker, the \$4 trillion figure does not even include additional nuclear weapons-related costs America expends on aerial refueling tankers, aircraft and ships; nor the costs for dismantlement of outmoded missiles,

bombs and submarines. And, Mr. Speaker, the \$4 trillion does not even include the estimated cost of \$350 billion needed to deal with impending nuclear waste management problems.

Mr. Speaker, our nuclear weapons-related expenditure for last year alone was approximately \$33.157 billion.

Of this, the Department of Defense expended over \$21 billion. DOD's costs included the maintenance, operations and modernization of nuclear weapons, ballistic missile defense, satellite systems, ground-airborne command posts, and the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program for dismantlement of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union.

The Department of Energy expenditure to conduct stockpile research and testing of nuclear weapons—including nuclear materials stabilization, nuclear waste management, the naval nuclear propulsion program, technology transfer, intelligence and safety/security issues, verification and implementation of treaties—cost the Department of Energy almost \$12 billion.

Other agencies spent approximately \$185 million on programs related to nuclear weapons.

So, Mr. Speaker, just for the past year alone, our expenditure for nuclear weapons-related costs totalled over \$33 billion.

A question is raised, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the American taxpayers got their money's worth for our nuclear program. Here are some interesting figures for my colleagues to consider: The cost for not testing any nuclear bomb this year—\$410 million; the total number of U.S.-built nuclear warheads and bombs from 1945 to the present—70,000; the total number of nuclear missiles the United States built from 1951 to the present—67,500; the total land area occupied by the Departments of Defense and Energy to carry out our nuclear weapons program—approximately 12,800 square miles—which is comparable to the combined area covered by the States of Maryland, Delaware and the District of Columbia; the total number of nuclear bombs we exploded in the State of Nevada—935.

The total number of nuclear bombs the United States exploded in the Marshall Islands—now the Republic of the Marshall Islands—106. One of these explosions, Mr. Speaker, was the world's first hydrogen bomb test—known as the Bravo Shot. This was a 15 megaton hydrogen bomb explosion that was 1,000 times more powerful than the atom bomb that we dropped on the city of Hiroshima, which incidentally killed and vaporized some 150,000 men, women, and children. Let me go on, Mr. Speaker, after our nuclear testing program in the Marshalls, there are still, to this day, up to 26 islands that remain contaminated as a result of our nuclear tests.

Let me also add, Mr. Speaker, that we either lost or never received 11 nu-

clear bombs through our testing program. We have also built, Mr. Speaker, about 75 special facilities for the President and our national leaders to utilize in the event of a nuclear war. Today, over 250 million pages of documents remain secret that the Department of Energy has not yet declassified.

Mr. Speaker, I'm no pacifist. As a Vietnam veteran, I have fought for America. I firmly believe that our country must always be second to none as far as our national security is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, without boasting or arrogance on my part, I take great comfort in knowing that the United States stands not only as the preeminent leader of the free world but as the most powerful nation on this planet.

Which brings me to the question before us—and to the 187 recognized sovereign nations of the world. There are nations that test, possess, and can even deliver and explode nuclear bombs if necessary in times of national crisis. Then there are nations that because of threats and perceived danger to their national security from bordering countries with nuclear bombs—want to develop their own nuclear weapons systems. Regional examples among such nations are the problems between Pakistan, India and China; between North Korea and South Korea; and between Israel and Iran.

However, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the world's nations simply want nothing to do with nuclear bombs, nuclear missiles, nuclear everything. These nations consider nuclear weapons as weapons of genocide, that should be outlawed altogether by international law and standards of conduct.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend President Clinton and his administration for taking a strong stand against nuclear testing and support of a genuine zero-yield comprehensive test ban treaty. The Clinton administration, and in particular the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, should also be commended for their leadership in gaining the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago a moratorium on testing was called for by the nuclear nations of the world. With the exception of China, all the nuclear powers, including the United States, Great Britain, Russia and France, complied and did not detonate nuclear bombs.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, last year in June with a newly elected President in France, one of the first policy decisions made by President Chirac was to destroy the moratorium and announce that France would explode eight more nuclear bombs in the South Pacific in French Polynesia. Chirac maintains it is in the highest national interest of France to expand its nuclear arsenal with a new generation of nuclear weapons—a neutron

warhead. Mr. Speaker, where are these weapons to be pointed—Russia, a nation striving toward democracy? Or are their nuclear missiles pointed at Germany, whose humiliating invasion of France in World War II gave birth to France's desperate need today for a nuclear security blanket?

Mr. Speaker, the cold war is over. Our Nation's taxpayers paid well over \$5 trillion to overcome the global threat of Marxist communism. Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that nuclear weapons of mass destruction were never utilized—and certainly credit should be given to our country and our NATO allies, and to the former Soviet Union and members of the Warsaw Pact, for taking every precautionary measure to ensure the planet wasn't blown up into tiny pieces.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure my colleagues are aware but perhaps many Americans are not aware of the fact that without even considering the deadliness of the former Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal, our Nation alone, Mr. Speaker, has enough nuclear bombs to blow this planet up 17 times over.

Mr. Speaker, if a nuclear war occurs, there is no such thing as a win-win result nor even a win-lose result. I submit, Mr. Speaker, the next nuclear holocaust will be a definite lose-lose result. There will be no winners—period. Everyone, everywhere, comes out a loser, as we will all ultimately suffer the harm and violence committed against the Earth's ecosystem.

Mr. Speaker, I am also greatly troubled by man's difficulty in harnessing nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Although the electricity generated by nuclear power is a great benefit to humanity, at the same time we are faced with the very serious crisis of how to dispose of nuclear waste materials. Even now, Mr. Speaker, there is a serious debate in Congress as to which State or States in the United States are going to have the dubious honor of playing host to storage centers of nuclear waste, now and for the future. Unfortunately, some of our national leaders are looking at Nevada as the designated storage site for dangerous and hazardous nuclear waste materials—but is it fair to the citizens of Nevada that their State should bear such a burden?

And it should also be noted, Mr. Speaker, that it will cost our country over \$350 billion to clean up and safely store such nuclear waste, when and if ever, our National Government decides where nuclear waste materials are to be stored.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that we're still greatly struggling with the peaceful application and harnessing of nuclear energy. Given that we haven't even been able to control and manage the peaceful use of nuclear power, Mr. Speaker, I find it most disturbing that our Nation and other nations look at

nuclear weapons as a means of providing security and protection against aggression. Literally, Mr. Speaker, nuclear bombs are weapons of genocide and mass destruction.

What bothers me greatly, Mr. Speaker, is that France—supposedly a shining example of Western values, Western virtues, and Western civilization, where there is a very high premium placed upon the value of human lives, human rights and human dignity—their Government simply went ahead 5 months ago and started exploding nuclear bombs half-a-world away from Paris, despite the protests and objections of millions of people from around the world.

France exploded these nuclear bombs in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, with no real interest or concern for the marine environment; no real concern over the ciguatera fish poisoning created; no real concern for the pleadings of the nations that are part of the Pacific Ocean; no real concern for the tremendous amount of nuclear contamination from their testing that will eventually have to be addressed in the near future; and, no real concern for the health and welfare of some 200,000 French citizens who live in French Polynesia where the nuclear tests have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, the post-cold-war era presents a rare and unique opportunity to lessen our reliance on nuclear weapons for global security and stability. With the progress achieved on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty negotiations, the world stands at a historic point in time as we move toward nuclear disarmament.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me to tell President Chirac that what he is doing is not only shameful on behalf of the Government of France, but certainly outrageous, as far as I am concerned, as far as those people who live in the Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to my two distinguished Members and colleagues from the great State of Hawaii who have volunteered to share with me their concerns about what the French Government has been doing to these areas in the South Pacific. I gladly yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I must commend my colleague for his great leadership in calling attention, time and time again, to this Chamber of this egregious conduct on the part of the French Government.

Mr. Speaker, this particular special order is especially timely because we are told by the majority leadership that next week we are hosting the President of the French Government, Mr. Chirac himself, in this very hall in

a joint session with the House and the Senate. I find it almost intolerable that such an invitation would have been extended on our behalf, in view of the huge protest that has been lodged against the French Government and President Chirac personally for his complete refusal to acknowledge the substantive basis upon which 170 nations have filed their protest and their objections to these tests that have been going on in French Polynesia.

I think that this is an example of his almost total refusal to understand the enormity of the human rights questions which this whole testing series exemplifies.

The French Government dismisses our objections on the basis that we have absolutely no evidence that any untoward damage could occur or any possible problems with respect to radiation contamination in the area.

All we have to do is to look at the record of what has happened to all of these Pacific islands where such tests have occurred in the past to know that it is not mere speculation that radioactive results could occur in this area and that the likelihood of irreparable contamination to the French Polynesian Islands is undoubtedly going to occur.

The gentleman, I am sure, has seen this article that appeared in a very timely way in the Washington Post, which the headline reads, "France Acknowledges Radioactive Leakage in South Pacific Nuclear Tests," and goes on to point out that quantities of iodine 131 has seeped into the lagoon in the test sites and dismiss it again by saying it is insignificant. The significance is that there is this fallout in terms of the test.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend in the well.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for pointing out that article that appeared in the Washington Post about the leakage of iodine 131 into the sea. I want to share with my colleagues and with the public a little artistic demonstration of what this atoll really looks like from the air, if we were to look down directly. We can see that those areas of the atoll, this atoll sits right on top of what is known as a volcanic formation, as we see here.

Some of our friends may think that this is how Polynesians decorate their Christmas trees with these funny red dots. I wanted to share with my good friend that these red dots represent 185 nuclear explosions that have already taken place in this atoll, and the French Government kept denying, "No, no, no problem. It is impossible for leakage."

Mr. Speaker, 185 nuclear bombs have already been exploded in this atoll, and the French Government has the gall to tell the public and the American people

and our top scientists that it is perfectly safe to continue this program. This is outrageous.

This is how it looks right now in this atoll. It is like a fractured cheese full of holes, and this is exactly what the Government has been doing, and they keep insisting by saying, "It is perfectly safe. No problem over there."

It just happens to be that this is right in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. That is my definite problem. I welcome my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], for his comments.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. "Mr. Speaker, one would think, would one not, that if it were perfectly safe, that they could conduct this test in the bay at Marseille in France? If the tests are perfectly safe, why do they not conduct them in the channel off the French coast? If the tests are perfectly safe, why do not they conduct them in the Mediterranean Sea off the French coast?"

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for making that observation. This has always been the question raised by everyone around the world. If it is so safe, why not test it in France? I will tell my colleagues the reason why: The French people will not allow it, and all the peoples in Europe will not permit France to do such a thing. They had to pick on the most innocent people living on this planet.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Is it not then the case, would you agree, that if it was, in fact, safe and it could be done in France or it could be done in the seas in the waters surrounding France, and it has not been done and has been done in the South Pacific, that this is an indication of the continued colonial atmosphere, an example of the colonial mentality that the French still maintain toward the Polynesian people, most specifically those who live in the South Pacific?

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I thank my good friend for making that observation. I want to share with my colleagues and the American people, they may be Polynesians, they may be Tahitians, but, by God, these are human beings.

It is so often said that France is the home of enlightenment, France is the home of all these beautiful observations about what human life is. This is the worst example of French democracy, if they call it a democracy. It is really sad, a really sad commentary that our national leaders have seen fit to allow this man to address this Congress, while the world's condemnation sits on the head of this man, whether it be in Europe or in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

□ 2030

What in the world are we doing? I cannot believe this.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the hypocrisy of all of this is that the French Government has for some time now put itself on record declaring that it would abide by a test ban treaty. It declared a moratorium. It specified their commitment to the concept of no tests by any of these nuclear powers and, in doing so, encouraged all of these other nations to join in this tremendously, highly moral commitment that we are not ever going to have any more of these nuclear tests anywhere in the world.

When they came out in June with their announcement that, notwithstanding the moratorium that they had declared, that they were going to proceed with these tests, to me that was a violation of the confidence and trust that the peoples of this area had placed in their earlier pronouncements. That to me was a devastating reversal of their government's policies. I agree with you that coming to this Chamber next week is a very very disappointing event.

I regret that our leadership has extended such an invitation. I hope that our Members will understand the depth of our feelings about this issue and not grace this Chamber when the President appears at the joint session.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. What is really funny about this, there was an article that appeared in the New York Times yesterday. The French are masters at doing this kind of thing. They leak some things here. They leak some things there and tell you what, they have already explained what Chirac is going to tell us next week.

Let me share with my colleagues and with my good friend from Hawaii what Chirac is going to be telling on this pulpit next Thursday. This is what he is going to say: The U.S. Government should not go into bankruptcy or default because it will seriously impact France's economy as well as other countries of Europe and the world for that matter. That is a real good line of instruction to our Republican friends.

Second, Chirac is going to lecture the Congress and our President and the American people that our country is not paying enough to the crisis in Bosnia. Would you believe that? This is the kind of thing that we are going to get from this man. It is OK because this is what the French officials are already telling the world. This is unbelievable.

Another thing, Chirac is also going to tell the Congress and our President that our country is not paying enough foreign aid to Third World nations. May I remind President Chirac where the United States has been for the past 50 years in providing security against aggression in Europe and when de Gaulle at the time pulled out of NATO and demanded of U.S. forces to leave France within 60 days, and what was

our response to that? Does that also include the 10,000 soldiers who lie buried in the soils of France, freeing them from Nazi aggression in World War II? This is the kind of thing that we are faced with.

All I can submit to my good friends here is that this is the kind of thing that we are going to be hearing from him.

Another point, Chirac is going to say: Well, you are not contributing enough to the Bosnia crisis. But at the same time France expects to be the leading eminent role model and leader of Europe to provide the remedy that is needed for the Bosnia crisis. I think we can agree somewhat to the reason why there has been an impasse all these months, because they could not agree even among the European countries. So the United States had to be there to show real leadership how to remedy this crisis in Bosnia.

Another thing, Chirac is also going to give us a lecture that we are not a world class leader; we are not living up to our responsibilities as a world leader among nations. Could you believe this? Could you believe this? Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. This is unbelievable. This is what the French Government officials have already leaked in the press and to the media. This is what we are going to be hearing next week. Do you know what is really funny about this whole thing? He will not say anything about the French nuclear testing program. Is that not sad? Is that not totally indefensible?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. I think it is astounding that, if this report is accurate, the French President would dare to come here to instruct us on what should be our national posture on all of these critical issues on the pretense that the French Government serves as any kind of role model for the rest of the world in its conduct, when it denigrates the will and the passions and the emotions of the people of the Pacific region by flaunting these tests notwithstanding the fact that 170 countries all across the world have filed their protests.

I hope that our colleagues will pay attention to our protest and our deeply felt feelings about this.

As the chair of the Congressional Pacific Asian Caucus, I hope that they will follow our leadership and not grace this Chamber to allow the president of this government to come and lecture to us about how we should conduct our affairs when he has violated the fundamental principle of peoples across this country and the world; and that is to live in peace, not to be disturbed, not to be harmed and injured in this way in perpetuity.

I thank the gentleman again in the well for causing us to raise our voices on this, to increase our understanding and to make our conscience speak for us on this very, very important measure. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, carrying Mrs. MINK's point a bit further, is it not interesting, is it not instructive that the French think that they can move ahead with this testing and at the same time condemn the activities or the presumed activities with respect to testing or the utilization of atomic or hydrogen weapons by Iran or Iraq or Pakistan or the People's Republic of China.

Is it not clear that by France, ostensibly one of our allies, despite the fact that it has never cooperated with us in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as a member of the Committee on National Security, I can say that one of our great difficulties with respect to European security is never being able to know where France will be. Will they be behind us? Will they be beside us? If they are behind us, what do they have in mind for us? What do they have in mind for Europe?

We find ourselves in the position of attempting to establish a standard with respect to testing, asking other countries to follow our lead in ending the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons as an act of common humanity on behalf of all the nations on the planet.

And when France moves ahead with this kind of testing, how do we have the moral authority then to be able to say to Iran, to Iraq, to India, to Pakistan, to China, where do we get the moral authority then to be able to say, no, you should cease this kind of activity?

It very quickly becomes an argument in which the Western Powers, those who are conceived of as the Western Powers by history, the imperialist colonial powers, are allowed to do as they will with respect to atomic or hydrogen testing and somehow, then, those countries which have been viewed as unindustrialized or Third World or whatever kind of set of adjectives are put upon them, those countries are disabled from being able to do the same thing that France now carries on.

France undermines everything that we have tried to do since atomic testing and hydrogen testing took place, since all of us, from President Kennedy on, on a bipartisan basis in this country, came to the conclusion that this was against the interests of humanity. This goes beyond individual political machinations or individual political posturing. This goes to the very heart of what constitutes a responsible nation in the present-day world acting in a manner in concordance with those actions that promote peace. We are not in a position, then, to complain to other countries about possible testing that they may be doing if we are unable to discipline ours sufficiently to be able to say to France, we will not countenance this.

Now, it is one thing, perhaps, for the President to say, look, there are wider

considerations. It may even be that the State Department wants to say there are wider considerations. That may be so. An argument may be made. I think it can be refuted and should be refuted. But I do not pretend to have some corner on the market of political wisdom in that respect. It perhaps should be debated.

But, to have the Speaker's chair occupied, the podium of the House of Representatives occupied by the President of France under these circumstances is beyond my comprehension. It is a privilege of the House, a privilege of the House to stand on the podium where the Speaker resides and to speak to the House assembled.

We are forced into the position of saying that we must boycott this speech, this address to the House of Representatives, and we request our colleagues to think deeply upon this subject. We do not pretend for a moment to be better than someone else or to have greater insight. We are not trying to speak from some morally superior position. Quite the contrary. We are here making an appeal, we are making a pleading, if you will, we are mounting an argument that we hope is persuasive to those who have given so much. I think this is what my good friend from Samoa referred to when we talked about World War II.

I hope you will not resent the fact that I think we can go back a little further, World War I. Who was it that left the shores of the United States to go and rescue France in World War I? Who went to rescue France in World War II? And it is a sad chapter, one that still has not been resolved in our own country, who then, with the best of intentions, tried to go into Vietnam in the wake of the disaster that the French created there in Indochina? It was the United States, for good or for ill. We have no apologies that we need to make to the French about taking a position with respect to testing in the Pacific.

Some could say to us, yes, of course, the gentleman from Samoa, the people from Hawaii, they live in the Pacific, I suppose we could be seen almost as a special interest in that regard.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Let me add to my friend, yes, we did conduct in the Pacific, but something did happen afterward. There was world outrage what our country was doing in testing in the Marshall Islands for one obvious reason. Do you know what happened? We found strontium 90 in dairy products. The clouds had shifted and it affected all over the different regions of the world. So we had good reason for having to stop because there was a real serious hazard in conducting atmospheric tests at the time.

In fact, it was at the time that the Soviet Union and our country made a band not to conduct any more atmospheric tests. We told France, please do

not do this because we know the aftereffects. Do you know what happened? No way. They exploded 12 nuclear atomic explosions in the atmosphere.

Let me tell you of the problems that caused, that situation when the French Government went ahead and did it, totally disregarded the warnings from our own Government. Yes, we paid the price and we are still trying to compensate for the lives of those men, women, and children on the islands of Rongelap and Utirik to this day because those people were directly subjected to nuclear contamination and forever their lives will never be the same because they are now subjected to leukemia and all forms of cancer.

□ 2045

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up on what the gentleman said by indicating and admitting for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that my interest is personal. I freely admit to it. I think we can make a case on the merits politically, scientifically, regionally, if you will. I think we can make a case on the morality of it in the social-political sense, but I must confess to you, Mr. Speaker, and do so quite freely, that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and myself are among the few people that have actually seen the results of a hydrogen bomb test, because we saw the results of the Johnson Island test that was made by our country. That is where I made my first resolve.

This is not an issue that I came to this evening, Mr. Speaker, because I have been recently converted. I saw with my own eyes what happened when we exploded a relatively minor hydrogen device 900 miles away from Hawaii, and the sky lit up. It was and remains the most awesome physical sight, the most—I have chills, Mr. Speaker. As I speak with you right now, my body is suffused with a chill, because it is etched in my mind's eye and will be for the rest of my life what that test looked like.

I resolved at that point, coming down the hill from the Manoa Valley down Punahou street to the bottom of the hill where I have spent the last three decades of my life, I resolved at that moment that I would devote whatever political energy I could bring in whatever form was made available to me as a free citizen of the United States to see to it that I would speak out and speak on the issue of atomic and hydrogen testing with the idea of ending it, ending it for everybody and for all time, because it is antihuman. It is antihumanity.

It is not just a matter of political sovereignty, it is not just a matter of one set of forces against another. It is not a matter for abstract intellectual discussion in a textbook or a military

briefing on a map on the wall with little cards and drawings moving around, or scales of warfare and what are acceptable casualties and what are not. It is the most elemental circumstances of physics being made manifest in the most destructive way, not constructive, not the sense of humanity that we would like to exemplify as a species, where we see the love of God in one another, but we see the destruction of the species and the planet and what we are capable of.

Mr. Speaker, we are capable of great things as a species. We are capable of great humanity, we are capable of being worthy of the spark of life that is in us, as best we can understand it, but we are also capable as a species of committing great evil and great harm, and we will be judged. We will be judged one day, if only by ourselves, as to whether or not we have exemplified what is best in us, not what is worst in us.

These tests are an abomination in the sight of any God that is worthy of the name, and any species, anyone who has a desire to manifest his or her humanity to the best of his or her ability I think and I hope would stand with us next week and at least make this gesture, and it is nothing more than that, I understand that, but make this gesture that justifies our existence as human beings by saying that we will not stand here in this place of honor and privilege, because I hope that all of my colleagues would agree that this is a place of honor and privilege. We have been elected here by free men and women in a free society. This is a gift that has been given to us to be on this floor and to speak.

I would hope that we would honor that gift that has been given us and live up to the faith that has been put into us, that has been given to us by the voters of our respective districts, and say that we will not be on this floor when that speech is given, because the privilege of the floor should not be given under such circumstances.

Mr. FALCOMA. I thank my friend for his observations. Mr. Speaker, we are also joined here in our special order by my good friend, and by profession, an outstanding physician from his home State of Washington. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MCDERMOTT].

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from American Samoa, for bringing this issue to the floor. I was sitting in my office listening and watching it on television, and I decided that I ought to come over here, because it seems as if I was listening as though this was something that was just an issue of Pacific Islanders, of people out in the middle of the Pacific, or that it was just an issue of people who live in Hawaii, which is a little closer.

This is an issue that affects all Americans, affects everyone in this country,

and for us, and I agree, I think we ought to boycott, not come to the speech by the French premier, because I personally do not think he should have been invited. I think he deserves the response of the Congress to someone who has done something that is offensive not only to Pacific Islanders, but the whole United States and the whole world community. The insistence by France of doing these tests is simply unacceptable.

My view comes, as does that of my colleague from Hawaii, from a personal experience. I am a physician and I work at a hospital in Seattle that has, for a long time, dealt with the folks, the people who were affected by the atomic bomb in Japan. These people have been followed for the last some 40 years now since that bomb was dropped, more than 40 years, and they have been followed as they have increasingly gotten cancers of all sorts, leukemias, a variety of deadly diseases, and we have followed that. We know what atomic warfare does.

Mr. FALCOMA. I would say to my friend, I have made this observation earlier. It is bad enough that we cannot even harness and control the situation that we have in harnessing energy from the nuclear power in providing electricity and for other good things, the positive things that it does, but we do not know what to do with the storage. We have a very serious crisis now in our country and other countries as well that use nuclear power for electricity.

It is bad enough that we cannot even solve that problem, but it is OK to come up with as many nuclear bombs as you can among these nations that can produce them and go and shoot one another, and just simply annihilate this whole planet. Not only is it the height of hypocrisy, but contradictions that even I cannot comprehend.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The State of Washington has a facility that has been involved in this, and nuclear waste storage is the biggest threat to our economy. That kind of thing sitting there and rusting, silos and so forth, has been a threat for a long time.

The people of the State of Washington passed an initiative, "Don't waste Washington." We don't want anymore nuclear waste. Nobody wants nuclear waste. It is accumulating all over the place. To create bombs means you make more nuclear waste. There is no question about it. So even the process is making a problem for those people. Even if there is no war, there still is the question of how do we deal with the long-term storage of the waste.

The thing that is so, to me—if you look at the people who were in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and look at what happened to them, and recognize that if we ever—anybody should be thinking of testing such a weapon simply has

never looked at these people and looked at what the effects of it are. My belief is that for us to allow somebody to come here and speak as though it did not make any difference—

Mr. FALCOMA. As if nothing happened.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. As if nothing happened, and simply to say Well, it is OK to us, because it is done way out there in the middle of the Pacific, and somehow that will not affect us. The gentleman is absolutely correct, when that stuff goes up in the air or when it is in the water, it gets into the fish.

We have fishing fleets out of my district, the whole Pacific fleet from the State of Washington goes out of my district. They go out and catch fish everywhere. What kind of fish do they catch? What concentration of these elements is in the liver of those fish or in the roe or whatever? And we are feeding it to people.

When it comes in the air—we measured Strontium 90 in milk in Wisconsin when I was in medical school. That simply is a threat to our people, that we should be saying to them How dare you do that when you threaten us?

Mr. FALCOMA. One of the things I want to add to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, is sometimes our own people here in America do not realize we are also a Pacific nation. Our country may be situated a little closer to Europe and the Atlantic, but the fact of the matter is that 33 million Americans live in the State of California, which happens to be a Pacific Coast State, and my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, has in Washington State, 4½ million people.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Almost 5½ million.

Mr. FALCOMA. And the gentleman from Oregon, 3 million, and another 1.3 million live in Hawaii, and 150,000 in the territories of Guam and the Mariana Islands, and these are American citizens. These are not aliens. These are not people, as if we just put aside and just assume that nothing is going to happen to us. I am very fearful of this.

I want to say this to my good friends, the gentleman from Hawaii and the gentleman from Washington. This atoll, it has been estimated, is the equivalent of several Chernobyls, right now, inside this atoll, where the French Government has exploded 181 nuclear bombs, and they are telling the world that—each one of these red dots, I would say to my good friend, represents a nuclear detonation that the French Government has put in this atoll for the past 30 years, and they are saying it is OK. Jacques Cousteau in 1987 was permitted to do a study of the situation there as far as the marine ecology was concerned. He came out and made an observation, there were leakages. There were fissures.

Another problem with Jacques Cousteau's mission was he never went down further south, lower and in greater depth of exactly what is down there. In other words, nobody knows what is happening down there.

Another observation, 60 percent of the people of France did not want President Chirac to resume nuclear testing. This is another thing that really bogs my mind, when the very people that he represents did not want him to do this, he went right ahead and blew them up. Five nuclear bombs have already been exploded. Leakages are already evidenced as a result of these explosions. The French scientists and the Government of France have the gall to tell the public and throughout the world that it is still OK, we can still continue to do this.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, my good friend, the gentleman from Washington, has indicated the scientific basis and the human context, as a physician. My good friend, the gentleman from American Samoa, has made it clear that the United States, too, is a Pacific Nation; that this is not some isolated event in a faroff place.

I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that very much needs the bipartisan attention of the House. I would hope that the Speaker would reconsider the question of whether or not Mr. Chirac should be allowed to speak, because I maintain that far from being a scientific test, that the information that could have been gained from the testing, ostensibly gained from the testing, we would have been happy to share. The United States of America would have been happy to share.

I can say as a member of the Committee on National Security, without violating any sense of clearances or restricted data or anything of the kind, classified data, the information to be gained here is common knowledge to those who will take the time to find out what was required or what kind of knowledge was sought with respect to the effects of this kind of testing, if that was indeed the rationale for it.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that this was a political statement by the French. They were doing this for political reasons, and precisely because, and I will not dispute anyone with whether or not this was a good political idea or a bad political idea. It was done for reasons that seemed good enough at the time to the French Government, and as a result, and whatever statement they wanted to make, they were willing to take the chance of opprobrium from the rest of the world if they went ahead with these tests in order to make their political statement.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that the leadership of the House would take this into account with respect to my request for reconsideration

of whether this speech moves forward, it is a political statement to have someone stand at the Speaker's desk, at the Speaker's chair and the podium, on the floor of the House of Representatives. That is a political statement. It says that you have the privilege of the floor, freely granted by the Members of this House. That I was a political statement.

So if the French exploded these bombs for political reasons, are we not saying, then, if we give him the privilege of the floor, that we are, in effect, approving that; that he can do this with no political disadvantage, there is no political price to pay?

All we ask, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps there is a protocol situation that the Speaker cannot now rescind, and perhaps not all of this was taken into consideration, but I ask this, then: If the privilege of the floor cannot be rescinded at this time, and I most seriously and parenthetically emphasize, reemphasize, reiterate, that I hope the Speaker and the leadership will reconsider the question of whether Mr. Chirac should be given the privilege of this House to speak from the Speaker's podium.

□ 2100

But in the event that that is not possible, I ask, because it is a political statement and will be a political statement to be on this floor, that people boycott this floor; that the cameras that will be in here to record this event will record empty seats of duly-elected Members who are saying, out of respect for the House, out of respect for the people who have sent us here to the House, out of respect for this Chamber and this institution and what it means, that we will not participate, we will not be here in our seats, we will boycott this, respectfully so, because we have a higher duty, a higher calling, a higher political statement to make by virtue of our absence.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Hawaii and my good friend from the State of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I can pretty much venture to raise my projections as to what we might expect next week when President Chirac supposedly is to address the House. I suppose one thing he is going to demand that all Americans should learn how to speak French, that perhaps French should be the spoken language here in America. I suspect also that our good friend from France is going to demand that nobody would be able to translate, because he is going to be speaking in French, he is not going to be speaking in English, even though he is very, very good at speaking the English language.

All that aside, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Washington, [Mr. McDERMOTT] and certainly my good friend from Hawaii, [Mr.

ABERCROMBIE] and the gentlewoman from Hawaii, [Mrs. MINK] who was here earlier for participating in this dialog to express our real serious concern about the presence of President Chirac and the fact that it has the outrageous condemnation of so many countries throughout the world and millions of people throughout the world, having the arrogance to conduct these nuclear tests or these nuclear explosions in the Pacific for the past several months.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patience, and I thank the members of the staff of the House for their patience in allowing me to address the House in this special order. Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 24, 1996]
AS NUCLEAR TESTS END, PACIFIC OUTPOSTS
FEAR LOSING AID FROM PARIS

(By Thomas Kamm)

PAPEETE, FRENCH POLYNESIA.—If French Polynesia has too many beauty queens, blame it on geopolitics.

The winner of the Miss Tahiti pageant went straight to Miss World—bypassing the Miss France contest entirely. This was fine with Miss World pageant officials, but not with Vaes Devatine, a Tahitian who saw red, white and blue. She set up a rival contest to send a representative to compete in France.

"We are a French territory, and it's aberrant not to go through national channels," says Ms. Devatine, who runs a public-relations firm. "It's a strategic and political mistake."

From the seemingly trivial to the geopolitical, self-governing French Polynesia has a case of split personality. While the islands want to retain their cultural identity, they don't want to lose the benefits of their link with France. "We're constantly playing a balancing act," says Alex du Prei, the editor of Tahiti Pacifique. "The truth is, we want it both ways."

PRICE TAG OF POWER

The same may be true for France. Its far-flung outposts are vital to its sense of grandeur—and to its claim of being a global power. But grandeur comes at an annual cost of about 50 billion francs (\$10 billion). And so, under pressure to cut its budget deficit to meet the criteria for a common European currency, France may be forced to address a long-held taboo: Does it still need its overseas empire?

This issue already is brewing in French Polynesia. When President Jacques Chirac, breaking a three-year moratorium, resumed nuclear tests in this tropical paradise more than 10,000 miles from Paris last September, Tahiti exploded in a day of riots. On Tuesday, the French government acknowledged that its nuclear tests had caused leaks of radioactive materials in the South Pacific. While it insisted the levels were too small to pose a threat to the region, the admission is likely to spark renewed protests.

Still, now that France has pledged to end all nuclear tests beginning next month, many Tahitians are wondering how they will survive without the windfall that came with being what pro-independence militant Nelson Ortas calls "a dumping ground for the bomb." After all, French money accounts for almost 70% of its annual resources.

While France has vowed to maintain current aid levels until 2006, some question what

its long-term interest will be in French Polynesia once the tests end. "The problem isn't the nuclear tests," says Nelson Levy, chief executive of Tahiti Tourisme, the tourism promotion board. "The real question is, how do we cope afterward?"

LAST GREAT COLONIAL POWER

With Britain handing over Hong Kong to China in 1997 and Portugal set to do the same with Macao in 1999, this network of overseas outposts—known in France as DOM-TOM, short for *departements et territoires d'Outre Mer*—is far bigger than those of the U.S., Britain or the Netherlands, and seems to some like an anachronism. "France is the last great colonial power," says Paul Neaoutyine, a leader of New Caledonia's independence movement. While many French citizens disagree, it could become increasingly difficult to justify subsidizing what they call "the confetti of empire" at a time when France is still smarting from widespread strikes over proposed cuts in entitlement programs.

But no French outposts want to break their link with the mother country. When New Caledonia, the nickel-rich South Pacific island that was racked by pro-independence violence last decade, holds a referendum on the issue in 1998, it is likely to vote to stay French. In Mayotte, an island off Africa's southeastern coast, moves are afoot to strengthen links with France by turning the territory into a full-fledged department, with all the rights accorded to French citizens.

It's easy to understand why. For if this is colonialism, it is colonialism in reverse. "They've invented a totally new form: not colonialism by exploitation, but an empire of handouts," says F. Roy Willis, a history professor at the University of California at Davis who is writing a book on overseas France.

France's ties to its outposts also are riddled with contradictions. The minimum wage in overseas France—in both the public and private sectors—was lower than in the mainland until this month; meanwhile, civil servants in some territories, including local hires, are paid nearly twice what they would earn in France. French Polynesians pay virtually no income tax, but they also don't have access to France's social safety net. And even though French officials insist that overseas territories are as French as Paris, trade with them is accounted for as foreign trade. "Double-speak is omnipresent," says Jean-Luc Mathieu, the author of several books on overseas France.

Nowhere are the distortions and ambiguities of France's influence more visible than in French Polynesia, this collection of 130 islands and turquoise lagoons that cover an expanse as big as Europe and that explorers likened to the Garden of Eden.

When Gaston Flosse, president of the self-governing territory of 200,000 people, returned last October from the United Nations General Assembly in New York, he called a news conference to express his pride at having twice represented France when President Chirac stepped out. But that same day, French Polynesia's representatives at a South Pacific Commission conference refused to enter the assembly hall because the French flag was higher than French Polynesia's banner on the table.

French Polynesia has its own flag, its own currency—the Pacific franc, pegged to the French franc—its own anthem and its own government and institutions. Yet its livelihood is owed to France: It boasts a gross domestic product per capita eight times higher

than that of many neighboring Pacific Islands. "It's the most extreme case of an artificial economy," says Paul Ronciere, France's high commissioner in French Polynesia.

A SECOND COLONIAL SHOCK

Annexed by France in 1843 after a sly colonial governor negotiated control of the islands with a drunken Polynesian king in return for a small stipend, French Polynesia long remained the languid, untouched paradise immortalized by the painter Paul Gauguin. But in 1963, after Algeria gained its independence, Gen. Charles de Gaulle moved France's nuclear-test site from the Sahara to Mururoa Atoll, 750 miles southeast of Tahiti.

French contractors, businesses and public servants swelled the local population; over one-third of France's navy was stationed here. Islanders flocked to Papeete to find jobs in construction and services, disrupting the subsistence economy. Imports from France ballooned.

But this boom was short-lived, lasting only through the 1970s, and it bequeathed the highly distorted economy that exists today. "Expatriate" civil servants were paid nearly twice their normal pay—and the wages of local hires were aligned on this scale. To keep up with the bloated, high-paying public sector, private industry is in effect protected through high tariffs on imports, making it difficult to produce competitively.

Thus, French Polynesia finds itself priced out of the world market and hooked on the \$1.2 billion that France pumps in each year to keep the economy going. France has pledged to keep this up for another 10 years while an economic reconversion plan is worked out, but outlays beyond 2006 are in doubt, and weaning Tahitians from this artificial standard of living will be difficult.

TROUBLE AHEAD

Some Polynesians think last September's riots are a sign of trouble ahead. The protests were led by unemployed youths, most of who were among the native Maohi people who make up 67% of the population.

Many of those youths live in Faaa, a ramshackle suburb of Papeete that is French Polynesia's biggest city, with a population of 35,000. If Tahiti is a paradise, it doesn't show here.

On a seaside plot of land, Mereta Turau shares a wooden shack without windows or electricity with his 10 grown-up children—nine of whom are unemployed. A 62-year-old who moved here from Raiatea Island to work in construction during the boom years, he is now a fisherman resigned to his fate. "With or without independence, it will be the same hard life for people like me," he says.

But the young are more radical. "The French run everything here: the state, the airport, the port, economic life, everything," says 31-year-old Tefana Tavarii. "And we have nothing." Standing beside him, 24-year-old Camille Roarari agrees. "To get a job here, you need a French diploma. But I'm not French. I'm Maohi. The French are colonialists. We're at home here, and we're treated like dogs."

Faaa's mayor is Oscar Temaru, a pro-independence leader. At city hall, a series of Polynesian-style huts, the French flag and official portrait of Mr. Chirac are conspicuously absent. The 51-year-old Mr. Temaru, a former customs officer, makes a point of speaking English, not French.

"The French say Tahiti is France, but we can't accept that," says the soft-spoken Mr. Temaru. "Geographically and historically, this is my country, not Chirac's. Paris is al-

most 20,000 kilometers away, people are freezing there while we're sweating in the heat." Mr. Temaru hopes for a peaceful evolution toward independence, saying Tahiti has to rethink its whole development model. "If France says bye-bye, we'll tell our people we have to return to the land. We don't want to go back to the Stone Age, but to reality."

But many view Mr. Temaru as an idealist. "Independence would plunge French Polynesia into misery," asserts Mr. Flosse, the president. "France doesn't impose its presence on us. We're the ones who want France to stay."

A majority of French Polynesians agree. A poll last October showed some 57% of Polynesians don't want independence, while 15% are in favor of independence within three years. Mr. Temaru's party has only four of 41 legislative seats. But even those who want to remain part of France say the country has to break its economic dependence on the mother country, and it should wisely use the 10-year grace period to start building a local economic base.

"The departure of the nuclear-test center is both an opportunity, because we'll be obliged to change systems whether we want to or not, and a risk, because we're not really prepared to change systems," says Jean-Claude Barral, the principal of Faaa's only public high school. "But it's clear we can't continue living in the same system we've had for 25 years without money falling from the sky."

[From the Star Bulletin, Jan. 19, 1996]

NUCLEAR TEST WARNING

While protests have focused on the French nuclear weapons tests in the South Pacific, India has been secretly preparing to conduct its own nuclear explosion. The Clinton administration has quietly warned New Delhi that if it goes ahead Washington will cut off virtually all aid.

The unpublicized message was delivered last month after U.S. intelligence officials detect early signs that a nuclear test was in preparation, the Los Angeles Times reported. India was warned that such an exercise would prompt the administration to invoke a 1994 law requiring the U.S. to cut off all economic and military aid, credits, bank loans and export licenses. The total would run into billions of dollars. The law applies to all undeclared nuclear-weapons nations.

India conducted its only nuclear explosion in 1974 and has denied plans to conduct a new test. A Clinton administration official now says the U.S. accepts India's assurances, but the warning would not have been issued without evidence.

The Clinton's administration has had its problems in relations with Japan and China. The nuclear test issue could sour relations with another Asian giant.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 24, 1996]

POSSIBILITY OF DEFAULT STARTS TO WORRY EUROPE, ESPECIALLY FRANCE

(By Craig R. Whitney)

PARIS, January 23.—The possibility that the deficit-cutting impasse between Congress and Clinton Administration could start causing the United States Government to default on its debt next month has begun to sink in on European leaders, and the French are anxious to avoid the turmoil that could result.

President Jacques Chirac, who will visit Washington next week, is prepared to warn in a speech to a joint session of Congress that default would upset economies around

the world and deeply undermine the American global position, French officials said today.

Congressional Republicans have threatened to refuse to raise the national debt limit unless the Clinton Administration agrees to their agenda for cutting the Federal deficit. If the Administration refuses to give in and fails to find other ways of coming up with money, the Government could start running out of money to pay obligations due on March 1.

At this point some European leaders are said to be beginning to feel like onlookers at a political game whose players appear little concerned about the chaos a default would cause in international currency and bond markets.

Some see a situation comparable to that in 1975, when Chancellor Helmut Schmidt of West Germany felt compelled to warn President Gerald R. Ford that letting New York City go bankrupt could send economic shock waves around the world, which was still fragile from the effects of a sudden rise in oil prices.

Mr. Chirac told the Senate majority leader, Bob Dole, and Speaker Newt Gingrich during his last visit to Washington in the summer that the United States gave too little foreign aid to developing countries, and French officials say that he plans to deliver the same message to Congress in an address planned for Feb. 1.

"We hope that Congress will be disposed to let the United States live up to its global responsibilities," one official here said.

Mr. Chirac will tell Congress, French officials say, that Europe with about the same size economy as the United States, gives three times as much to developing countries—\$31 billion, compared with less than \$9 billion last year from the United States.

"Where is America and its traditional generosity, where is its desire to help reshape the world?" asked one French policy maker.

Mr. Chirac is also likely to use his visit to tell both Congress and the Administration that France will insist on reshaping the NATO alliance to reflect changes since the end of cold war, according to officials in Brussels and Paris.

Mr. Chirac has reintegrated France into some NATO military structures that it left in 1966, but officials say he did so to push for the creation of a stronger European defense arm within the alliance. "We need to be able to deal with crises like Bosnia even if the United States doesn't want to become involved," an official said.

Mr. Chirac may also tell Washington that American plans to contribute \$600 million to the reconstruction of Bosnia over the next three years are inadequate. European estimates of the total cost run to \$3.7 billion. "Don't think that the Europeans will be the only ones paying for Bosnian reconstruction," Mr. Chirac said in a recent interview, adding that the Europeans expected the United States to pay about the same as they will—about one third.

American officials have responded that the United States committed 20,000 soldiers to the NATO peacekeeping force that began moving into Bosnia last month, a larger contingent than any of its allies.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. CHENOWETH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 1 p.m., on account of medical reasons.

Mr. SERRANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of a death in the family.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, after 6:30 p.m. on account of family illness.

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. DOGGETT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TORRICELLI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CHRYSLER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes, on January 31.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ROTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TORRICELLI, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. COBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GREENWOOD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, on January 30.

Mr. MCKEON, for 5 minutes, on January 31.

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on January 26.

Mr. GREENWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FALEOMAVEGA) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MONTGOMERY, 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. FALEOMAVEGA) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mrs. MEEK of Florida in two instances.

Mr. MARKEY.

Mr. BARCIA in two instances.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. ANDREWS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. MENENDEZ in three instances.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. GORDON.

Mr. REED.

Mr. JACOBS.

Mr. DELLUMS.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. SERRANO.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. FRAZER.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. BROWN of California in two instances.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Ms. WATERS.

Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. WARD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GREENWOOD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BAKER of California.

Mr. TATE.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia in two instances.

Mr. KING.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. LOBIONDO.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. CALLAHAN.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. BARTON of Texas.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mrs. ROUKEMA in three instances.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. WHITE.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FALEOMAVEGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 26, 1996, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1970. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Report to the Congress on the Runaway and Homeless Youth Program of the Family and Youth Services Bureau for Fiscal Years 1993 and 1994," pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 11822; to the

Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

1971. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the fiscal year 1994 report on the extent and disposition of United States contributions to international organizations, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2226(b)(1); to the Committee on International Relations.

1972. A letter from the Acting Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting notification that the following reports will be delayed due to the lack of personnel to complete them: "Report on Revitalization of ACDA"—due December 31, 1995, "Annual Report to Congress"—due January 31, 1996, and "Public Annual Report on World Military Expenditures and Arms Transfers"—due December 31, 1995; to the Committee on International Relations.

1973. A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report entitled "Financial Management: Implementation of the Cash Management Improvement Act," pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 6503 note; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1974. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, 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.

1975. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on progress in correcting identified material weaknesses at NASA; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1976. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the annual report on its 1995 Federal financial management status report and government-wide 5-year financial management plan, pursuant to Public Law 101-576, section 301(a) (104 Stat. 2849); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1977. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the 13th semiannual report to Congress on audit follow-up, for the period of April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 100-504, section 106(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1978. A letter from the Executive Director, State Justice Institute, 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.

1979. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, 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.

1980. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Little League Baseball, Inc., transmitting the organization's annual report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1084(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. GIBBONS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. JACOBS, Mr.

FORD, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. McNULTY):

H.R. 2879. A bill to provide that individuals performing services for the peacekeeping effort in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina shall be entitled to tax benefits in the same manner as if such services were performed in a combat zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H.R. 2880. A bill making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska:

H.R. 2881. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to permit States to impose fees to finance programs for providing air service to small communities; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BLUTE:

H.R. 2882. A bill to require that the pay and benefits of the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, and certain high level Government employees be treated in the same manner as the pay and benefits of Government employees who are affected by a Government shutdown; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committee on House Oversight, 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. BRYANT of Texas:

H.R. 2883. A bill to amend title XIX to the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement for States to seek recovery of medical assistance properly paid and to restrict the use of liens and such recovery in any MediGrant Program and any other future medical assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 2884. A bill to provide that the income tax instructions shall include an explanation of any law under which the Federal budget is projected to be in balance in 7 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGLY:

H.R. 2885. A bill to amend section 214 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1980 to limit the use of federally assisted housing by aliens; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 2886. A bill to amend the Impact Aid Program to provide for a holdharmless with respect to amounts for payments relating to the Federal acquisition of real property, to permit certain local educational agencies to apply for increased payments for fiscal year 1994 under the Impact Aid Program, and to amend the Impact Aid Program to make a technical correction with respect to maximum payments for certain heavily impacted local educational agencies; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 2887. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the highway vehicle excise tax certain equipment specially designed for off-highway seasonal harvesting of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.R. 2888. A bill to ensure the economy, efficiency, and management of Government operations and activities relating to travel

arranged by the Executive Office of the President, by abolishing the White House Travel Office and requiring procurement of travel-related services by the Executive Office of the President from private-sector sources; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 2889. A bill to eliminate the duties on 2-Amino-3 chlorobenzoic acid, methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAXON:

H.R. 2890. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of certain footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 2891. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a presumption of service connection for certain specified diseases and disabilities in the case of veterans who were exposed during military service to carbon tetrachloride; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2892. A bill to impose sanctions on Burma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, the Judiciary, Commerce, 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 Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 2893. A bill to provide increased access to health care benefits, to provide increased portability of health care benefits, to provide increased security of health care benefits, to increase the purchasing power of individuals and small employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, and Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 2894. A bill for the relief of the seven individuals who were terminated from employment with the White House Travel Office on May 19, 1993; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW:

H.R. 2895. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to fireworks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2896. A bill to limit the issuance of public debt obligations after December 31, 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 2897. A bill to increase the public debt limit, to protect the Social Security trust funds and other Federal trust funds and accounts invested in public debt obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, 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. TATE:

H.R. 2898. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that aliens

removed from the United States as illegal entrants or immigration violators shall permanently be inadmissible; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH (for herself and Mr. ENSIGN):

H.R. 2899. A bill to establish within the Department of Energy a National Test and Demonstration Center of Excellence at the Nevada Test Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committees on Science, and 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. WHITE (for himself, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. RICHARDSON):

H.R. 2900. A bill to establish nationally uniform requirements regarding the titling and registration of salvage, nonrepairable, and rebuilt vehicles; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, 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. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. WAMP, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution condemning the court-martial of Specialist Michael New of the U.S. Army in response to his refusal to wear on his military uniform the insignia of the United Nations and calling on the President to vindicate this courageous young man, override his conviction, and restore him to a place of honor in the Army; to the Committee on National Security.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. REED, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 135. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the political and human rights situation in the Republic of Kenya; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H. Con. Res. 136. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress concerning resolution of the conflict between the Government of Turkey and Kurdish militants; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ARMEY:

H. Res. 343. Resolution electing Representative James A. Hayes of Louisiana to the Committee on Ways and Means; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FAZIO of California:

H. Res. 344. Resolution electing Representative Michael McNulty of New York to the Committee on Ways and Means; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BEREUTER (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SANFORD):

H. Res. 345. Resolution expressing concern about the deterioration of human rights in Cambodia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GOSS:

H. Res. 346. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives respecting the procedures of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BERMAN):

H. Res. 347. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the human rights situation in China and Tibet and encouraging the United States to sponsor and press for the enactment of a resolution condemning the human rights situation in China and Tibet at the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. Boehner, Mr. COX, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BLLEY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. MICA, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. SALMON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. BONO, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOSS, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KIM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LINDER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. JONES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. BAKER of California):

H. Res. 348. Resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of the standards proposed by the National Center for History in the Schools for the teaching of U.S. history and world history; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

199. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, relative to support for the American Troops in Bosnia and Herzegovina; to the Committee on National Security.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SCARBOROUGH introduced a bill (H.R. 2901) for the relief of Joel Andrew Dopp; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 248: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 249: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 264: Mr. FOX.

H.R. 322: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 359: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 580: Mr. BROWDER.

H.R. 883: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 963: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 995: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1023: Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1027: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1406: Mr. SHAW and Mrs. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1484: Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 1575: Mr. FOX and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 1591: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1625: Mr. PAXON and Mrs. SEASTRAND.

H.R. 1661: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1684: Mr. GORDON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HAYES, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 1750: Mrs. KENNELLY.

H.R. 1757: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1780: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 1794: Mr. BUYER and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1876: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1893: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 2011: Mr. WARD and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 2039: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2133: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 2178: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2192: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 2199: Mr. ZIMMER.

H.R. 2214: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 2228: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2247: Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 2320: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2374: Mr. BLUTE.

H.R. 2463: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2468: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2480: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2566: Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 2578: Mr. MORAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. MOORHEAD.

H.R. 2579: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 2602: Mr. GOSS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2604: Mr. WAXMAN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2640: Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. EVANS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2650: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 2651: Mr. FRAZER, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 2682: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2690: Mr. FRAZER.

H.R. 2691: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2697: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. JACKSON.

H.R. 2700: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 2701: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KING, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. ROSE, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 2716: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2728: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.R. 2745: Mrs. KENNELLY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FORD, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. WARD, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 2755: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2777: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. STARK, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. YATES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. DELUMS, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2778: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. HORN, Mr. WELLER, Mr. FOX, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CONNIT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BURR, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. MARTINI.

H.R. 2795: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2807: Mr. BAKER of Louisiana and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 2823: Mr. GOODLATTE, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 2827: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 2828: Mr. COBURN and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 2837: Mr. RUSH, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2854: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mr. CHRYSLER.

H.R. 2862: Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WARD, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FALCOMA, Mr. DICKS, Mr.

JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. KLING, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2867: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. DANNER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BARR, and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.J. Res. 117: Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 23: Mr. ZIMMER and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. KIM, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. MARTINI.

H. Con. Res. 132: Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. TATE.

H. Res. 333: Mr. SAWYER.