who came up with this idea. Many times people come by our offices and bring us small tokens or some products from back home. When we get such abundant products, some of which sit on our shelves and go to waste, she thought it only appropriate that we reach out and help those in our Nation's Capital, that the food really go to use for those who truly need our help.

Again, I would like to congratulate my colleagues in Congress for supporting this very, very worthwhile project.

Mr. Speaker, let me speak for a moment on something that I think really needs reform in the United States Congress. Yesterday in the Committee on Science I had the good fortune of striking what I considered wasteful spending in Congress. Twenty-five thousand dollars was allocated to gas-cooled nuclear technology, which has been underway for over 30 years. The Department of Science, the Department of Energy, all conclude that this proposal is going nowhere, that commercial application of this gas-cooled technology is going nowhere.

The President's budget for three times has consistently voted against it. The Senate turned it down in 1993. However, somehow the $25 million has shown up in House appropriations. I won an amendment 25 to 15 to strike this $25 million from the budget.

Today in the committee, however, Mr. Speaker, one of the Members decided $25 million is too much to pass up, and offered an amendment which was successful, to transfer that $25 million to another program.

There is a problem here in Washington, and the problem is people in Congress cannot get their hands out of the wallet, out of the checkbook of our Nation's taxpayers; that every dollar that is on the table, any dollar that is missed by an appropriator, any dollar that is offered up as sacrifice for deficit reduction, is instantly claimed as found money, so they say ''Let us get every cent of that $25 million and find something else to spend it on.''

Mr. Speaker, I can only reach in my pocket so deeply to find the very few dollars that are in it. Every dollar I come out with is my dollar. However, in this institution, the dollars are somebody else's. The card that we vote with is the world's most expensive credit card. We stick this in the machine and we can spend billions of dollars without any consequence.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat appalled when this Congress cannot come up with a mechanism that when a Member offers a deficit reducing formula to save the taxpayers money, that saves money from wasteful spending, that we cannot take that money and earmark it and lockbox it away to bring down the Nation's deficit. It is clearly one of our greatest problems. It clearly is driving up the cost of credit for consumers.

Clearly, the cost of credit for buying a home today, a 30-year mortgage, 7½ to 8 percent, would be brought down over 2 points if we get the Federal Government's appetite for credit to be minimized, and the private sector would then see relief for the average consumer.

However, no, not in this body. I see money, I spend money. I see money they do not want, I will spend it over here. Mr. Speaker, I say to the Members who are listening to this, they need to clearly reflect on what our priorities are. I think we should be in a race to see who can save the most money.

The prior speaker suggested that the Republicans are only interested in voting for bombers and missiles and are not concerned with AIDS and other issues. This Member of Congress voted against the B–2 bomber. This Member of Congress does indeed support increased funding for AIDS research, because I think the cost to the taxpayers will be exacerbated by the cost of AIDS in our community.

Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to characterize all Republicans as mean-spirited, only interested in defense and not interested in social services.

RESCISSIONS, BUDGET, AUTHORIZATIONS, APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Texas, [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, rescissions, budget authorization, appropriation. Mr. Speaker, I imagine the American people are wondering what holds up in the U.S. Congress, what is the job and the tasks of those that would represent us.

We have heard these words: rescission, budget, authorization, and appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to an issue of great importance, not only to the people of my Houston district, the 18th Congressional District, but to the entire country. It is interesting, Members will hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chastise, criticize, and disjoint the pleas of the American people. What they will claim is that this particular Congress is filled with nothing but special interests, special interests here, special interests there, special interests over there.

I would simply say that this Nation is not filled with special interests, it is filled with special aspirations. We want to be inspired and challenged. We want to dream. We want a Nation that is not on the brink of a recession. We want economic enhancement and development.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say, as we begin to look at this process—rescissions, budget authorization and appropriation—why do we not understand what the special aspirations are of Americans?

I would simply say that this young lady, possibly an honors graduate, simply wants an opportunity for higher education; or would you say that she does not deserve it? I would venture to say if she is typical, she has about 70 percent student loans that have to be paid back, and we understand that we must make sure and ensure that we have a system that ensures that recommitment back to the student loan program, and maybe only 30 percent scholarship. She is typical of the student in America today: hardworking.

Many campuses that I go and visit in my district alone, which is only an example, whether they are the Houston Community College, whether it is a 4-year college in Chicago, IL, or maybe a private college in Atlanta, GA, there are hardworking students there. All they simply want is an opportunity and a chance.

What do we have out of this process of rescissions, budget, authorization, and appropriations? Cutting student loans, not for fiscal responsibility, which I have standing to be here, because I voted for a balanced budget, but we do not have our interests and our goals and our focus right.

When we go to the House floor and begin to talk about deadbeats in America, does that include those citizens who have fallen upon tragic hard times in Oklahoma City? Does it include those who have faced tragedy and loss in Florida, with the weather and hurricanes? Does it include those individuals and citizens in California suffering in the recent earthquake just about a year ago or so?

America is a country of people. It is people with aspirations. Yes, we should balance the budget, but what are we doing? During the rescissions process, which is taking back money, it seemed that we could find nowhere else to cut but summer jobs. That seems like someone would be able to stand up and talk about ''Oh, another handout.'' I argue vigorously not, for summer jobs, which must include the partnership of corporate America, give young people the opportunity to work. It gives them the culture of work. It allows them to have an understanding of what work is all about.

Although these particular youngsters are not necessarily real, they do symbolize what is good about America, the fact that we have children who have an opportunity to grow up strong, hopefully healthy, like many of the babies and young people and elementary school youngsters that I see in Wesley Elementary School or Turner Elementary School or Peck Elementary School or Pleasantville Elementary School, located in the 18th district, along with the wonderful elementary schools in the North Forest Independent School District, and Ailine, and parts of Ailey.

□ 1845

It simply exhibits that we have as a responsibility in this Nation to be fiscally responsible but to take care of our children.

Do you think it makes sense, then, to cut a program called WIC, women and infant children, that not only provides nourishment and nutrition for children but in fact it provides opportunity for young mothers to get their children immunized? What is the ultimate impact of that? It means that we will have less of those be subject to disease, and lower health costs, and all of us would like to see that.

What we have had happen is rescission, so the first part of this half a year has been taking back money. It seems that the knife-cutting has been on the aspirations of young people and children, clearly taking away hope, and not playing the role that the government should, not in charge, not dominating but actually being a partner. That is what we should be.

We have heard your cry from America, and we know there are those who may be a little misguided. I read an errant writer who wrote to a local paper,

> Don't ask me to feel guilty for the innocent children of someone who is too lazy to provide for them. Sorry, it just does not work anymore. When you can find several generations of welfare recipients living in public housing, who live off of others from birth until death, something is wrong and it's just not my fault.

An easy statement to make. In fact, as my children would say, that's the ''in'' thing. ''That's fresh. That's cool.'' That is what everybody is saying. That is what the polls say is something good and cool and receptive to say: ''Get rid of the deadbeats. I don't want to support them.''

But when you actually probe who is on welfare, it happens to be many people who want to get off. Should we provide an incentive to get off? Of course. Should we purge those who have been on and not seeking employment? Of course. But to blanket and to label all of those folks as individuals who are not my problem, somebody else's problem, is misguided, is not an example of the true spirit of America, which is to challenge people to be better and to give people a better opportunity.

As the Committee on Appropriations marks up the various bills for fiscal year 1996, I am concerned that many programs such as education and housing and job training will not receive adequate funding. They equal investment in America.

We can fight articulately and well for programs like defense and space and research, vital programs. But you cannot tell me you cannot imagine the value of matching that, creating the scientist through education that will then be at NASA, the technologist who will then be at the Defense Department who will help us be militarily ready. Why would we want to counter this young woman's opportunity and my wonderful dolls who are symbolic of all the children in America?

Have you listened to some of our children talk about their hopes and dreams? Some youngsters today talk about their feet of living past a certain age, many in the inner city, some in our rural communities, because they are exposed, if you will, to more than we have ever been exposed to with respect to violence and threats against their lives. They are feeling that maybe they will not be able to get to come up to this young lady's stage in life, happy, graduating from high school, looking for a dream.

I understand that it is the ''in'' thing to talk about the other fellow. The Republican majority has produced a document they call Cutting Government. There is not a one of us who would not sit down to the table of reason and talk about downsizing, talk about making government efficient.

You know what the real dream is and the real focus? You should have a plan behind cutting, not a mishmash of scissors, going here and going there. I believe in a lock box. If we save some dollars, there is an opportunity to put it in a lock box for deficit reduction. But let us not lose our dream, our path, the hope that we give to these young people.

The document proposes to eliminate three Cabinet departments, this Cutting Government document, 284 programs and 69 commissions and 13 agencies, some of which we can get along without, many of which have made it through their time period of survival or purpose.

But yet if we look seriously and honestly about where we want to go in this Nation in the 21st century, we would be appalled at the cost cutting in vocational job training. We would be literally appalled at the programs for Goals 2000. We would be literally overly overwhelmed, if you will, by the proposals that would undermine the role of Government, giving hope to those who would seek hope.

These proposals do not represent budgetary surgery with intelligent scalpel-like precision. Instead, Mr. Speaker, these goals are tantamount to crafting a fiscal policy with a meat cleaver.

Some people would say, well, these only impact on these soft programs. But when you cut housing, when you cut veterans' benefits, when you go into the infrastructure and cut transportation dollars, you are literally turning the clock back.

You might have heard some years ago the commitment of this Government to rebuild America. Many of you may have read in your local newspapers about the pending or the possibility of a recession. That is why I am hopeful, with the President's budget, that it is another opportunity for discussion of the best way to go.

It does not take us away from a balanced budget. It simply provides a reason and rationale for moving forward a little slowly in a 10-year period. I would simply say to you that it is important that we rebuild the highways of America, the bridges of America, the infrastructure work of America.

We are finding out that, as we have come under the Clean Water Act, and the Clean Air Act as well but particularly the Clean Water Act, many of our local communities find themselves with impure water, bad sewer conditions, and not able to enjoy the quality of life we would like for Americans.

Did you read recently the report from the Center for Communicable Diseases told most Americans, ''Boil your water before you drink it''? Someone would say, ''Are you sure you didn't see that in the paper back in the 1800's?'' No, we saw that today.

It is extremely important that we not take short shrift to the role Government can play. Let me simply share with you as we begin to look at how we can be more successful in focusing in a more reasoned manner in dealing with some of these issues.

I am a strong supporter of the defense of this Nation and of course, as I said, military readiness. That is a theme that everyone likes to promote and I think it is important. We want our young men and women, our enlisted men and women, to be secure and protected and prepared.

However, I am also concerned about families, children and the elderly. They, too, need our help as a partner. Let us not take the ugly way out, the castigating, the throwing stones, ''It's not my fault,'' ''I don't care about innocent children if the bums want to be on welfare.''

Yes, I am reiterating this because I think it is tragic, because Americans have always been individuals that have risen to the challenge. But as we look at this budget chart, we show the budget allocations for 1996, and I ask you to pay particular attention to the deep reductions in Transportation, Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, VA, and HUD appropriations.

Do you know what some of those HUD appropriations are all about? Well, it takes some of the folk that many of you see under the bridges, some who can be redeemed, some of the homeless folk under the McKinney Act we were providing and going at full steam ahead to house individuals and begin to turn them away from the mindset of homelessness.

I know it well, for when I served in the city of Houston on its local city council, I began to craft for that city a formula for working with its city's homeless, maybe about 10,000. There were many naysayers: ''You can't do anything with them. They like living under the bridges.'' But when we began to look, they were families, some of whom were living from paycheck to paycheck and because of some tragedy in the household, they were made homeless.

Let me tell you, we have turned that problem around. We have got folk housed in what we call transitional housing. We have got the private sector working with us. We have a downtown corporate community actively engaged in helping the homeless, and we are getting folk off of the homeless rolls, back into housing and being able to work as much as they want to work.

It is my challenge that we cannot abide by such draconian cuts and a withdrawal from investment in the future. We must be considerate and thoughtful.

When we look at these cuts and we see that it has been reduced, as I have said, by $9.8 billion, look very carefully at what we are going after. We are hurting cities. Cities are in fact the bastion, if you will, the heart and soul of civilization. Rome likes to think that, but cities are in fact where people are energized.

Let me include rural America, as well, because as I talk to my colleagues from rural America, they assure me that many of the ills that confront us in cities are there in rural America, and they need help with AIDS, they need help with housing for the homeless, they need help with health reform and health care, for I sat on a committee in the State of Texas, and it appalled me to see the number of rural hospitals closing because of the inability to fund indigent patients in rural America.

Can we stand for that? We can stand for more fiscally responsible health reform. We can be assured that we do the right thing and don't have people abusing the system. But can we have hospitals closing because we are in the budget-cutting business?

Mr. Speaker, what this evidences is the fact that we have forgotten our direction. We have forgotten the future of America.

I see my colleague from Illinois and I know how hard he has worked on many of these issues. In fact, he comes from a district that has called upon him to be of great service in this battle, and he has fought not for his single issues but he has fought for Americans.

I am very proud to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for taking this special order. I was back in my office going through my mail and I listened to her, and I said I want to come by and join my friend from Texas, because her message is my message. When you told the story about the college student loans, that touches me very, very deeply.

I was a recipient of Federal college student loans. My father passed away when I was a sophomore in high school. My mother was a payroll clerk for a railroad. We literally did not have the savings or resources to take care of my college education.

My mother and father had made it through the eighth grade. That was the extent of their education. They of course hoped I would do better, as every parent does. But when the time came to pay for those college expenses, I took a job, as every student would, and worked during the school year and during the summer months, and it just was not enough.

I got a little scholarship assistance here and there, but frankly had to turn to the U.S. Federal Government and something called the National Defense Education Act, that loaned me the money necessary to complete college and law school. It came to a grand total back in the 1960's of $7,500, which I thought was a mountain of debt I would never get out from under. Yet my wife and I worked and paid it off as we promised we would, so that younger kids behind us could have their opportunity.

When I listen to the proposals for budget deficit reduction from many of our friends among the Gingrich Republicans that suggest that we need to cut back on college student loans, that suggest we need to make the expense of a college education that much more for kids from working families, I think many of them have forgotten where they came from. They have forgotten that at a time in their life, this Government, this Nation, reached out a helping hand to them and was paid back in a great measure because for each of them who got that helping hand, there was an education, an opportunity, and I guess an opportunity to contribute to America, not only as a Member of Congress but in business and in so many different areas.

It seems to me so shortsighted for us to be cutting back on college student loans. I sincerely hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will remember how significant this is.

If I might mention one other point along these lines, 75 percent of the young people who graduate from high school are not going to end up graduating from college. They are going to go out in the work force looking for good-paying jobs. They will need other types of assistance, job training, to make sure that they are qualified for good-paying jobs.

I worry, too, as the gentlewoman points out the cutbacks that we are making in training and employment programs. She and I will be the first in line to suggest we need to modernize those programs, make them better.

I would commend to my friend from Texas, if she has not read it, a book by Hedrick Smith entitled ''Rethinking America,'' where he basically compares the educational systems in Germany, in Japan, and in the United States, and shows some real deficiencies in our system that need to be corrected. But we also have to understand that in those countries that are successful in taking kids right out of high school, putting them into good-paying jobs, career jobs, they have made a massive investment in training and education that is important to them.

Last week we had a debate here on a defense authorization bill, a question about building multibillion-dollar bombers.

□ 1900

Let me tell you, I think a few less bombers and a few more dollars spent on education and training would go a long way for a much more secure America in the future. The gentlewoman is right on track here, and I thank her for her leadership in this special order, and I will continue to stay here and join in, if I can, as she raises issues of mutual concern.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I thank the gentleman for his very, very kind comments but as well very, very pointed comments. He has taken me back for a moment. If I may have the gentleman indulge me just a moment, sometimes when you come to share, you are so busy focusing on numbers that you do not put the face on who may be impacted, and he took me back to my early years, and I think it is important because, let us be very frank, we are somewhat different. I think that is the face of America. It is important to realize that as the gentleman's history was, so was my history. I remember being the first to go to college in my family. Hardworking parents, their main goal was to make sure their children had a better opportunity and the time came for college and, of course, was I even then going to college, much less did we have funding to do so. Lo and behold came this opportunity for financial aid through and by a scholarship and grant and loan. The gentleman is right. The numbers seemed enormous at that time because I had them in college as he did and fortunately was able to go forth out of college and then decided, being inspired and really viewing America as a place that is a place of special aspirations, as I have mentioned, to go on to law school. Those numbers seemed enormous, but I think as the gentleman has said we can count those who have made good on those student loans and the broad brush of the problems with these programs that the Government involves itself in is not the way that we should go.

I know the gentleman spent many of his days in his district in May and June at graduations and he actually got to talk to students I would imagine, as I did. Each of them I think had stars in their eyes, holding that diploma, being able to look for an opportunity. There was not a dry eye in the place. I had to talk to those parents, many of whom had spent their life savings and were in trouble, but they were there clutching that purse, clutching that diploma, and hugging that child to say we can work with you to make sure you go, and I know that there will be a little bit of change here and a little bit of change there, but these are hardworking people. Should I come to the U.S. Congress and take that dream away from them?

The gentleman is right. What year is this: 1995 going into 1996. In 4 years almost we will be in the 21st century. Do we want to be any less of a nation than Japan, and as you mentioned England and Germany and France and Italy, in terms of any focus they may have on work, job creation, and the training of our young people?

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentlewoman will yield, I would like to also comment we spend so much time on this floor talking about statistics and numbers and percentages and budget outlays, and all sorts of things which I am sure most of the viewers back home say, what in the world is that all about.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That is why I started out with budgets appropriations, authorizations.

Mr. DURBIN. I am so glad the gentlewoman did, and I think what we have to do too is try to translate some of the debate here on the floor to the real lives, to the people we represent.

If I can use an example, I went to a community college in my homeland, Lincoln Land Community College, to talk about the increased costs of college student loans from the Gingrich Republican proposals, and I asked the students what impact this would have on them when the average student will see an increase of $5,000 in the cost of their college education because of Gingrich Republican proposals, and a number of students said: This is tough, Congressman, it is tough enough now. We want to get out of school and get to work. We stretch out our education because it is so expensive, and now you tell me it is going to be more expensive.

So we broke up the meeting as I started to leave and a young lady came up to me, an African-American lady. She said: I was a little too embarrassed to raise my hand, but let me tell you my story. I am a welfare mother, I have two children. I am coming out to this community college and I have a college student loan. I said, ''What are you studying to be?'' ''I want to be a chef. I am trying to get the courses and training so I can be a chef and make a good living and get off welfare,'' she says. ''Now you tell me it is going to cost me more for this college student loan.'' She looked me in the eye and said, ''What am I doing wrong? Why are you making it tougher.''

We talk about welfare around here as if it is an easy thing for a person to get off. In many cases it might be, but sometimes it takes hard work. She was putting in hard work, finding somebody to watch the kids, going on out to school, taking the courses borrowing money to pay a college student loan, and community college tuition is pretty low, but she did not have it and had to borrow it, and now we are telling her it is going to be more expensive for her to try to get off welfare and go to work and have some personal responsibility. I think we have to remember some people like her around this country who are behind these statistics and standing behind these budgetary names. I think you have pointed it out here, and there are so many other areas too that we ought to be addressing.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. You tell her she need not be ashamed because I confronted her sister, who happened to be a white woman in Houston with two children who came up to me, how ironic, and said the very same thing and looked almost panicked because she was trying to grapple with and understand was I telling her tomorrow she would not have a student loan, but certainly expressing a fear because she too was leaping into the arena of independence.

The gentleman remembers how vigorously we worked as Democrats for real welfare reform. He remembers how vigorously we argued against welfare punishment and what was the deal? Work was the cornerstone of that proposal. It was again an investment back into America and Americans so that we would take less people into the 21st century on welfare. How proud we could be as a nation to be able to go into the 21st century and look back on real welfare reform that had welfare, job training, child care and health care, and a work element to it. How proud we would have been. How much we could have pointed to what the Government would have been able to say, not that it dominated, not that it took over, not that it spent too much, but it partnershiped with the States and local government to get masses of people off of welfare and to be working Americans in the 21st Century.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentlewoman would yield, I think what we determined during the course of that debate on welfare, we analyzed on the Democratic side and the Republicans did it on their side, and I think frankly we understood the parameters of welfare. Certainly there are people on welfare as there are people in business and in other walks of life who are going to try to take advantage of the system and game the system and stay on as long as they can. But I am impressed by how many people we meet who want to get off this welfare tangle. They really want to do something with their lives, and we have to decide whether as a nation we will invest in them and their future. And that investment is training, it is education, it is transportation, it is day care, it is some health care assistance for them during this period of time.

But think about it, if we do not do it, if we just leave that person in the depths of despair, stuck on welfare, hopeless, they are not only a drain on society, they have lost their own self-worth, and they really do not have a chance to succeed. So what we tried to do on the Democratic side was say all right, we will draw the line. You cannot be on welfare forever, but for goodness' sakes let us have a goal for each person. Let us move from welfare to work. Let us make people productive citizens in America today. That is an investment that will pay off for a long time to come. It is one we made after World War II.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Clearly did.

Mr. DURBIN. We said to the returning veterans, we really invested in you as soldiers and sailors and airmen, and now we are going to invest in you as American citizens and your families, and boy, did it pay off.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. What a boom in the fifties, was it not?

Mr. DURBIN. The greatest growth in the size of America's middle class in our history. We may never rival it again. I hope we do some day. But the country said as a nation our biggest and most important resource is our people, and these veterans and their families are an investment we are going to hold very dearly when it comes to their education and housing and businesses.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman raises, if I can move to two other issues that he reminded me of, and goes to the issue of investment and partnership. I think what we did when the veterans came back was actually the Government being affirmative, but it was a partnership. It was to give those returning veterans a leg up, and they got their leg up. They made good on their investment in terms of having served time. If they got some loans or some other governmental help, they became working Americans. They built all of the kind of tract houses throughout this Nation, but they became homeowners, taxpayers, and they raised their families.

The gentleman talked about how he had to work his way through, and most of us did, with that summer job or some kind of job. Interestingly enough many of us rose to the floor of the House to fight vigorously against cutting our kids, cutting them off from summer work.

Somebody made a lot of loose jokes about this baby-sitting camp, they are standing around. I made it my business to go back home and to reintroduce myself, if you will, because I have had youngsters work in my office in summer jobs, and I can tell you I did not see anyone being baby sat, if you will.

I tell you one personal story of a youngster, I will never forget her, came from a different background, was a recent immigrant of some years, family is now naturalized, Vietnamese, and called back one day after she was hired and said, ''Ma'am, I think I won't be able to come.'' We kind of calmed her down a little bit and prodded a little bit, and she said, ''I don't have the right clothes.'' We said whatever you have, we kind of tried to make it light, said if you have a paper bag, come on to our office. But that young lady was concerned she did not even have the clothes to come sit in an office. She worked harder than any other young intern during that summer. She learned something as well. I have heard great things about her since, graduating from college.

This is not a baby-sitting program. If we have got some, we will fix it. No one has said not to fix those programs that are not working, but I can go to the city of Houston and find youngsters getting good skills, getting an incentive to finish high school and go on to

college because they have been exposed to a workplace relationship. I would not deny any corporate American to participate with us in this program. I do not think any of us said that that was not possible. But the Government steps in to give incentive and to provide and to invest dollars in a worthy manner.

Let me add another point for your thought about this. You come from an urban area. What would we do without transportation? We can all debate on whether your urban transportation is mass transportation, train, rail, or someone else's bus or someone else's highway or bridge, but what would this Nation be? Our forefathers left the 13 Colonies and found a way to go west, go west, young man, young woman, to explore, and they got there through transportation, and of course the way they got there was a four-legged animal. We now today are prepared to make massive cuts. That is taking away from the opportunity for people to grow.

I see people up here, tourists who have visited this Capitol, many of whom have come by the transportation that includes the highways and the bridges of America. We are glad that they are here. We are glad they have the opportunity to freely flow throughout this Nation in freedom. What would they think if they got to the end of one bridge having traveled halfway across the country and it was nothing but an open pit because it had collapsed because it was in such disrepair? Is that a focus on what is good for Americans? Is that the cleaver mentality of the Republican majority? Yes, it is, the meat-cleaver approach. It does not invest capital in Americans, in jobs, in businesses, that help us design and build these infrastructures that are needed for us to be the kind of 21st-century nation.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. What we should recall too is there is nothing partisan about what the gentlewoman has just said. Possibly the greatest investment in modern times in America's infrastructure was made under a Republican President, President Eisenhower, who decided in the fifties that the United States would embark on an Interstate Highway System. It was unheard of. He was going to link up every corner of America through a modern highway system. In my part of the world, my hometown, Springfield, IL, is on old Route 66. It used to be the subject of a lot of songs and a lot of Americana. But Route 66 was replaced by Interstate 55, and so many other interstate systems. At the same time the middle class is growing after World War II with our GI bill and our investment, America made an investment in infrastructure that has paid off so handsomely for us. It is the greatest thing in the world when one of my communities, Quincy, IL, was recently designated as being on an interstate highway. All of a sudden now they have a chance to brag and say not only have we got a great highway, it is interstate standard. So you think about what this means to a community. If we do not keep up that investment in not only our highways and our bridges and our airports and ports, but in the people who build them, then frankly we will pay dearly in the future.

I watch some of these cuts that are coming down the line here.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. $1.1 billion in transportation, by the way.

Mr. DURBIN. $1.1 billion, and it not only affects what I have just described, but it also affects mass transit. In the city of Chicago, for example, so many working families get on that mass transit every day to get down to their workplace. It is their only way to do it. They cannot afford to drive and park. They have to take mass transit. Now we are seeing massive cuts in operating assistance. So these communities will see the fare box go up in cost, which means that families struggling now to get by, husbands and wives both working hard trying to make ends meet, have a new added expense because of this decision to cut back on operating assistance. It really raises a question about whether we are helping the right people.

I worry as much as the gentlewoman does that we have to help all of America, but I am particularly concerned about those who are struggling down at the bottom, those forgotten families at the bottom of the economic pyramid, who pay their taxes, play by the rules, and keep falling behind. When we see cuts in operating assistance for mass transit, we are not making it any easier for them to get to work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. If the gentleman would yield, I am glad he said that we are here for all Americans, because if I can get just a little bit feisty for a moment, I am darn mad about the accusation. I do not know about the gentleman. He has got Springfield and parts of Chicago. I know he has a corporate community, and I know he has worked with them, because I have worked with the corporate community in Houston.

□ 1915

Because I have worked with the corporate community in Houston and we have worked along the lines of making their needs come before the United States Congress and insure the activity for a climate that will create jobs and a good business climate. No one, I guess, is against that.

But I think that we fail and do not reach the mark. We do not get to the finish line if we do not do what is good for people.

We take that $1.1 billion away from transportation, including mass transportation, and Mr. and Mrs. Smith, who do not have a car or cannot afford the gasoline that will take them downtown on a regular basis, are then kept, and that is a lot of dollars, the transportation costs of going back and forth and maybe the youngsters are going to school on public transportation. It adds up, and every penny is counted in some families in America. You know, 14 million of the families in America earn under $10,000 a year, and so what we have is a situation where we are turning around and slicing ourselves in the wrong place because we are not investing in Americans and giving them the opportunity to go to that workplace and be part of the system.

And so I do not take very lightly any suggestions that the climate for business has not been good when Democrats have been in, because I think we have not come this far for them to be able to achieve in the best Nation in the world for the kinds of corporations that we have. They have enjoyed the bounty of this Nation.

And yet we now come to a point where we may undermine that very structure that they have, the talent, and the trained employees that I have had corporate executives tell me they depend on. They wonder where the trained workers will come from for the 21st century. We are cutting transportation for them to get there, and we are aimed, for cutting, if you will, the training for them, but yet I think, you know, this issue, we still have a billionaire tax loophole. We allow those folks to enjoy the bounty of this Nation. That means that they enjoy the green lands, the wonderful capital. I heard one colleague tell me what the percentage of what we are invested in America, what each of us owns. We are millionaires, to be certain, about what we own in this Government, and yet those individuals will enjoy the bounty, all of this goodness, and then have to abdicate their citizenship and live somewhere else where they will not pay taxes. They are billionaires, and we are losing about $3.5 billion a year.

Mr. DURBIN. The gentlewoman makes an important point. Most people may have missed it. There was a television special about folks who became so rich that in order to avoid paying Federal taxes, they renounced their citizenship, and by renouncing their citizenship and becoming citizens of some other country, they avoided their Federal tax liability, so they used our Nation, they used our resources, they used our people, they filled up their bank account, and then they skipped town, and what we have been trying to do, actually skipped the country, what we have been trying to do here is to change that and to say that is all over. If you owe the Federal Government of the United States taxes and you have made a profit in doing it simply by renouncing your citizenship, we are not letting you off the hook. I am sorry we could not get our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in this effort.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Repeatedly we have tried, have we not?

Mr. DURBIN. We tried it several times. It strikes me as eminently sensible if a person earned his or her fortune in this country, they should not be able to get off the hook and escape the tax liability. These families getting on the mass transit every day in your hometown and the city of Chicago, they are paying their taxes. It is coming right out of their paycheck. They never think about renouncing their citizenship. They are proud of their country.

I am sure they get a little catch in their throat at the ''Star Spangled Banner'' and watching the flag.

Here we are protecting these folks who would walk away from America. That does not make any sense whatsoever.

I sincerely hope we can address this in the near term because it is really a loophole in the Tax Code that must be changed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me just draw you, as we begin to conclude on where we are trying to take this Nation, because I believe what has been misunderstood, as I have understood it, I have worked hard to be a part of the process, is that we have solutions. We did not totally ignore a tax cut. We had a reasoned tax cut for citizens making under $75,000.

There are solutions that can be bipartisan. We, as Democrats, looked at whether or not any citizen making over $200,000 need a tax cut. I have had them tell me they do not need it.

And so the tax cut that was offered, a fair one, I might add, really spoke to the issue of getting to those working families.

Mr. DURBIN. I just will ask the gentlewoman to yield so it is clear the tax cut package the Democrats support was for families making $75,000 a year and less.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. The tax break package supported under the Gingrich Republican contract actually gives tax breaks to families making $200,000 a year and more. A family could be making $4,000 a week and qualify for the Gingrich Republican contract tax break, and I think the gentlewoman makes an important point here. We ought to focus on helping people who ready need it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. We had a plan. I think that is what is important.

The other difficulty that I have is that many of the rescissions, remember I started out saying rescissions, budget, authorizations, appropriations but many of the rescissions, taking away money, was not even to place it with a focus, to help us move into the 21st century, maybe giving some more money to education. Those cuts they were doing was to give these people making over $200,000 more money, and not really focus on transportation, on military construction, or dealing with the training program or having a real welfare reform package. That is the exasperation.

That is what I think the American people need to understand. There is not a lot of talk here without action. We worked on real packages that, if accepted, would have been a fair bipartisan approach to this whole idea of, one, reducing the deficit, having a balanced budget over a period of years, which I think many of us may agree with, but we want to have focus and direction and we want to protect the working families of America.

We could not strike that chord, that unifying chord. What we actually had were pages and pages of cuts going to the very heart of veterans, like our good friend who is not a veteran but certainly our hero we had in Bosnia. He came back. We all praised him. Why were we praising him? Because he had the training, the training to know what to do. He saved himself, and he made us proud of America.

All through here are cuts that would impact on some aspects of what happened with that young man, who is a hero, aspects on his early education, training, secondary education, high school, college, impact on housing on those who are trying to get job training, all of these, a myriad of cuts.

I do not think anybody paid any attention to what they were impacting. They just got lists.

Mr. DURBIN. That point is an important one. The question is whether or not we have to make cuts to balance the budget. The answer is ''yes.'' The question is: Should we make more cuts in order to give a tax break to wealthy people and to profitable corporations?

What the Republicans proposed in their Contract on America was a package of about $350 billion in tax breaks. That meant, in order to move toward a balanced budget, we had to cut another $350 billion in spending on other programs, and we are down to the point now, there is still waste we can find, we are also finding they are proposing cuts in education and health care and things so critically essential to our Nation.

So does it make sense to cut a college student loan in order to give a tax break to somebody making $200,000 a year? That is upside down.

If we have limited resources, focus it on the people who need it.

What we said in our tax cut package was let us focus it, for example, on families that want to deduct the cost of college education for their kid. That is sensible. That says let them put together a little account for their kids' college education and get some favorable tax treatment as a result of it. That is a good investment all around, families doing the right thing for their son or daughter, the son or daughter gets a chance of an education, and the tax code is basically giving them incentive instead of for the person making $4,000 a week, handing them a tax break which they will never even notice.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I have had many say this is not the time for that income level to receive one. I have had them actually say that. I appreciate the employer or a constituent who would say they are concerned about the deficit, they do want to ensure they have got the kind of youngsters trained and other adults who need retraining, by the way.

Let me speak just a moment to something that is somewhat unpopular. That is what we are going to be facing as foreign aid. I know many of our citizens claim a great opposition to that.

What is the direction of the Republican Party, to cut aid to developing nations, that they want to get off, if you will, the dependence that they have on this Nation? And I support that.

And so some of the programs that help independence, humanitarian aid; I do not want to call any particular countries, but in particular to Africa where you are able to ensure that these individuals can stop coming to the United States, and that is where we all want to be. We want to see a world that is standing on its own two feet, that has people working, that has a country that stands up for helping their economic development.

We do not know how that vote is going to come out, but what I have seen to date, it seems that they have taken the ax again, or the cleaver, to programs that would allow those small countries to be independent, and I think we do the wrong thing when we think taking dollars away, because we do not know if those countries will fall then to some misguided political philosophy, because they have not had the opportunity, not to get a fish from us, but for us to teach them how to fish and to be able to go ongoing into the 21st century to be independent.

Mr. DURBIN. Foreign aid is not popular in any quarter in America. People are very upset about it. Many do not understand it. Sometimes it is humanitarian in nature.

We have seen these heart-rending pictures of people who are literally starving to death, mothers holding their children as they starve to death in their arms, and we sense as Americans a feeling of compassion and caring to come and provide our extra bounty so that they do not die literally in the dust covered with flies. That is what America has always been about, we have always stood for.

I will tell you an area of foreign aid the gentlewoman would agree with me on, and we really ought to take a look, and I am afraid we have not. That is military foreign aid. When it comes to sending our millions and often billions of dollars overseas to protect Germany and Japan, this Member has a real problem. Here we are, 50 years after World War II, and we are still defending Japan? For goodness sakes, these folks are cleaning our clock when it comes to the trade account. They ship all of their products here. They have a trade surplus with the United States, and we are sending millions of dollars

overseas for troops and ships and planes to protect Japan?

The same thing is true in Europe. For goodness sakes, now, the Berlin Wall is down. The cold war is over, and we still defend Europe 50 years later, while the Germans are investing and uniting their country and educating their work force, making better products, a higher, I might say, standard of living, unfortunately, than the United States, in many areas. That is military foreign aid which we tried to address on this floor in the name of burdensharing, saying to our allies, ''It is about time you share this burden that we have carried for 50 years in this country.''

But many of our friends who are the first to say they hate foreign aid would not even consider touching this military foreign aid which costs us so dearly.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. That is why I wanted to spend some time on solutions, because what comes out of the media and what trickles down to constituents is what are the solutions. We have had solutions.

What you have just talked about, yes, I join you on that. It made perfect sense, reasoned, logical planning of what we want this Nation to look like in the 21st century.

We all applauded the 50th-year celebration this past spring that we had celebrating the great coming together and the great victories we had in Europe in World War II. We celebrated, we embraced it, we went back to salute the heroes, they saluted us. We are in sync. We are committed to each other, Europe and Japan.

But the question is, the question becomes a very commonsense proposal that do we want to continue to pay for military, and it leads very well, as we move to July 4, what we are doing to our veterans.

It makes sense. We sit down to the bargaining table, we work out a process, we say if you get in jeopardy, we come to the table, we come and rise to the occasion.

But during peacetime, to continue to pay, time after time after time after time, over and over again, dollars to a peacetime relationship, it seems to me that you are not investing your money right. You are not making the right decision. It is not saying that we are isolationists or moving away from the international role that we need to have, because I support that.

I think America needs to be strong. I think we need to be there for our allies, but it makes no sense, to me, cutting veterans' benefits, having seniors come to me who are veterans saying that they are losing their benefits in health care, as someone has told them, because they have got to cut costs. These are people giving almost the extent of their life, and we are grateful they did not lose it, to this country, and yet we are cutting the very benefits of those who are in need.

We do not know what we may face in Desert Storm or what we may continue to face with Agent Orange with Vietnam veterans and others, and we need to ensure that we pay both our respects, like we like to do on these holidays, of which I join my veterans on Memorial Day, but we must show them, as we celebrate July 4, the founding of this Nation, and what we stand for, that we respect and appreciate them.

Why are we still taking care of the military overseas for other nations?

Mr. DURBIN. One of the things that I think is significant, and most Americans are not aware of this fact, is that we will spend about $270 billion in the next fiscal year on our military. I often ask in my town meetings if anybody in the audience knows which country in the world is No. 2 in military spending and how much they spend.

Well, most do not know, and it is almost a tie between Great Britain and France. Each of them spend about $45 billion a year, one-sixth of the amount that the United States spends, and yet despite all of this expenditure, $270 billion, six times more than any other nation in the world, we still have soldiers and sailors on food stamps.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. They are not being paid enough in the service not to qualify for food stamps; still, their income is too low.

So the quality of life for men and women in the service is being sacrificed at a time when they are our most important investment. We put money into these weapons, billions and billions of dollars, and overlook the most important weapons system, the men and women giving their lives and their time to serve in our American military.

□ 1930

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. As exhibited by the captain that was so heroic in this last month in terms of his coming out of Bosnia.

Mr. DURBIN. Lieutenant O'Grady.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. I like him a lot. I think all of America fell for this fellow, because he came out and it does us proud to have fellow who has come through such terrible ordeal and who says, ''Don't give me credit. Give the credit to the rescuers. I was acting like a bunny, hiding in the bushes.'' But when he tells his story, we know it took a lot of guts and bravery for him to make it through that.

There are many more like him in the service, and thank God there are. They deserve first-class treatment. And instead of building these weapons system that cost so much money like star wars, we have put $40 billion in star wars, this Ronald Reagan concept that is going to protect the United States. We have little or nothing to show for it. And now our friends on the Republican side say, let us spend another $30 billion and see what we can find.

I say put the money in defending this country and making sure that the people who serve in the service are treated with respect and dignity.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. If the gentleman will yield, I tried to elevate the young man to captain, but maybe because I was so impressed with his demeanor and how he presented himself to the American people.

Which reminds me of one of my invitations to visit 6,000 men and women on one of our nuclear submarines. And, really, the most impressive part of it was the young men and women. Particularly the young men; I think this was a ship that did not yet have young women on the ship.

In any event, in addition to seeing the expertise that they had, I got some personal stories as well. And I think you realize that those who are on submarine duty are out 6 months or so at a time and they leave their families back home.

And one in particular came up to me and mentioned that he was a single father with two girls who were living with the grandmother. And he pleaded with me about the need for a higher salary, because his youngsters were probably on food stamps with his mother who was taking care of them. He did not see them on a regular basis and he was struggling to make ends meet. But he was trying to be a good father and a good parent.

That breaks your heart when you hear those kinds of stories, because you know when we call upon him, if anything was to happen and he had to risk his life for us, for Americans, he would be right there to do it. I would hesitate to have him have on his mind the needs of his children. And they do.

The same thing with housing for our enlisted men and women. I again will bring up veterans. The same thing with facilities for veterans. Why would we want to put them through that? Where is the focus? Where is us capturing the aspirations of Americans?

Let me add one other thing. I am wearing this little patch because I was today with the physically challenged. And they are out supporting the Americans with Disabilities Act, which will be impacted by many of these cuts, because as you realize, the act requires modification.

And these folks were not here asking for handouts. They were not here whining about their condition. They were here in full force. They came from across the country; many of them in different challenged conditions, but yet they got here saying, We just want a chance.

I promised them today in front of the U.S. Capitol that I will give them a chance and that is what we are missing out here. We are not giving Americans a chance.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentlewoman will yield, I had a presentation last Monday in my hometown of Springfield, IL, at the Land of Lincoln Goodwill Industries. They have been accredited for their rehabilitation activity and they take a lot of people facing

physical and mental challenges and them to work in good jobs. They pay them a modest amount of income, but really turn their lives around.

I visited a license plate factory in Decatur, IL, several years ago and the administrator told me a story. She pointed to a young woman who was working on the assembly line for these license plates and said, ''When she first came to this facility we literally carried her in. She was considered to be an impossible case; never capable of doing a thing. We trained her and stuck with her. You know what the problem is now, Congressman? When we have a big snowstorm and I want to close down this factory, I know she is going to show up anyway. She feels so dedicated to the job.''

Many people with these challenges and disabilities just need a chance. And the Government comes through with that chance, giving them a helping hand so they can be productive and have real lives.

Your commitment is one I share. And I really fear that the disabled will be the first casualties of these budget cuts and it would be sad for the future of our country if that occurs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I think your fears are well founded. They indicated they felt concern about the education act that related particularly to the mentally and physically challenged, the Americans with Disabilities Act, the SSI, and Medicare and Medicaid which they depend upon.

And what I started out saying, sometimes we think it is in to talk about folk like that. Articles in newspapers or letters to the editor saying, Sorry, I am not going to feel guilty. These people are deadbeats that are on welfare.

But let me tell you that out of that session I had today in front of U.S. Capitol came a young woman who said, ''I was an architect, but after a tragic car accident and brain injury I am here today to say I just need a chance.''

We had a good time out there. A few tears were shed. Because I think Americans need to realize that people who find themselves in these conditions, physically challenged, mentally challenged, are not just the other guy that you might see that unfortunately was born that way, but many of us in life's journey may come upon these hard times, whether it is a tragic accident, but we live, and we thank God for that, but it may be leaving us in a condition where we need the kind of support that this training program could give or SSI could give.

And I have heard some really, I think, thoughtless comments that some mothers are misrepresenting on forms so that a child could be listed as autistic. I do not know if anyone has seen an autistic child. I do not think that any parent would go to that length to be able to label the child autistic, just to be on SSI.

I have seen real life cases. And we need to really invest in the American people and the cases that we have seen before us for the future of this Nation.

Mr. DURBIN. I noticed, too, in my own district, a young lady who was a single mother with two children and one suffered from a severe learning disability. She was able to continue to go to work, and continue to make money to help raise her family, because of the assistance she received from the Government.

And they asked her in this interview, What are you going to do if you do not receive that assistance? And she said, ''It is hopeless for me. I would have to stay home and take care of my child. I would not be able to work.''

At a time when we are trying to reduce welfare dependency, she is doing the right thing. She is facing a challenge that many of us would wither under and doing the right thing. And we are giving her a helping hand for that purpose.

I would hate to see us turn that hand and slap her and say, No, now you're on your own. Show us how you can do it personally without our help, because we know that just a little bit of help has made a significant difference in her family's future.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. I don't know what the answer would be for that young woman, and that is why I am trying to get this clear message that we need a focus and a direction; that none of us are apart on the fact that we want the Nation to be strong with a strong bottom line, moving toward deficit reduction.

But where is the focus? Today I happen to have voted against the congressional appropriations bill. I did that because I would almost imagine we could cut a little bit more. But I will say the direction was wrong.

Here they were, as I see tourists coming to this Nation and this Capital represents so much good. The Botanical Gardens, which needed some enhancement, we get someone on the other side of the aisle, a Republican, who wants to cut the flowers out from Americans.

That is the kind of misguided direction. It does not mean we cannot come to some conclusion about cutting the budget. But I would think that if you asked an average American if they enjoy a botanical garden where flowers grow and enhance the beauty of this Capital, whether or not the few pennies that were going to be saved, and I can tell them it was a few pennies that would be saved, or whether or not that was worth it.

What happened? No focus. Just a haphazard approach. Everybody with a meat cleaver. Me, me, me. I want to be the one that cuts. So, I think it is very important that we place the American people first. That we ensure that we understand what the Constitution says, but more importantly what the Declaration of Independence said; we are all created equal with certain inalienable rights. And that equality is a promise to Americans and a promise of job opportunity.

And I might add just a note, it is a promise to those of us who came from different locales and look differently. And that is why I think affirmative action is something that Americans need to understand. It is not a negative; it is an even playing field.

What we should say to Americans is: Understand that Democrats have solutions. We have solutions. Your Member has a solution. I have a solution for the 18th Congressional District. I do not want the State of Texas to lose $1.1 billion in rescissions and not go back to any deficit reduction, but go to tax cuts for those making over $200,000.

What I want is a plan; a plan to invest in America. Those investments would count for infrastructure, for education, for housing, for energy development, for space development for some of us who are interested in making sure we are at the high technological cutting edge for the 21st century. It has to be, I believe, an investment.

TERMINATION OF SUSPENSION OF ISSUANCE OF LICENSES FOR EXPORT OF MUNITIONS LIST ARTICLES TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–87)

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 International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 902(b)(2) of the foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Public Law 101–246) (''the Act''), and as President of the United States, I hereby report to the Congress that it is in the national interest of the United States to terminate the suspension under subsection 902(a)(3) of the Act with respect to the issuance of licenses for the export to the People's Republic of China of U.S. Munitions List articles, insofar as such suspension pertains to export license requests for cryptographic items covered by Category XIII on the U.S. Munitions List.

License requirements remain in place for these exports and require review and approval on a case-by-case basis. The Department of State, in consultation with the Department of Defense and other relevant agencies, will review each request, including each proposed use and end-user, and will approve only those requests determined to be consistent with U.S. foreign policy and national security.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 22, 1995.*

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TORRES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for June 21 and today, on account of personal business.