Without the folding room, the House is a more confused and inefficient operation. Is this what the American people voted for in the last election?

And, there is a very important moral issue at play. Over 100 people lost their jobs when the folding room was abruptly shut down. Many of these people were loyal employees of the House with over 20 years of faithful service. I believe that the treatment of the folding room staff was wrong. I am very distrusted that many are starting to believe that the House is the last plantation. If the labor laws of America are to be applied to Congress, then the employees of the House should be treated with at least minimum levels of respect and decency.

I want Congress to be efficient and mindful of the taxpayers' money. However, by closing the folding room, the total money spent by the House will most likely increase, constituent service will be slowed, and the House will appear to be even more out of touch. The Oversight Committee's action are well intentioned, but poorly implemented. The House may find that it needs to look at this issue again.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE RYAN WHITE CARE ACT

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is fast approaching the time in this country when we will reauthorize a very important health care act known as the Ryan White Care Act. This act does tremendous amounts of good in terms of offering health care for those afflicted with this dreadful disease.

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] for his efforts to raise the awareness of this body, as well as this country, as to the former testing practices of the CDC, and we also owe a debt of gratitude to him for making us aware of the failed policies of the ethicists that have advised the CDC, for over this past year we have been blindly testing mothers and children for this disease, without their knowledge, and when finding positive cases we have refused to identify those positive cases and offer treatment for both newborn children and their mothers, this all at the advice of a group of ethicists that told our CDC that this was an appropriate practice.

The other disturbing thing about that is that the CDC thought it was an appropriate practice, that newborn children infected with a deadly virus and knowledge of that by our own Centers for Disease Control should not have the opportunity for the best treatment that we have available, and also their mothers should not have the knowledge or opportunity that they in fact could be treated, their quality of life could be prolonged, and complications arising from this disease could be prevented.

That, however, has not been the full story of what has happened. Because of the awareness that has come to light through the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], we will be proposing, with the new Ryan White authorization, an opportunity for children to have a future.

□ 1245

There is no place today where we have and can make an impact on the HIV epidemic in this country like that associated with women of reproductive age. Today the fastest growing segment in this epidemic is women in the reproductive age category. It is growing 8 times faster in this group than in any other group in our country.

We also have the opportunity to truly impact newborn babies, because now we have a treatment that prevents, two-thirds of the time, infection in the baby from a woman who might be carrying the HIV virus.

The opportunity that will be coming before us will be shadowed in many debates, a debate on confidentiality, a debate on the rights of women not to be tested, but the ultimate debate that will come about as we reauthorize Ryan White will be the debate of how we have handled this epidemic in our country. In 1981, the first case was diagnosed, and today we have 2.5 million people in our country with this virus. We should ask if we are proud of the job that this country has done in facing this disease, in the way that our Government agencies have handled the epidemic and their approach to it.

But, most importantly, where we have an opportunity to make a difference, to prevent infection in newborn children, we should not shrink back from that. We should stand up and make the difference, the difference that not only will save several thousand babies' lives each year but also, in this time of scarce resources, will add a quarter of a billion dollars in saved health care costs just from testing mothers during their first trimester of pregnancy.

It is my hope and my wish that we will step aside from the politically correct positions of our country and look at the real harm that this infection has caused, not to make callous judgments on those who have unfortunately acquired this disease but all work together to make a new and improved effort at making a difference, saving lives and controlling this epidemic.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2265, MOTOR SPORTS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I introduced H.R. 2265, the Motor Sports Protection Act to meet the threat to professional auto racing posed by Bill Clinton's assault on tobacco.

If tobacco companies are forced to remove their sponsorship of racing the very existence of NASCAR, NHRA, and formula one is in doubt. NASCAR alone is a $2-billion industry. An advertising ban will put thousands of Americans out of work.

Richard Petty the king of racing noted: ''That all race fans can rally around this bill and I want to help stop Big Brother from attacking law abiding, family oriented, hard working citizens who enjoy racing.'' Mr. Speaker, this is not about tobacco alone. It is about whether we will stand up and fight another blatant power grab by the Federal Government. We must draw the line against bureaucratic meddling with this wholesome, all-American sport. H.R. 2265, is the first step in our fight to win back Government for our people. Please join the effort and help save racing.

THE BALANCED-BUDGET MYTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to preliminarily begin with some general remarks and then as I go into my allotted time, I will be more specific in the issue that I feel is in urgent need to be discussed.

The reason I wanted to have some preliminary remarks by way of explanation is that this period set aside that we designate as special orders is a very interesting one with a very interesting history in which I am very proud of the role I played in developing it into an accepted and formal part of the procedures.

In the beginning of my career here in the House, which of course spans quite a number of years going back to 1961, it was not the custom to practice what we call today special orders. It was looked upon as a quite radical if not an unaccustomed practice, and the procedure was very, very formal, very standardized, and allowed for no real participation even during the general consideration of the full House for any but the very few selected leaders who exercised total power at that time.

Well, of course, that is a long time ago. Those of us who have managed to span these years have noticed, with some gratification, the changes since that rather straitjacketed and quite sterile period of time. Of course in the interim the country has literally been shaken to root and marrow with some very, very substantial issues and developments that have engulfed it, not because there were issues born spontaneously from within our country, but as the work shrunk and the United States after the war became an inescapable even though quite reluctant leader of

the world, has had to accept those issues and those matters that were very seldom confronted in the House in any kind of a general debate.

There have been quite radical and innovative changes since then. I am recalling a period of time in which any but the leadership, very select leadership, participated in the general procedures. There was no such thing as an individual Member, not part of that very select and small group, initiating or even addressing the full House.

So by dint of the force of circumstances and the great historical occurrences that hit the country and because of the worldwide changes, that, of course, changed the whole aspect and it has been reflected in the internal proceedings in our House. I believe that I have witnessed about every single major occurrence, or as I call it, great landslides in developmental history of this country, both social, economic, and political.

In the first place, I consider myself and want to acknowledge the privilege that I have been given by virtue of our institutional system in our country, one born of freedom, one born of equal access to all citizens depending on the citizen's own exertions and energy and whatever innovative changes he was motivated to bring about. When I first came to the House, it was not that way at all. It was very formal, very staid, very rigid.

I do not recall sessions of the House being held more than at the most 2 or 3 days a week, and of a duration of not more than 2 hours on each occasion. But, of course, this was before the great watershed developments that engulfed us as well as the rest of the world. We must remember that I am talking about a period of time that antedated the Berlin Wall crisis, which today who recalls such other at that time Earth-shaking crises, and then, of course, the internal and the vast sea changes in our domestic, economic, and social structural composition.

Now today, though, I want to take advantage of this opportunity, which is a great opportunity. I am proud of the contribution I have made to providing this hour which we call here and designate special orders, but which is really born out of one of the original legislative practices mounting back to the very first Congress, and that was the privilege, because that is what it is, it is a privilege under our system of legislative procedures based on hard and fast rules, of a multiple body in which it is quite understood and it makes common sense to understand that if you have a multiple body such as this, 435 Members, you have to have some order of selectivity in the recognition of the Members. Otherwise, it would be confusion, worse, confounded and compounded.

But today I am here to set the record straight about a very misleading slogan which is being broadcast from the rooftops and the airwaves through our country, in Washington, from various groups around the country, and last weekend from most of the speakers at Ross Perot's meeting at the Dallas Convention Center we were hearing the same refrain, quote, balance the budget, balance the budget, balance the budget.

Of course many swear their dedication to this goal or this slogan or this, I do not know what else to call it, but a myth of balancing the budget. It is said by them that once the budget is balanced, we will all be saved from the dire consequences that having the deficit in the Government budget imposes on us.

I have been one of those that from the beginning of my career have noted this balance-the-budget outcry and have followed it all through these 35-plus years in the House.

□ 1300

Now, our friends in the other party, the Republican Party, say that their miracle cure on this goal of balancing the budget will take only 7 years. However, those of us who were around during the Republican administrations of the 1980's and early 1990's find their plan to be like an arsonist; someone who sets the fire to a building, and then brags about how quickly he can come around with the firearm and put it out.

Before the first budget request of these Republican administrations, at the beginning of 1981, and recall I have been through all of this, the total Government debt, mind you, minus debt held by the Government itself, was $769 billion. that is a lot of money, but it is nothing like the $2.8 trillion debt they left behind in 1992.

Mind you, an 11-year period, and from that amount, $769 billion to $2.8 trillion is quite a bit of a difference and a accumulation of what I said then and continue to say is unacceptable debt.

During these Republican administrations, these are Republican administrations, mind you, even though it was the Democrats that were constantly pilloried as the spenders and wastrels by these same Republicans, but it was during these Republican administrations, I repeat, that the deficit of the Federal Government, that is the amount, the Federal Government spends over and above its revenues, grew to large proportion of the country's total income.

In 1983, the deficit was over 5 percent of the Nation's total income, and it was over 4 percent in 1984, 1985, and 1986. Now, in 1995, the deficit has come down. After 3 years of a Democratic administration, the deficit is slightly over 2 percent of the Nation's income. This is at least some substantial progress.

Mr. Speaker, it is not success, but it is certainly a big march down the road toward that. Now, the truth about what the deficit is going to be in 7 years, that is in the year 2002, is that nobody, under any plan, knows with any precision what that deficit might be. By the year 2002, the total income of everyone in the country will grow from its present level of about $7 trillion to somewhere around $8.4 trillion, if it grows at about 2.7 percent per year, as it is projected.

Nobody, no economist, no statistical expert, and no Republican budgeteer spewing a constant barrage of projections and balanced budget slogans could possibly tell you with any certainty whether the budget deficit will be plus or minus 2 percent of the Nation's income in the year 2002. Given the unknown course of the economy, which is now struggling through a period of slow growth, no one could even predict with any certainty what total income will be 7 years from now.

Now, many so-called experts didn't even know last year how slow income would grow this year. Certainly the Federal Reserve did not know when they doubled short-term interest rates again and again in only 13 months, and I protesting every inch of the way, and protesting since my coming to the Congress at this type of an action, because that is the heart of the matter.

Any power in any country that controls interest rates controls the life of that country. That is what I have said all along and repeat it now.

And now, they have begun to retreat with lower interest rates after they have seen the consequences of this foolish policy. In the race of the balanced budgeteers, there are now attempts in the Congress to forget about the people who have no well-heeled lobbyist working the halls of the Nation's Capitol in their behalf.

Many of us are familiar with the increasing problem of poverty in our country, even though it is not much discussed and even though it can conveniently be out of sight of the general middle-class public.

We know the people who will be hurt the most. There are numerous statistics showing the Nation's distribution of income is continually getting worse. This week an international study, the nonprofit Luxembourg Income Study, financed by the U.S. National Science Foundation, made some international comparisons that point to this critical problem in the United States.

The researchers found that the gap between the rich and the poor families with children in the United States is the largest among the 18 industrial countries that they studied and rated. The largest. Our country with the largest gap between the rich and poor families with children in the world in the industrial world.

One of the authors of the study, Timothy M. Smeeding, said that while the gap between rich and poor is generally wider in the United States than in other developed countries, U.S. social programs for the poor are less generous. In an interview this week, Smeeding is reported to have said, and I quote, ''Some people say we're such a rich country that even our poor kids are better off. It isn't true.''

So what is the Congress now doing in the face of this national tragedy? On the table there are proposals to turn back welfare legislation to the States and eliminate Federal standards and supervision. For example, there is proposed legislation to abolish the aid for dependent children, this real spinal column of all aid programs, and replace it with a temporary family assistance block grant to States. Under that program, there would be no Federal guarantees, which will mean much lower assistance to most of our Nation's citizens who happen to be poor.

This means more deprivation for poor children. This is no gimmick; this is the truth. The history of welfare payments since 1970 shows that this type of proposed legislation is misguided.

For example the State aid for families with dependent children payments have been jointly funded by the National and the State governments, but they are set at the State level. AFDC, as this program is known, began in 1937, and benefits increased for three decades. In 1940, the average States' benefit paid to a family was $287 in 1993 dollars. In 1970, it reached its top amount of $608, and then began to drop, reaching $349 in 1993, again measured in 1993 dollars. That is almost the same level as in 1940, and this is a shame.

Since 1970, these welfare benefits corrected for inflation, have declined because States have been fearful they would attract poor people if their benefits were high. This was the so-called undesirable magnet effect.

Mr. Speaker, it is a travesty to commit to a policy to further deprive the Nation's poor and destitute at a time when the problems of poverty are becoming worse. In 1993, 39.3 million of our citizens, that is 15.1 percent of the population, were considered poor under the official measure based on family income during the year.

This is an increase of 1.3 million people from 1992. In 1993 over one-fifth, 22 percent, of all children were poor and there is a good chance that new poverty figures will not show any improvement. The Government poverty-income cutoff for a family of four was $14,763. The Federal Government has a duty to provide assistance for those citizens. It does not benefit anyone in this country, rich or poor, to let conditions of poverty continue without help from the Federal Government.

One example of a beneficial effect of Government programs is the poverty rate for older people, at one time higher than that of children, which dipped below the child poverty rate in 1974 and has remained that. However, that could change if Medicare is seriously underfunded as the Republicans are now proposing in order to give a tax break—net tax break—to the wealthy.

It is an embarrassment to rational reasoning, and a con game with terrible consequences, to use the balanced budget slogan to justify gutting our already lean program designed to help the less fortunate. We should not, and will not balance the budget of America on the backs of the poor.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

REPORT OF FACTFINDING TRIP

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, we have had a fast 3 days. Started late on Wednesday, finishing early today. Pressure is building up here for a major budgetary struggle between the two major, only major parties in the world's only superpower, on all of these budgetary issues.

We have come back from a long, what we sometimes euphemistically call a district work period. We are supposed to cram in a vacation and work hard. For some of us, it is hard work.

I took one of the more difficult and fast-moving factfinding trips of my career, now that I am one of only two double chairmen out of all 435 Members of this Chamber. I chair a Subcommittee on Intelligence, the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence, and I chair the Subcommittee on Military Personnel, which becomes the most important of all 5 military subcommittees under the Committee on National Security, what used to be called Armed Services, and is still called Armed Services in the House of Lords or the other Chamber, the Senate.

On this trip, in discussing the issues with new young enlisted men, senior sergeants, petty officers, and the officer corps at all levels, up to and including four-star admirals, at Naples, at the major air base that is in command of all the bombing missions going on as we speak over poor torn ripped Bosnia-Herzegovina. And at Brendezy, down at the coast at the very heel of the Italian peninsula.

That is where we have our Navy Seals, where we have what was a major listening post base. In all the world, there are only five listening to everything, San Vito Air Station, using the international airport at Brendezy where we keep our AC–130 Hercules special mission Spectre gun ships.

I met with all the crews there. It is still classified whether or not they are going in at night over Bosnia. These were the aircraft that if we had them in Somalia over Mogadishu, we would have saved a dozen or more lives of our best trained Army special forces and Delta Force, Rangers and 160th Aviation Regiment, special armed squadrons.

Then I traveled with Congressman GREG LAUGHLIN, the highest ranking active reservist in the House or the Senate, of Galveston, TX, and we went to Slovenia. A fascinating, brand-new country in the world. It never had nation status, let alone a seat in the United Nations since the dissolution of the Communist country of the former Yugoslavia.

□ 1315

Then we went down to Croatia, met with Secretary General Boutros Boutros-Ghali's special representative to all of the problems in former Yugoslavia, Mr., that is his formal title, Mr. Sasushi Akashi, met with him at the U.N. headquarters, the blue helmet home plate in Zagreb, then went down along the Dalmatian coast, drove slowly through all of the destruction wreaked upon one of the world's most beautiful coastlines, looks for all the world like the California coastline between Santa Barbara and Monterey—just torn apart. The international airport in Zadar utterly destroyed except for the runways, all of the international terminal buildings, hollow shells of aluminum, like a nuclear explosion went off, the tower, all the windows shot out with AK–47's by the retreating Bosnian soldiers. They almost cut Croatia in half at that point, Zadar.

Then we went down to Macedonia, met with all of our American tripwire forces out in the front outposts along the border, flew on white helicopters, UH–60 Blackhawks that, of course, called themselves the Whitehawks, with the United Nations stenciled on the sides, went out to these American outposts, studied this poor city of Skopje, which had been destroyed by an earthquake in 1963. It has never really made it back to a stable, functioning city, still great pockets of poverty from that horrible earthquake in 1963.

Then we flew over to Albania, one of the most godforsaken but still physically beautiful countries in the world, and met with the president there, Sali Berisha, Mr. Berisha; he is a European renowned heart surgeon. His wife is a renowned doctor of pediatrics, a child doctor. What a lucky country to go from the depths of communism with a paranoidal maniac, Enver Hoxna, one of the last psychotic, paranoid Communist dictators in the world, who literally took this beautiful country of Albania, a brand new country created after World War I, not a traditional nation on the face of the Earth, and just drove it into the ground, more than a half-century of locked-up paranoia and total Communist psychotic oppression, and now they have a wonderful president who said to me and to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LAUGHLIN], although he wants to be in the United Nations and would like to be accepted into NATO, he does not care what happens in the world if he just has the friendship of the United States, just one on one, unilateral friendship, and he thinks Albania will make it into the 21st century.

That is the identical message we got north of there in another one of the eight parts of Yugoslavia that have spun off in Solvenia, same message: ''U.S. friendship is what we want.''

In Albania, we looked at what was supposed to be a top-secret program