United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1995 No. 204—Part II

House of Representatives

REVISED BUDGET RESOLUTION REFLECTING THE PRESIDENT'S MOST RECENT PROPOSAL

(Continued)

☐ 1445

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to break this impasse and to balance this budget now. On Medicare and every other contentious issue, it is the coalition's budget that provides the framework to do just that. Let us get back to the table, Democrats and Republicans, and let us balance this budget for the American people.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE]. The problem is that only 60-some Democrats voted for his budget that did balance.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy for the President and some Democrats to say they want a balanced budget, but it is hard for them to offer a proposal to show where those cuts are coming from. I believe one of two things is going to have to happen before we break this budget impasse. One, the President is going to have to stop playing politics and do what is right for the future of this country; or, Americans are going to have to spend some hard studying time realizing how serious this overspending problem is and what it does to their future.

Mr. Speaker, it is not easy politically to reduce the growth in Government. The bottom line is if we fail this time in cutting the growth of Government and balancing the budget, we are not going to do it for many years. Vote against this budget for what it is. It is politics as usual, spending and taxing and borrowing as usual.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is an exercise in fun and games, Republican-style. We are just given this budget. We do not know what is in it. It is just like yesterday's irrelevant resolution. We should be doing the work of the people. We should be passing a clean continuing resolution so the Government could open, but Republicans do not want to do it.

Let us make one thing clear: It is the Republicans that have shut the Government down. There is no reason to link the continuing resolution to keep the Government open with a 7-year balanced budget. There is no reason to link it. The reason we have the Government shutdown is because the Republicans did not do their job and pass the appropriations bills by the end of the fiscal year, September 30.

Let us look at the Republican budget. Medicare decimated, Medicaid decimated, all to pay for tax cuts for the rich; education, our children's future, decimated; the environment, decimated; tax increases for working families. This is the Republican budget. It is mean-spirited and it is extreme.

Let us stop playing the phony Republican shell game. That is all it is. They talk about family values. What kind of values are we giving to our children under this Republican plan? This is a farce. We should be passing a continuing resolution to keep the Government open.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. HERGER].

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has abandoned his commitment to balance the budget in 7 years. Still, after four attempts, the Clinton budget maintains a $426 billion deficit over 7 years. Just 30 days ago the President signed a promise to the American people, and I quote, ''The President and Congress shall enact legislation to achieve a balanced budget no later than fiscal year 2002.'' The President has broken his word. Vote ''no'' on the President's massive $426 billion unbalanced budget.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the Democrat side of the aisle keep telling the American people that we are cutting, cutting, cutting, we are going to hurt everybody. Let me give some figures. We are increasing, increasing the earned income tax credit by $6 billion; school lunches we are increasing by $1.7 billion; student loans by $12 billion over the next 7 years; Medicaid we are increasing by $38 billion, and Medicare by $112 billion. Yet they continue to tell the American people and scare old people into believing we are cutting them.

Yet, when we bring to the floor the President's budget, they do not want to vote on it. Do Members know why they do not want to vote on it? Because they know it is not a real budget. They know it is nothing but smoke and mirrors. They know the President is not sincere. They know it is a bad budget that is bad for America, and they know that even they will vote against it. They do not want to have to vote against it.

Our budget is real. We balance the budget in 7 years. We still give a tax cut, and we increase spending for very important programs like Medicare. The Democrats should come clean.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the goal we have here, all of us, Democrats and Republicans, as I see it, is to have a balanced budget, the first one in 27 years, but we are at an impasse. We have to overcome this impasse.

☐ 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.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

If there were a plan to do it, would you be interested? Because I have a plan. Here is what we should do. The bill we have before us is not a balanced budget. Let us vote it down. Let us pass the Republican balanced budget for the first time in 27 years, but let us give President Clinton the benefit. Let us say it is his budget so we can both win here in the Capitol and at the White House.

We had Edward Demming here before he passed away, the great strategist, who said, ''In the world today you have to have a win-win strategy.'' This would be a win-win strategy. The Democrats would win, the Republicans would win, but do you know who would be the biggest winners of all? It would be the American people, because for the first time in 27 years we would have a balanced budget.

Let us do it. Let us get over this hurdle. Let us get around this impasse. This is the way of doing it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Coalition budget, the best budget around here.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

(Ms. WATERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are on the floor with another meaningless bill. They had one yesterday when they tried to make the people believe that the President had not already agreed to the CBO numbers and a 7-year balanced budget. He had already done that, so that was meaningless. Today they are back again.

Nobody knows what is in this bill. They do not know, we do not know. It has not been scored. It has not been analyzed. The real negotiations start at 3 o'clock. The President has a meeting with Senator DOLE and with NEWT GINGRICH. They know it. They know that they are not accomplishing anything by being there.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the President has been to the table. He has told you he is not going to let you devastate old people. You cannot get any more money out of Medicare and Medicaid. You cannot do away with our priorities of education and environment that you agreed to. The real problem is you cannot count. You cannot save money and give away money at the same time. You have got to learn. If you want to save, you cannot have a tax cut of $245 billion.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, what we have in front of us is our best attempt to construct the President's budget. I want to spend a few minutes talking about the Medicare portions of the President's budget, because frankly, he has probably focused on this more than most of the other provisions in the budget.

The gentlewoman from California just indicated that we cannot get any more money out of Medicare. Rather than listen to me, I would rather have Members listen to the words of a television program that ran December 12. It is called Nightline. Ted Koppel said, ''Tonight Mediscare, Rhetoric Versus Reality.''

For one of the very few times on the national media, serious newspaper people focused on the rhetoric versus the reality in the Medicare discussion. What was said, I hope, will enlighten us. What was said on that program by an ABC reporter by the name of Chris Bury was that the Washington Post said:

> The Democrats, led by the President, have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that's where the votes are.

The Democrats are demagoguing on Medicare. To substantiate that point, Nightline then discussed the fact that you have to reduce Medicare to balance the budget. In fact, they used a clip from 1993 when the First Lady, Hillary Rodham Clinton, was in front of the Committee on Ways and Means. This is what the First Lady said in front of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1993. She said:

> We are talking about beginning to reduce the rate of increase in Medicare from about 11 percent to about 6 or 7 percent annually.

In fact, the Republican plan reduces it to 7.2 percent. What did the President say about the Republican plan? On October 19, on the program, a news clip of the President, he said:

> On Medicare, the House is voting on a $270 billion cut on Medicare that will eviscerate the health care system for our older Americans.

That is plain and simple demagoguing, plain and simple demagoguing.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, what was said in the program later is what I want to focus on for a minute. Uwe Rhinehardt, who is a professor at Princeton University, in fact he helped the task force on an unassigned basis, said:

> The real problem is the current Medicare program cannot accommodate the baby boom after the year 2010. We need to reform Medicare.

Ted Koppel asked Mr. Glassman, who is a columnist for the Post, ''Do you agree, Mr. Glassman, the problem is not the one between now and the year 2002 but the one beyond the year 2010?'' The answer, ''Absolutely.'' What is it that is going on beyond the year 2010? Guy King, an actuary for HCFA for 24 years, for 17 years the chief actuary, has now given us a picture of the world beyond 2010.

Let us take a worker who in 2010 is 22 years old. They are going to get an average wage for the time they work. In 2053 they retire at 65 years of age. Under the current law for Medicare, part B this person would pay over their lifetime into the current law Medicare, in nominal dollars are $281,000. Under President Clinton's plan as determined by the actuary, $280,000. What is the GOP plan, the plan that reforms Medicare? One hundred and forty thousand dollars ($140,000) over the lifetime of that worker.

This is what this debate is about. For those people who go to work at 22 years of age in 2010 and work hard for an average wage, the President makes virtually no change from the current law, despite all of his handwringing. What Republicans do is reform Medicare. What was said on that program by all of the experts is if you do not reform Medicare, you cannot balance the budget. The President has a phony plan. He does not do what he needs to be done in the area of reforming Medicare. It is Mediscare, it is demagoguery.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, this debate here this afternoon is in many ways a metaphor for what has been wrong with this session of the Congress. It is a lot of politics and very little substances. The gentleman that preceded me to the floor here just a few moments ago is alleging to convince us that he knows what is going to be going on with regard to the health care system 58 years from now, a preposterous notion.

They are claiming to balance the budget. If they really wanted to balance the budget, they would follow the rule that was laid down 3 year ago. The budget deficit today is half of what it was just 3 years ago. If they really wanted to balance the budget, the plan has been laid out. They know how to do it. We have set the pattern for them.

What you want to do, really, is to destroy the health care system for older people and for people on Medicaid. We know that. We have it in your own words. BOB DOLE was bragging that he voted against it when it was first brought to the floor here 35 years ago. Your own Speaker, speaking before the Blue Cross-Blue Shield group at your convention here in Washington just a few weeks ago, said that you did not have the nerve to attack Medicare directly, you were going to go about it circuitously, withdraw the funds and let it wither on the vine. We are wise to you. We know what you are all about.

□ 1500

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, for 26 years, Republicans wandered in the minority, crying out for a balanced budget. If only we were elected the majority, we said in our Contract With America, out first action would be to balance the budget, and last November it happened. We were elected to the majority and we did exactly what we said. We passed a balanced budget and we did it without increasing taxes.

Conventional wisdom said, it cannot be done. But we knew that it was too important to our children's future not to balance the budget.

The critics, however, said the budget could not be balanced because politicians were afraid to confront the problem of explosive entitlement spending, and they said that the budget could not be balanced without increasing taxes.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the new majority broke with that conventional wisdom and proved the skeptics wrong. We threw aside the politics of the past and made the tough decisions that have brought us to the brink of a balanced budget, our Nation's first since 1969.

Make no mistake: We are here today talking about a balanced budget solely because the people elected a Republican Congress. If the Congress was still controlled by the Democrats, they would still be passing tax increases and President Clinton would still be signing them. They would still be dodging reforms of entitlement and President Clinton would be there with them.

But fortunately we have another direction to choose. Republicans have defeated conventional wisdom and are bringing real change to Washington. We are now at the point where the only person standing in the way of real change and a real balanced budget today is President Clinton. This debate today tests the question of whether this President is truly committed to a balanced budget, and at this point, I can only conclude that he is not.

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget strikes out on three pitches. It is not balanced, it spends more, and it taxes more. His fourth budget of the year, the one we vote on today, leaves the Nation with a deficit of $87 billion in the year 2002.

If you like the politics of the past, if you support higher taxes, more Government spending and continued deficits for as far as the eye can see, then you will support this President's budget. If you want to break with the past, cut taxes, cut spending and bring our Nation's budget into balance for the first time in a generation, then you will vote against the President's budget and support our plan for welfare reform, cutting taxes on middle-income Americans, saving Medicare, and balancing the budget, using real numbers.

Join with me, break with the past, and bring real change to Washington, defeat the President's budget.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER].

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are debating another smoke screen to keep the American people from knowing exactly what is in the Republican budget, what that budget really does. Exactly 1 month ago today, the President and the Congress adopted by resolution a continuing resolution that said quite clearly that we were going to have a balanced budget by the year 2002, and that that balanced budget must, and I quote, ''provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment,'' and further, quote, ''will adopt tax policies to help working families.''

Now, what does the budget do? Does it provide adequate funding for Medicaid? Absolutely not. It cuts Medicaid by $133 billion, by the most recently revised figures. That takes money from long-term care, which is what provides for elders in nursing homes, people who have used all of the resources that they have available, and takes away their capacity.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

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

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the balanced budget that we are looking at today is more than just a balanced budget; it is also about its contents. On the question of welfare reform, it is time for a compromise. The President can start by stopping his campaign to demonize the Republican plan. We have bargained in good faith and we have moved dramatically in the administration's direction by putting together a reasonable welfare reform bill that the President can and should sign.

We recently sent to the President a lengthy response showing that our negotiations have produced an agreement that is complete or in substantial agreement with 85 percent of the 88 specific objections that the administration raised in October, 85 percent. How many negotiations do we enter into where the other side can win on 85 percent of the issues, and they still are not satisfied?

We provide more child care funds and more cash welfare funds than States would get under current law. These are not cuts; these are not even reductions in the rate of spending growth. The are absolute increases in Federal spending above the CBO line, and spending on all of these welfare programs covered in our bill rises over 4 percent each year. Yet, despite our willingness to compromise, the administration continues to claim that is not enough and that we are harming millions of children. That is baloney.

This administration has shown no willingness to compromise, to put a credible alternative plan on the table, and the budget we have before us today is simply proof of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President if he were here that the welfare reforms in your latest bill do not end welfare as we know it today, and the President knows that. He knows that the American people know that.

Mr. President, in the next few days, you will receive a bill that will allow you to fulfill your pledge to end the current failed welfare system. We await you decision, and the American people are watching to see whether you can be counted on to keep your word and change welfare as we know it today.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY].

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, a week before Christmas, and almost 3 months past the beginning of the fiscal year, and we have a Government that is shut down. We are nowhere close to passing a 7-year balanced budget plan that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, and poor children. How come? How come?

Well, Speaker GINGRICH and the new majority just does not seem to be able to do their job. For sure, they have not done their job when it comes to passing the spending bills. In fact, 75 percent of nonmilitary domestic spending for this year has yet to be approved, 75 percent. And the new majority certainly has not done their job when it comes to living up to their side of the budget negotiations. They have yet to deliver a plan that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, our environment, and poor children.

Instead, the new majority is down here on the floor today fiddling, fiddling as the Nation burns. That is right. The new majority is fiddling today as crucial services for the elderly, veterans, and our national parks are cut off, and the stock market is drooping.

This Nation cannot afford another day of NEWT's dangerous games. It is time for the majority to stop fiddling, to stop fiddling around and wasting time. It is time to stop the political grandstanding. Let us reopen the Government today.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if this Congress does nothing, in 15 short years with the policies embodied in current law, every single dollar of tax revenue will go to entitlements or interest. If there is no serious reform of our budget and the policies that underlie it, in 15 years there will be no money for roads and bridges and airports, no money for education and Head Start, no money for

embassies abroad, no defense, no EPA enforcement.

We cannot allow that to happen, and yet the President's budget does nothing but deal with dollar figures. Just cutting here and cutting there will not put this Nation on a sound financial basis. We must reform the way we use our dollars. We have to reform Medicare, we have to reform welfare. This is not a budget that creates a future for our Nation.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK].

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let us face it. The President and the Democrats want to save Medicare and Medicaid. Those are our priorities. The Republicans want to do that, but they want $245 billion in tax cuts. The two things cannot be done. My colleagues, we cannot have $245 billion in tax cuts and save Medicare and Medicaid. It is just that simple. That is what the American public needs to understand.

Forget about all of this rhetoric, forget about all of this air. The bottom line is, we need to save this for the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, we have been talking about how this is President Clinton's budget. How can we vote for this when this is just like taking one of the old master's paintings, one of the old Dutch masters, and come up and reproduce it and say, this is a real Rembrandt or this is one of the real Dutch masters. It is not. We must know a phoney when we see it.

So we cannot do that. The real Clinton budget saves older Americans, it saves education, it saves children. We need real, honest figures. These are not real, honest figures. The Congressional Budget Office has changed this by $135 billion, different from what it was in the beginning.

Face it, America. Come through with the figures and then help the American public save Medicare and Medicaid. We have to do it.

The resolution before us today is just like those phony paintings by the old masters that pop up every now and then. The sellers say that the painting is a Rembrandt, but the experts know that it is really just a fake. Let us face it President Clinton and the Democrats want a balanced budget in 7 years with our priorities—Medicare and Medicaid.

Well, let us get real: This is not really President Clinton's budget; it is a Republican reproduction of President Clinton's budget.

The real Clinton budget will provide Medicare and Medicaid for older Americans.

The Republicans have taken something of value and made it worthless, because they are so desperate.

They were elected to govern, but they have proven that they do not know how to govern. They can only stalemate.

They do not know how to compromise; Republicans can not pass appropriations bills on time—three of them have not even gotten to the President yet.

CHARLIE STENHOLM and the coalition and President Clinton have proven that you can balance the budget in 7 years and still maintain our compassion for the poor, and the elderly, and people in nursing homes. Republicans talk about balancing the budget with real, honest Congressional Budget Office numbers. Let me remind you that Congressional Budget Office real numbers have changed by $135 billion. So the key is getting rid of that hallowed Republican $245 billion tax cut.

But here we are, less than a week before Christmas, and we see this Republican reverse Robin Hood: ''Take from the poor and give to the rich.''

Republicans, you can balance the budget in 7 years, but you cannot provide a $245 billion tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, defeat this phony facsimile of the Presidents budget resolution; drop that quarter-trillion dollar tax cut; and let us write real budget.

I will show you how.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

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

Mr. Speaker, what we are debating here today is the latest offering of the President in the budget negotiations, and that latest offering has been scored by Congressional Budget Office, and that latest offering has been found by Congressional Budget Office not to balance the budget in the year 2002. So for those of my colleagues who are saying that we are fiddling here today, that we are doing nothing, I want to point out that it is the President who is fiddling.

The President has yet to put on the table a budget that will be in balance in the year 2002, and what we are doing here today, very frankly, is underscoring one more time that the legislative branch of this Government wants to produce, with the President's help and signature, a balanced budget in 7 years using Congressional Budget Office figures.

If my colleagues vote for this budget today, they are saying they do not want a balanced budget in the year 2002. But I suspect they do, and I suspect they will vote against it.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the President, Democrats, and Republicans have all agreed to balance the budget in 7 years. That debate has been won. What are we talking about? The debate had been won that we would balance the budget in a time certain, 7 years. So why are we going through this?

We should not be in a debate about whether we balance the budget; the debate is really about how we balance the budget, who will pay and who will lose? Will there be shared pain, shared sacrifice, as we go through this process? That is what the debate is about.

This resolution that is on this floor is an insult to our intelligence and to the American people. This is not the President's budget. My Republican colleagues took his old submission and gave their interpretation of it. It really should be a clean continuing resolution to allow the Government to go on as we serve the citizens and the Nation. While we debate how we actually balance the budget, we should let the people of this country be served well by the citizens.

This debate really is the wrong debate. We should defeat this bill not because it is the President's bill, we should defeat the bill because it is a phoney act on the part of the Republicans.

□ 1515

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget we vote on today, and I would agree with the former speaker, is insulting. It is not only a broken promise, it is a broken law.

Twenty-nine days ago the President signed into law a commitment to present a plan to balance the budget in 7 years using Congressional Budget Office numbers. Instead, he has sent us a budget that continues deficit-spending and fails to balance by at least $87 billion in the year 2002. It is out of balance by $87 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the President has said in speech after speech and press release after press release that he favors a balanced budget. Why does he refuse to submit one? We will negotiate a great many items in our balanced budget proposal but we cannot and will not compromise on our commitment to balance the Federal budget in 7 years with honest numbers.

Vote against the President's budget and end the policy of spend now, pay later.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN.

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here today is to talk about the comparisons between what the Republicans want to have in their budget and what the President wants.

The President has agreed to a 7-year budget using CBO numbers, but the reason we cannot come to an agreement is because of the tax cuts that the Republicans want to have before they really get to the 7-year balanced budget.

The Republican budget not only wants to provide tax cuts but they want to slow growth in, their terminology, Medicare by forcing seniors into managed care that they opposed last year in President Clinton's health care plan, raise the premiums, cut doctor and hospital reimbursements, and cut senior citizen health care.

I have a letter I received today from a senior citizen in my district who may

very well decide to use managed health care right now, but that is her choice. Under the Republican budget, she will be forced to do it because she cannot afford the $100 extra that it is going to cost her on her supplemental policy.

The other difference is the education cuts. The Republican budget over the 7 years will cut Federal funding for education just like the rescissions bill earlier this year cut schools in my district. It is wrong to cut Medicare and education to provide tax cuts.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ENGLISH].

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Clinton budget. Not only is it bloated and unbalanced but it contains a dog's breakfast of job-killing tax changes dreamed up by green eyeshade types apparently in the bowels of the Treasury.

For example, the Clinton budget would strike the so-called 2 percent de minimis rule which allows companies to invest up to 2 percent of their assets in tax-exempt bonds without any cumbersome recordkeeping. Eliminating this rule would severely impact the market for small issue industrial development bonds, a key local job creation instrument, and would raise interest costs for all State and local government borrowing. In short, eliminating this rule will eliminate jobs and raise local taxes.

In addition, the President's plan contains a proposal to deny deductions to companies on certain securities they issue, discriminating against long-term debt financing.

By limiting the financial options of American companies, the Clinton budget would limit their ability to invest in new equipment and technology. It would hurt the ability of American workers to compete in the world market. Vote against this budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on the trend of the gentlewoman from North Carolina talking about where we are today. As she pointed out, yesterday we voted roughly 390 to 41 to have a 7-year balanced budget. That is set up.

Where we are now at this very moment hopefully, our leaders and our President are meeting and going to get back on the track and especially back to the table so that we can begin talking about a budget that we can all agree on and that we can pass and get the Government working again.

There are differences and they are honest differences in this budget that we should be talking about at the negotiating table. One of these is the cuts in the earned income tax credit, because when we look at the amounts being suggested, this would roughly increase taxes by $508 a year for roughly 3.3 million Americans, low-income-earning, working families. The coalition budget, which we are not even talking about here today, takes the 7-year balanced budget CBO scoring and does not do this.

I am just saying, let us get back to the table, let us have a budget. That one is not even alive anymore.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DEAL].

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the balanced budget is made up of many components, one of which is welfare reform, and I would like to talk about it very briefly. It is an issue that both sides have expressed their opinions about.

In looking at that component of the President's package, I think we find that it falls short of both of our expectations. All of us recognize that if we are going to reform welfare, first of all we have to emphasize work. The conference committee report puts more people to work every year than does the President's plan.

Second, we have to emphasize individual responsibility. Time limits. We are told in a recent survey that the average family now stays on welfare for 6½ years and that will rise to 13 years. The conference committee report puts a 2-year limit with an overall 5-year limit. The President's plan literally would allow people to remain in a subsidized program and never go into the private sector.

Third is State flexibility. States are our partners in welfare reform. Under the Clinton proposal, they still have to go through a bureaucratic maze and beg the HHS for waivers in order to put their plans into place. The conference committee report gives them flexibility.

Last of all, it should not serve as a magnet for those who are immigrants into our country. I would tell Members that the conference committee report is far superior in the area of welfare reform.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this proposal which does not balance the budget and with really great disappointment that we are not going to be allowed to consider the coalition plan today.

Nobody here is more serious about deficit reduction than the coalition, but make no mistake, there is a right way and a wrong way to balance the budget. The coalition, the blue dog Democrats, proves that in 7 years you can balance the budget without undermining the American family farmer, you can balance the budget without limiting opportunities for our children and our grandchildren to better themselves through education, and you can balance the budget without jeopardizing the health care that our seniors have relied on for over 30 years.

The coalition substitute balances the budget with fairness, common sense and without gimmicks. Right from the start we have been motivated by a commitment to both fiscal responsibility and fairness. We are determined to meet our responsibility not to burden future generations with our debt but we are also determined to preserve what is working, the very best policies that enable our children to succeed, our farmers to compete and our seniors to feel secure that their health needs will be met.

The coalition is willing to work with anyone who wants to balance the budget. We know that our colleagues may not agree with everything we want to do, but we want to stop wasting the time of the American people and start working on a solution. This is a great opportunity that must not be wasted. We must do the right thing by our children and our grandchildren. We must start working together. I hope we do it now.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when the President of the United States came into this Chamber to make his first speech to a joint session of Congress, he observed that only by controlling the runaway growth of Medicare could we hope to ever balance the budget. We do that in our budget by transforming Medicare contrary to the misinformation and wrongful rhetoric for political purposes. We force no one off of the current program. They may elect to continue with the current program. But we offer them choices, choices that will give them more benefits at less cost and at the same time transform Medicare and save it, not just for the next election but for the next generation.

For 15 years, CBO scores our plan to save Medicare so that it will not go bankrupt. That is what this balanced budget is about. But it is also about saving Medicare.

Now the Democrats should not be able to have it both ways. They claim on the one hand that the President has submitted a balanced budget in 7 years. Yet if in fact it is not specific enough to be scored by CBO, which they have argued today in the way that we present it, how can it be concluded to be in balance? It is not specific. If it could be, it would then certainly undermine their argument that what we present is not scored by CBO. They cannot have it both ways.

Hopefully the President, who is meeting right now with our leadership, will finally come to the bargaining table and seriously present a CBO-scored 7-year balanced budget with real numbers. Let us find solutions for the next generation, not political fixes for the next election.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, and to my neighbor from Houston, that unfortunately what we are doing today is all

about rhetoric. This is not about the budget process. We do not have the coalition budget on the table that is a 7-year CBO budget. This is about how absurd things get in this House the closer we seem to get to Christmas.

Last week we passed a bill that was supposed to save Social Security from an impending default which would destroy our creditworthiness and in fact the bill would do the opposite. This week we are voting on a budget that is not even the real budget that the President submitted. This is just something to buy time so we can come down and talk on the floor. This is a Dale Carnegie course for the House of Representatives.

The fact of the matter is that we ought to be sitting down negotiating at the table. We have a coalition budget that we could talk about. Your budget is not the only way to do things. You all are not the smartest people in the world as much as you would like to think.

Let me say it is absurd. You all talk about interest rate cuts. You use your CBO and you say it is going to cut interest rates by 200 basis points, but when you look at what CBO says, it is going to cut them by 35 basis points. The fact of the matter is we are not doing our work. Let us do our work and let us go home.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, the members of the Commerce Committee were proud and privileged, earlier this year, when we were called upon to play a central role in the development of the first balanced budget for this Republic in a generation.

We were called upon to make difficult choices, overdue choices, choices that are imperative if we and our children are to maintain this economy.

With respect to Medicaid, as in so many other areas, those choices involved political risk. But that is the essence of leadership. And as we all know, leadership has been in short supply in this Capitol for far too long.

We took the political risks. We made the difficult choices.

We transformed Medicaid, with more money for more doctors and more medicines—and fewer bureaucrats, fewer rules, less paperwork.

We brought Medicaid spending under control, and for the first time since the Great Depression, we moved power away from the Washington bureaucrats.

We gave responsibility back to the people in their States and local communities, where Medicaid can be managed more fairly and with greater efficiency.

And Bill Clinton sat in the bleachers.

For years, when he was Governor of Arkansas, Bill Clinton came to this Congress and asked us to give the States the power to manage their own Medicaid programs.

Today, he gives those States an unfunded mandate instead. A mandate from Washington to the States, without the money to pay for it—a mandate of the sort we outlawed, earlier this Congress, and which the President himself has signed into law.

This is not just another unfunded mandate.

This is the ''Mother of All'' unfunded mandates—one with a pricetag for State and local taxpayers of $47 billion.

If President Clinton were to succeed in this stalemate, if he were to get his way with the so-called per-capita cap on Medicaid, it would force the States to come up with an additional $47 billion.

That is because the States would still have to comply with all the rules, all the requirements of the existing Medicaid system, but with a cap on the amount of Federal money to help them do so.

Forty-seven billion dollars, Mr. Speaker, 47 billion hard-earned dollars. Money that could be used for schoolbooks, for teachers, for roads and bridges.

As Bill Clinton himself told us in 1989, in a Resolution he wrote which was signed by 49 of the 50 Governors, ''the Medicaid mandates have put great stress on state budgets and undermined the states' ability to properly fund education and other important services.''

As Governor after Governor has told us, the President's budget is a recipe for disaster—all the Washington rules, all the Washington mandates, just a cap on the amount of money that Washington is willing to contribute.

The members of my committee are here, Mr. Speaker, to make the case—loud and clear—that America can no longer afford the pricetag of Washington's bumbling good intentions, and that the States are ready, willing and able to deliver better health care for the poor and elderly, at lower cost, if only they are given the chance.

☐ 1530

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TANNER].

(Mr. TANNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I think this rhetoric today and all of the things that have been said point up the need for an American solution.

In the unlikely event there is anybody still watching these proceedings, I think they are tired of listening to blaming of the President, blaming of this, blaming of that. It is not getting us anywhere.

I asked Coach Adolph Rupp one time years ago if it was true that it was not whether or not you won or lost but how you played the game. He said, ''Well, I guess that may have some truth to it. But if that is totally the truth, why do they have a scoreboard at either end?'' I would suggest there is a scoreboard up at this end and a scoreboard here. If you want to balance the budget, bring any budget, the President's, Republican, coalition, bring it in here on an open rule. Let us sit in here, start the voting on amendments. If you get more than 50 percent, you win. It goes on. If you do not, it does not.

Let us sit down and work and balance the budget. That is what people want us to do in this country.

This business the President did or did not do this or did or did not do that, people are tired of that. They want us to go to work.

In a democracy, thank God in a democracy, when the other fellow is as intellectually honest and sincere in his beliefs as you or I may be, the way you do things is sit down and you try to reach a consensus and compromise. You do not have to do that if you live under a dictatorship or under communism. But in a free country, no one gets their way on everything.

Republicans run the House now. We understand that. But let us come in here with an open rule, sit down and go through item by item, as long as people can stand it, and sooner or later we will have a balanced budget for the American solution.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today's debate on the President's budget raises questions in the reminds of our people, and it is our responsibility to answer these questions truthfully.

As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment, I will focus on the Medicaid Program. Everyone agrees that Medicaid cannot continue in its present state. Between 1990 and 1994, it was the fastest growing part of the Government. The programs' average annual growth rate was more than 19 percent. Over the years, the Nation's Governors have complained bitterly to Congress about the unfunded mandates that have been placed upon States.

On August 1, 1989, the Nation's Governors' Association sent a letter to Congress urging us to ''adopt a 2-year freeze on the enactment of further Medicaid mandates.'' The letter was signed by 49 Governors, including then Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton.

In this Congress, we are listening to these Governors. The Medigrant plan approved by Congress shifts responsibility for the Medicaid Program to the States, where it will be closer to the people it serves. Washington bureaucrats would no longer make the decisions. However, a handful of Governors and at least one former Governor are now criticizing this effort, wishing to retain control in Washington.

I might add that my home State of Florida received $13 million in Federal dollars over the last 7 years. During the next 7 years, under our plan, Florida will receive better than $33 billion. This is a cut?

Ironically, the President's budget advocates a principle that is completely contrary to that in the 1989 letter he signed. His budget continues the current flawed and failing program. This means Washington micromanagement continues, and State flexibility, a top priority of Governors, would not be permitted.

Plainly and simply, Mr. Speaker, the Medicaid program cannot survive unless the needed Medigrant reforms are made law, and this program must be saved. Accepting anything less would be breaking faith with those who depend upon it, and that would be the real injustice.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it has been through incredible political brinksmanship, NEWT GINGRICH has managed to shut down our Government, and by Christmas Day cost the American taxpayer a little over a billion dollars with these two shutdowns, paying Federal workers not to work. But now, with this resolution, in addition to brinksmanship, we have gamesmanship. It is as if we are going to consider a make-believe budget that they are presenting and planning to vote against instead of sitting down in good-faith negotiations to try to resolve this problem.

It is as if they have been watching too much daytime television. You know, it is like ''Let's Make a Deal.'' ''Mr. And Mrs. America, behind door No. 1, we have got misery. We have got misery for those families who will be called on to pay for a senior who gets left in a nursing home when you raid the family's income. Behind door No. 2, you can choose indifference. Yes, if you are a young person concerned about an education, if you are concerned about clean air or clean water, go with door No. 2. And behind door No. 3, why, we have got tax breaks, yes, tax breaks.''

And so you choose door No. 3, and what do our Republican friends say? Are you a corporation that made a lot of money and did not want to pay any taxes? No? Well, then you are not entitled to go to door No. 3. Are you a family sitting up there at the top of the economic ladder feeling really good and being asked to sacrifice by taking a little more income and a bigger tax break? Well, no. Well, then you are not entitled to go to door No. 3; you can only go to misery or to indifference, which is what this Republican budget is all about.

You see, they have failed yet to present a balanced budget, a balanced budget that provides balance to the American people and fairness to the American people.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is simple: Should seniors be given the same choices in their health care that Members of Congress enjoy?

Under the Republican plan to save Medicare, seniors get choices just like we do. They can choose from traditional Medicare, HMOs, PPOs, Provider Sponsored Organizations, Medical Savings Accounts, or other private insurance packages.

Under the Republican plan, seniors' first choice is traditional Medicare. Seniors are automatically enrolled in traditional Medicare if they don't choose a different option.

Under the President's plan, seniors do not get all of these choices. Isn't it time that we allow seniors to enroll in the same types of plans that Members of Congress can enroll in. Don't you think it's time we give seniors the same options that we give ourselves under our health plan.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal before us today includes the President's plan to get money from Medicare. His plan does not include giving seniors all the choices that the Republican plan would provide.

I urge my colleagues to reject the President's budget proposal. We have already proven that we can do better.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arkansas [Mrs. LINCOLN].

(Mrs. LINCOLN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, it seems like the freshman Republican class thinks they are the only ones sent here to work for change. But as a second-term Member, I was sent to bring about commonsense change.

But, instead, everyone is here today throwing stones, arguing political rhetoric. You know what that is, that is the status quo, exactly what I came here to change.

No Member, no Member in this body, I do not think, would be willing not to stay here Christmas Day if they thought there was a true national crisis. But it is not fair. It is not fair to the Federal employees, to our families, to the American people, most of all, to fabricate a crisis for the sake of a campaign slogan.

Because there is a commonsense budget out there that does balance the national budget by the year 2000, and it does it with good, honest CBO numbers. That is the coalition budget. If we are serious about doing the American people's business, we would have that budget up and we would be negotiating it now because it is good policy. It does not devastate agriculture. It does not devastate rural health, seniors, or our young people and education.

So I encourage all Members to come to the table here to find a commonsense solution for the American people who sent us.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR].

(Mr. BURR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURR. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the Clinton budget plan, particularly with regard to health care rationing through micromanagement by HCFA.

The President's Medicaid plan is a per capita cap plan which maintains all of the mandates, regulations, and obstacles to flexibility just as they are, while limiting the amount of money the States will receive. In a nutshell, the President is placing dollar figures on the value of health care for poor Americans, and forcing the States to use the cookie cutter method once again to classify who is Medicaid eligible. Poor children get the least and poor elderly get the most, regardless of their individual circumstances. Not only does this open the door to fraud and abuse via misclassification, it hogties the States and actually creates a much more difficult situation than the horrendous circumstances that States currently face.

Worst of all, the President's plan will enable HCFA to create a virtual health care police state in every State in the country to track down those who would misclassify beneficiaries. HCFA will dispatch dozens of bureaucrats to detect such practices.

This is the worst possible solution for a program which already faces way too many problems. The President's plan is unfair, unworkable, indefensible, and is doomed to failure. The Republican plan, on the other hand, frees States to enact innovative solutions to the difficult situations they face, utilizing the resources that are available. Mr. Speaker, we want to give States the ability to innovate with regard to providing health care for poor Americans, not place the States in a regulatory strait jacket with no room to move.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Speaker NEWT GINGRICH was named Time Magazine's ''Man of the Year''. Today, the man of the year brings us the scam of the year. That's what this resolution is, a colossal scam.

Everybody knows that when you can't defend your position, you change

the subject. That's what this resolution is—a diversionary tactic. Republicans cannot defend cutting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment to finance a tax break for the wealthy.

The American people have rejected the GOP budget which will do harm to the people of this country. But, instead of working to come up with a budget that reflects the priorities of the American people, the Speaker shuts down the Government, throwing thousands of people out of work a week before Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, stop playing games with people's lives. Stop playing games on the floor of the people's House. Give the American people an early Christmas present: a balanced budget that reflects America's priorities, not yours.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON].

(Mr. BARTON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives, I rise in opposition to what we are calling the President's budget. It is, in the materials that I have, the Clinton administration December 7 budget option which we are referring to in some of our working papers as Clinton's budget option No. 4.

I want to speak specifically on two specific items in this budget: the President's proposal for Medicare, which covers health care needs for senior citizens; and Medicaid, which covers health care for low-income Americans.

In Medicare, the balanced budget bill that we passed and the President vetoed would have resulted, according to CBO, in savings in waste, fraud, and abuse of $3.4 billion over 7 years. The President's option has Medicare savings in waste, fraud, and abuse of $2.4 billion, which is $1 billion less.

In relationship to Medicaid, which is health care for low-income Americans, the budget bill that the President vetoed, we would have block-granted Medicaid, given more money to the States, given the Governors and the State legislatures the opportunity to actually run the programs as they saw fit. In the case of Texas, the State that I represent in the Congress, Texas would have received $55 billion over 7 years, including half a billion dollars for legal alien health care costs.

□ 1645

The President's budget is silent on that. It maintains Medicaid as an entitlement and does not give the States the right to do anything. I hope we would reject the President's budget.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE.].

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we are engaged in a debate over a supposed presidential budget that does not actually represent the President's position. I think it is important for us to recognize that the Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, last week came out with projections that are new, and that the President today is completing work on a new budget proposal.

What is the point of having a debate and a vote on something that all of us know is already out of date? Instead, I suggest that we ought to be addressing the basic underlying conflict that plagues us here in the House of Representatives and in Congress in reaching an agreement with the President.

There are two basic issues: The first is tax cuts, and the second is block-granting Medicaid. I think almost everybody in this body agrees that we ought to cut taxes. We disagree on whether that ought to be the top priority or whether balancing the budget ought to be the top priority. And if it is not the top priority to cut taxes, can we actually wait and cut taxes after we have balanced the budget?

I submit that the top priority is balancing the budget, and we ought to wait with the tax cuts until we have accomplished that. I submit that if we made that fundamental decision, that we could reconcile with the President the issue of how we deal with block-granting Medicaid.

The coalition has presented a budget which does exactly this. It is a midground budget between the extremes that are represented in the debate today.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the budget plan offered by the President. There are many reasons to vote ''no'' today, particularly because the President's budget violates the pledge the Congress and the President made to enact 7-years balanced budgets using honest numbers.

But there is another reason to object to the President's budget. The President's plan guts health care improvements for seniors in rural America contained in the bill passed by Congress. Under current law, the formula used to pay private health plans participating in Medicare varies widely and unreasonably. While plans in some areas of the country receive over $7,500 per year for each senior, an HMO or other plan in a Adair County, IA, would get less than $3,000. The Clinton budget continues this unfair reimbursement. It protects the status quo. Iowans pay just as much into the Medicare system as everyone else in the country does.

The president of the Iowa health association has stated ''Iowa Medicare beneficiaries deserve to have the same kind of choices which are available already in New York City, Miami, and southern California. The Republican budget bill is a good first step in addressing Medicare health plan payment equity.''

The balanced budget plan passed by the House and Senate addresses this issue. The President's budget plan is a slap in the face to rural health care. We worked too hard and made too much progress to let this issue die. We owe it to seniors in rural areas to defeat the Clinton budget.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I have heard my Republican colleagues get up time after time today and criticize their budget bill that is before us today. My answer is very simple: Why are they bringing the bill up? They are in the majority. If they think the bill is a bad bill, why are they debating it and why did they bring it to the floor?

I think the Republican majority has forgotten it is their responsibility to govern. They should be bringing up a continuing resolution so the Government is not shut down. Friday passed, Monday passed, and now it Tuesday. No CR was brought up. The Government is shut down. They should bring up an appropriations bill so the Government would not be shut down and we can get on with the business of governing. No appropriations bill comes up.

They made a commitment a few weeks ago with the CR they were going to protect Medicare, protect Medicaid, protect the environment. Once again we see no movement whatsoever on the budget to try to protect these important programs that the American people want protected and that have been a success.

I do not understand the whole philosophy of what they are doing today. They are simply wasting our time. They know that this is a bill that will not pass. They are not even going to give it a single vote, I do not think, and yet they continue to debate it. It is not fair.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me, the gentleman from New Jersey, protests that the bill before us in fact does not fairly represent the President's positions and wonders why we bring this vehicle to the floor. The reason we do is because the President has never submitted a budget that actually reflects his positions. He has never done that.

The story really begins in 1992 when Bill Clinton ran for President. He made every promise anyone ever asked him to do in order for votes. He promised he could balance the budget in 5 years. He promised a middle-class tax cut. He promised to spend more money on virtually every program in the country.

The fact of the matter is, and the President knows it and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle know it, it is impossible to do that and balance

the budget in 7 years scored with honest numbers. It is impossible. That is why the President has to this date never walked into the room with a document that balances the budget in 7 years, scored by honest numbers. He has never done that to this date, and it is nearly Christmas.

So my colleagues and I, out of a sense of frustration, to show the country that the President of the United States has not even submitted a budget that his party will support, bring it to the floor today to show that the President of the United States remains, this late in the year, bereft of a plan that lives up to the conflicting promises that he has made through his campaign in 1992 and the conflicting statements that he has made throughout his tenure as President.

This is a bad bill. We are waiting for an honest bill from the President of the United States.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. POMEROY].

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, this dreadful Christmas budget standoff will only end when Members of the majority work with Members of the minority to bridge the differences that divide us. The scriptures say blessed are the peacemakers, and I congratulate each and every one who is working today to try to find a way to resolve these differences.

Now, in contrast to that effort, the resolution before us is a shallow, obviously partisan effort, to preen and posture, rather than tend to substantive business. With portions of the Government shut down and with budget talks at impasse before they have even begun, the American people can expect much more of the House than this silly sideshow today.

For those of us looking for a bipartisan agreement, I commend your attention to the coalition budget plan. It reaches a balanced budget, it does so in 7 years, it uses CBO numbers. It protects vital programs. The coalition plan restores $75 billion to the cuts the majority has proposed for Medicare. It adds back $68 billion to Medicaid, reducing by more than 50 percent the devastating cuts the vetoed budget would have imposed.

When we finish wasting our time on this meaningless resolution, I look forward to working with one and all on arriving at a balanced budget plan. I suggest the coalition budget will be a very good way to get this difficult job done.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, for the 10th day this year, major sectors of the American Government are at a standstill, with the White House and Congress at an impasse.

We have heard from our friends on the other side that this debate is an attempt to embarrass the President.

No. With the Government in gridlock, this is an effort to give the President's plan its day in Court.

As this debate has progressed, it has become apparent that what is at stake for the President is not an effort to balance the budget. What is at stake for him is the status quo—uncontrolled spending, bigger bureaucracies, higher taxes on the American people.

It is hard to imagine a deficit more in need of fixing. It is hard to imagine a program in greater risk than Medicare.

And it is hard to imagine a worse situation than the current Medicaid setup—Federal micromanagement, thousands of bureaucrats, volumes of rules.

And yet nowhere in these rules do we see the word ''patient.''

Nowhere do we see the words ''quality of care.''

It is hard to imagine a structure more complex, more inefficient than Medicaid is today.

But as the last 15 minutes of debate has shown, the President's proposal on Medicaid does just that—all the rules, all the mandates, all the bureaucrats, but a cap on the money available to the States to comply.

It is the biggest unfunded mandate in history, with a pricetag to the States of $47 billion.

Mr. President, I hope you are watching me now. I beg you, sir. Listen to this debate, watch the vote today, and realize that your plan fails on its own weight.

Then come to the table, Mr. President, and work with us in good faith. Let us do what you asked as Governor—give the States the responsibility for better Medicaid, with better health care, at lower costs, for more elderly and poor Americans.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN], my good friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sick and tired of all the rhetoric that I am hearing on the floor of this House. Everyone in America knows now that this shameful Government shutdown has nothing to do with reaching a balanced budget. It has to do with not passing the appropriations bill. Federal workers are sitting at home and our constituents are disgusted because this Congress has not completed its work. Unable to agree among themselves, the majority party is threatening the President to accept radical changes in policy or shut down the Government.

Well, I've got news for you. People's problems do not recognize a shut down. For example, the Annie Johnson Senior Center in Dunellon, FL, can no longer accept senior citizens to its congregate dining table because the Labor-HHS bill has not been passed. For the past 15 years, this center has been funded by the Older Americans Act. It provides home delivered meals, transportation, and homemaking help for senior citizens in Dunnellon. However, because this Republican Congress has not done its job, the center could close down.

It is time to get beyond this tiresome bickering and pass a continuing resolution that gets Americans back to work. Balancing the Federal Budget is everyone's objective but we do not need to ruin Christmas for Federal workers to achieve that goal. How we get to a balanced Federal budget can be debated after we put Americans back to work.

Stop the games and open up the Government. Peoples problems do not recognize a shutdown. Seniors need their food. Veterans need their benefits. College students need their loans. This is Christmas. The majority should quit playing scrooge and approve a CR. That is the best present we could give the American people.

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

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out to the gentlewoman that the reason that bill has not passed is because it is filibustered by the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate.

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

Mrs. THURMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentlewoman, was the center open when the House passed the continuing resolution?

Mrs. THURMAN. Yes, it was.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control the time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI].

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, while the President's overall approach to the budget is deplorable, he actually occupies the conservative high ground on the issue of student loans. Both guaranteed and direct student lending are Government programs, and both are run primarily by the private sector. The key difference is in the pricing of those private sector services.

Under guaranteed lending, all the payments to the private sector are determined politically—by Congress in the Higher Education Act. Under direct lending, all private sector services are procured through competitively bid contracts. [Let me repeat: under guaranteed lending, every payment made to private parties is determined politically. Under direct lending, every payment to private parties is determined in a market process.] Conservatives should prefer a market process over a political process every time.

It should come as no surprise that direct lending, as a market-oriented program, also costs less. The CBO does not score the savings primarily because it scores direct loans as if they were fixed

rate loans carrying interest rate risk for the Government, when in fact they are variable rate loans with no such risk. Conservatives should care more about the real cost than the CBO cost.

Mr. Speaker, politically set payments for private services are a classic recipe for corporate welfare, and guaranteed student loans demonstrate it. I deeply regret that many Members of my party have been led to support home State special interests rather than true conservative principles on this issue. I believe it undermines all our other efforts at Government reform, and therefore I urge all my colleagues to examine this issue much more closely.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. CLEMENT].

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, in 1776, our Founding Fathers fought it out at the Continental Congress trying to work out their differences, and they were able to work it out and form what we know of as the United States of America. I do not know why we cannot work out our differences now.

Harry Truman once said if you want a friend in Washington, DC, buy yourself a dog. Maybe that is what is wrong with us. Maybe we need to buy a dog, because it is obvious a lot of us do not know how to talk to one another. It is obvious we do not know how to work with one another, and it is surely obvious that we do not know how to solve any problems.

The American people are sick and tired of this gridlock that we have now. I blame some of it on the freshman Republicans, because some of them believe if you compromise, that you lose your principles.

□ 1600

Well, I do not think that is true at all. I think and believe very strongly that we can have a difference of opinion without having a difference of principle. That is what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, the question I have is why are we voting on this budget today. This get's us no closer to breaking the impasse which currently exists today and, in fact, acts as a wedge between the President and the Republican Congress preventing a budget agreement from ever being reached.

It has been said that a House divided against itself will not stand. It could also be said that a Government divided against itself will not stand. Before our foundation begins to crumble even more, it is time for the President and the Republican leaders in Congress to agree to compromise to end the current Federal Government shutdown.

Compromise is a word that has been thrown around in Washington quite a bit lately, but the time has come to stop talking the talk and start walking the walk: Congress needs to pass a temporary—very temporary—spending bill without any superfluous additions; we need to pass the six remaining appropriations bills; and, most importantly, we need to sit at the table together and agree to a 7-year balanced budget. But everyone needs to give a little. We all need to compromise.

The current budget impasse has been without a doubt the most frustrating situation I have endured as a Member of Congress. I am a strong proponent of balancing our budget, just as I am strongly committed to protecting our environment; enhancing education for our young people; and guaranteeing necessary health care for our seniors. There is a way to protect these vital interests and still crack the current budget gridlock, and that is through honest compromise and negotiation.

I have been meeting regularly with a bipartisan group of Members of Congress who are committed to solving this crisis, and who are willing to give a little to get a little. We support a balanced budget using numbers from the Congressional Budget Office that minimize the tax cuts proposed by the GOP while increasing funding for Medicare and Medicaid. The time has come for this spirit of optimism and compromise to find its way to the upper echelon of Government so that we can all move toward the middle and find an acceptable resolution to this budget fiasco.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON].

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

There has been a lot of talk about the Republicans killing student loans in the last few months, and today, I want to set the record straight. The Balanced Budget Act that the President vetoed actually enhanced the postsecondary student's ability to get a loan. Under our plan, every student will be able to receive a student loan. The student loan provisions in the Balanced Budget Act achieve our goal of protecting student loans for every student and saving taxpayer dollars.

Student loan dollars increase by 50 percent over the next 7 years. Every student who applies will be able to receive a student loan. No parent or student pays more for a loan under our budget than they do under the current law or under the President's budget, for that matter. More importantly, our budget spends money to give students more flexible repayment terms.

The President's budget fails to include such a provisions, making one wonder why the President does not feel that all students should have the same opportunity to select from various repayment terms.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN], my good friend.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my friend for yielding me this time.

People listening to this debate have to be wondering what we are debating about and why we are debating this. It is certainly not advancing a bipartisan solution of our budget crisis in this country, and it is certainly not about deficit reduction, because the budget resolution before us is not being seriously considered. Those who brought it forward indicate they will vote against it.

Democrats would welcome a new budget resolution. We know that the Republican budget resolution is not going to become law. We welcome bringing a new budget resolution to the floor. Many of us have suggested the coalition budget, a budget that has much more deficit reduction, realistic spending targets, and protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment. It does that by putting tax breaks after we balance the budget.

If we want to reduce the deficit, we can do that today. Let us pass a clean CR and stop wasting $40 million a day of the taxpayers' money by closing Government when it should be open and we should be negotiating a new budget.

These are childish games to be debating this type of an issue while Government is closed. We need serious negotiations without preconditions. That is what the Democrats are asking for.

Yes, the Majority asked about a 7-year balanced budget and CBO numbers. We are prepared for that. But what my constituents are saying is, where is the change in the budget that protects Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment?

The continuing resolution that we passed last month contained those promises as well, but the Republicans have not, in good faith, brought forth changes in their budget in order to protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop these games, let us sit down and negotiate a budget that we can all agree with so that we can pass a new budget resolution on the floor of this House that, yes, brings us to a balanced budget but also protects the priorities that are important to the American people. That is what we should be doing here today and not playing the games on this resolution.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TALENT].

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a letter I recently received from a young man named Aaron from my district.

He writes, ''When I turned 16 I did two things right away. I went out and obtained my driver's license, and I got a job. I am now almost 17 and have been working at various jobs for the past year. I have learned a lot from working, such as the value of money, the responsibility of having a job and how important it is to get a good education. One big thing I learned is that taxes will affect me for the rest of my life.''

''Before I started working I had no idea how much the government really took out of your paycheck for taxes. I have discovered that it is a lot of money. Actually, I don't really mind paying the money, as long as it is not too outrageous, and if I know for sure that one day I will benefit. For example, I want to be sure that when I am old enough to receive Social Security and Medicare, it will still be around.''

''I want to thank you for all your efforts toward decreasing taxes, and in

making sure that the things my taxes pay for, such as Medicare and Social Security, will still be around in the future.''

Mr. President, when you promised to present a balanced budget, you promised it to young men and women like this. Keep your promise, help us pass a balanced budget and keep faith with America.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I expect that there will be some embarrassment today among some of my Democratic colleagues who will find themselves voting against President Clinton's budget. I remember in the 1980's the humiliation that Republicans experienced when they voted against several budgets of our beloved former President, Ronald Reagan.

There have been votes against the Bush budget, votes against the Carter budget. In fact, I have been here 17 years, and I remember only 2 budgets that truly were the budgets of the President that passed this Congress in those 17 years. Three years ago, by one vote. In fact, I tied the vote and Congresswoman Margolies-Mezvinsky cast the deciding vote, and President Clinton got the budget he wanted.

Early in President Reagan's term, in his first year, he got the budget he wanted. All other Presidents, all other budgets since I have been here, have been turned down by this House, regardless of who was President.

This House has passed only budgets when the President would compromise with us. So today's vote, which I expect will come down against President Clinton, will be nothing new.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

(Mr. GOODLING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I realize and I empathize with those on the other side of the aisle who do not want to vote on the President's budget. My colleague put me through that exercise many, many times during the last, I do not know how many years. It is painful for a little while, but it goes away very quickly. So have no fear.

I want to thank the minority leader for indicating that he has a concern about school lunch. I hope he will join with me. I have a tremendous concern about school lunch. Fifty percent of all of the children who are eligible for free and reduced-priced meals do not participate. Do not participate. That means they are in school all day long, I suppose, without any food. I suppose they have no breakfast when they come to school.

So we should not do the status quo that the gentlewoman from Arkansas talked about. We should make changes. So I am happy that the gentleman is ready to deal with that.

Another person from the other side talked about decimating education. Well, education is 6 percent of the budget from the national level. That is all we spend, 6 percent. But let me tell my colleagues, in the 7 years that we are talking about, we are willing to spend $340 billion. The minority, in the last 7 years, spent $315 billion. We are ready to spend $25 billion more than they spent in the last 7 years.

Over the next school year, national spending on elementary and secondary education under our budget will increase by 4.1 percent. Again, let us talk about access to excellence and not mediocrity. Going back to the gentlewoman from Arkansas again, let us talk about something other than the status quo.

The gentleman from Maryland, who is going to speak later, has joined with me the last couple of years, but prior to that, I was the only one who kept talking about what we are getting in terms of quality from chapter 1. What we are getting as far as quality is concerned in Head Start.

Well, chapter 1, title I, we have spent $90 billion since 1967, and this is the report we get from the Department of Education. Comparison of similar cohorts by grade and poverty show that program participation does not reduce, not reduce, the test score gap for disadvantaged students. Indeed, chapter 1 students scored in all poverty cohorts declined between the third and fourth grade.

Going to Head Start, we have spent $31.2 billion on the Head Start program, and this is, again, what they say. Unchecked growth over the last 5 years has brought about sloppy program management. Of course, every President and every Congress has said we will put more into the program. And so the program has increased in 5 years' time 186 percent. Do my colleagues know what it increased as far as participation is concerned? It increased participation 39 percent.

The expenditure increases 186 percent, the participation 39 percent. And as the Secretary of HHS said, we do not say that improving quality will cost more money. So, again, let us not have the status quo. Let us insist on excellence in education, not just access.

Mr. Speaker, one other area, let me talk about very quickly, and that is the whole area of higher education. The President says that in his proposal he saves $3 billion in higher education by slashing the income earned by the banks and the State guarantee agencies. Folks, that cannot be. How can that happen? Because he is going to direct lending 100 percent in 2 years' time, so he cannot get $3 billion from the rest of the lending programs. He has eliminated them all in a 2-year budget. So he cannot say he will get $3 billion there.

Mr. Speaker, we got $5 billion from those same agencies, but we also allow the competition, and that is what we are talking about when we set up the program. We want to see in a 7-year period what is better. We cannot, if he goes directly, and he cannot save that kind of money.

So, again, look carefully at these budgets and let us talk about excellence rather than just access to mediocrity.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, let us be honest with the public about what is going on and what is not going on. What is supposed to be going on right now is a negotiation between the President and the leadership of the House and Senate. In that negotiation each comes to the table with a position. During the negotiation each makes different offers about where they could move and where they could change.

The President made such an offer of movement during a previous negotiation last week. That was not the President's budget. It was an offer of movement in a negotiation. What this resolution we are debating today represents is the chairman of the Committee on the Budget attempting to identify, with a large variety of assumptions, what that would look like in the form of a budget, and then bring it here and say we are voting on the President's budget.

That is not the truth. What we are doing is putting up a straw man to then take shots at so that we can attack the President as part of this negotiating posture. I would suggest it would be far more beneficial if rather than standing outside the room lobbing grenades into the negotiation room, that we actually find ways to find agreement between the two of us.

Now, if we want to negotiate with the President and the leadership, let them go into the room and we ought to stop throwing grenades in the room. If we want to do it here, if we do not want the President and the leadership to negotiate it, if we want to negotiate it here on the floor of the House, there is a way to do that.

We have suggested bring the majority resolution, the minority resolution, the President's, bring any resolution anyone wants to this floor under an open rule, without time limitations; put all of the Members in here, lock the doors, and do not even give any bathroom breaks, if the majority does not want to, but keep us here debating and using our voting card and doing what this Congress is supposed to do, what the people of the United States expect us to do, and let us vote and the winning vote passes. That is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, my leader.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the President really has not come to the table, and that is what brings us here today. He promised in his campaign to balance the budget in 5 years, and then the next year he raised taxes on the American people by a greater amount than ever before.

□ 1615

And then February, February 1995, he says, ''Well, I do not want to balance the budget. I just want to give the American people a deficit of about $200 billion a year, sometimes $300 billion a year, as far as the eye can see.''

Then he came up with a second budget, a 10-year balanced budget, because he got a lot of criticism for the first one. Still, when the Congressional Budget Office scored that budget, it was $200 billion in imbalance by the year 2005. Then he came up with a 7-year balanced budget, his third budget, and it was $115 billion in imbalance. Now, we have the fourth budget, given to us only a few weeks ago; $87 billion imbalance by the year 2002.

The President has said he is committed to a balanced budget within 7 years, but not now.

He says he is for tax cuts, or at least he has from time to time, but not now.

He says he is for Medicare reform and Medicaid reform, but not now.

He says he is for welfare reform, but not now.

He says he is even for discretionary cuts, but he criticizes the Congress for making those cuts in the appropriations process now.

Mr. Speaker, oh, he did say that he wanted to cut defense by $7 billion, but he sent the troops off to Bosnia, so he said not now.

Otherwise, the President is in an awkward position. He really does want to protect the bureaucracy now; duplication of programs, waste, inefficiency of government, high regulation, yes, high taxes, centralized government. He is the champion of those issues now.

My colleagues might call him the stalwart of the status quo. But he says he wants a balanced budget within 7 years. Now, these conflict. How does he do it? Well, we ask him to present his budget, but he still has not gotten there.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest if the President wanted to balance the budget and save our economy and bring down interest rates and preserve the American dream for our children and our grandchildren, then he would come forward and put his package on the table, as we have done. But, unfortunately, there is no ''there'' there in the President's package. Ours is on the table. Where is his?

Our reforms in welfare, Medicare, and Medicaid, our cuts in taxes are all in the package that he has vetoed. Our attempts in the appropriations process to cut $22 billion in this year's discretionary spending for fiscal year 1996 have, in part, been adopted and signed into law or accepted into law by the President. Seven bills have passed, and I will offer for the RECORD the status of those. But three bills have been vetoed in the last 2 days. That is despite the fact that overall, our appropriations process has eliminated 260-plus programs and substantially cut hundreds of others. But the President says, ''Not now.''

He says, ''No, we will veto those bills, and we will take up those bills later.''

Mr. Speaker, Christmas is coming and we have not taken them up. We have got an impasse, a constitutional impasse. It is our prerogative under the Constitution to pass the laws and send them to him. It is his prerogative to veto them.

Where do we end up? I am not sure anybody knows, unless the President comes to the table now. His budget is a fig leaf. If he really wants to put America back on the right track, he should accept our budget and our appropriation bills. But maybe that is just not good politics. Mr. Speaker, I hope he comes to the table.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following:

STATUS OF APPROPRIATIONS BILLS FISCAL YEAR 1996

[As of December 19—3 p.m.]

7–Enacted into law.—Military Construction (P.L. 104–32); Agriculture (P.L. 104–37); Energy & Water (P.L. 104–46); Transportation (P.L. 104–50); Treasury-Postal Service (P.L. 104–52); Legislative Branch (P.L. 104–53); and National Security (P.L. 104–61).

3–Vetoed by the President.—Commerce-Justice-State; Interior; and VA–HUD.

1–Conference reports pending in Senate.—Foreign Operations (Amendment No. 115—Abortion).

1–Bill in conference.—District of Columbia.

1–Passed the House and pending Senate floor action.—Labor-HHS.

PROGRAM ELIMINATIONS

Transportation.—Highway demonstration projects ($352 million); Local rail freight assistance ($17 million); Penn Station Redevelopment ($40 million); Interstate Commerce Commission (after Jan. 1) ($15.4 million); Coast Guard buoy replacement project ($8.5 million); Coast Guard 82-foot WPB capability replacement ($4 million); Coast Guard HH–65 helicopter gearbox upgrade ($2.5 million); Coast Guard GPS 2nd District ($2.4 million); FAA ''Quality through partnership'' program ($1.79 million); and FAA NAS management automation program ($2 million).

FAA traffic management system ($10.8 million); FAA Digital BRITE display ($5.5 million); FAA remote maintenance monitoring system upgrade ($3 million); FAA Integrated network management system ($300,000); FAA precision runway monitors ($1.2 million); FAA future airway facilities technologies (R&D) ($3.4 million); FAA general aviation renaissance ($1 million); Federal Hwy. Admin. OJT/supportive svcs. ($5 million); FHWA ITS advanced technology applications ($10 million); and FHWA ITS priority corridors ($10 million).

Agriculture.—Cattle Tick Eradication Program, Food Stamp Program ($12.5 million); Closed 3 Agriculture Research Svc. laboratories ($1 million); Eliminated 26 research grants ($4.7 million); and Nutrition Education Initiative, Extension activities ($4.3 million).

Treasury-Postal Service.—Advisory Commission on Intergovt. Relations ($216,000); Administrative Conference of the U.S. ($1.2 million); Treasury Special Forfeiture Fund ($45 million); IRS Tax Compliance ($405 million); OPM Federal Quality Institute ($800,000); OPM International Affairs Office ($140,000); OPM Research Office ($2.2 million); OPM Job Information ($2.5 million); and OPM Occupational Testing ($14.4 million).

Legislative Branch.—Office of Technology Assessment ($18.4 million); U.S. Code subscriptions for Members ($420,000); House Parking Lot 6 ($238,000); Warehouse at 120 Canal St., SE ($181,000); Historical Society calendars for Members ($850,000); Folding Room (privatized) ($6.1 million); Barber Shop (privatized) ($148,000); and Ended taxpayer-subsidized flag office ($324,000).

Energy and Water.—Gas Turbine Modular Helium Reactor ($20.7 million); Russian replacement program ($5 million); Technology Partnership program ($3 million); In House Energy Mgmt. ($31.3 million); Water Conservation Challenge Partnerships ($9 million); Energy/Water Product Efficiency Standards ($450,000); Construction Prod. Advancement Research Program ($6 million); and Nat'l Assessment of Water Supply Demand & Avail. ($3 million).

Nat'l Spacial Data Infrastructure ($2 million); Dredging Oper. and Environmental Research ($3 million); Water Operations Tech. Support Program ($1.5 million); River Confluence Ice Research ($1 million); Natural Resources Technical Support ($1.6 million); Environmental Review Guide for Operations ($1.5 million); Reinvested User Fees for Recreation Improvements ($5 million); and Real Time Water Control Research Program ($850,000).

Interior.—Bureau of Mines ($30 million); Emergency Preparedness (DOE) ($8 million); Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corp. ($7 million); Urban park and recreation fund ($6 million); State grants/land and water conservation fund ($25 million); Business enterprise development grants ($2 million); Indian direct loan program ($1 million); Navajo rehabilitation trust fund ($2 million); Rural abandoned mine program (RAMP) ($8 million); Advanced computational technology initiative ($10 million); and Coalbed methane program ($2 million).

Planar solid oxide fuel cells program ($3 million); Mild gasification process development unit ($4 million); Gasifier improvement facility ($4 million); Advanced absorption fluids ($1 million); Microcogeneration ($2 million); Lighting collaboratives ($1 million); Federal energy efficiency fund ($7 million); Cool communities ($2 million); Training for commercial building operators ($2 million); Pressure calciner project ($2 million); and Aluminum spray forming ($3 million).

Advanced fluid catalytic cracker ($2 million); Food, textiles and agriculture program ($1 million); Grants to industrial associations ($1 million); Industrial assessments ($1 million); CNG absorbent systems and tank design ($1 million); Federal fleet vehicle acquisition (elim. central DOE fund) ($20 million); Collaborative effort with DOT on crash behavior ($1 million); Automotive piston technologies ($5 million); Locomotive fuel cell program ($1 million); Fuel cells for buses ($3 million); and Integrated resource planning (utility sector programs) ($9 million).

VA-HUD, Indep. Agencies.—National Community Service/Americorps ($577 million); Community Development Financial Institutions ($125 million); Chemical Safety and Hazards Investigation Board ($500,000); Office of Consumer Affairs ($2.2 million); Public Housing Development ($598 million); Enterprise Zone Homes ($50 million); Pension Fund Partnerships ($350 million); Flexible Subsidy Fund ($50 million); Neighborhood Development ($5 million); and Community Adjustment Planning ($2 million).

National Homeownership Trust Demonstration ($50 million); Congregate Housing

($25 million); Project Based Service Coordinators ($22 million); Economic Development Initiative ($350 million); Joint Community Development ($6 million); Lease Adjustments ($22 million); Loan Management ($150 million); Public Housing Coordinators ($30 million); and Service Coordinators ($30 million).

Commerce, Justice, State.—Advanced Technology Program ($340 million); U.S. Travel and Tourism Administration ($14 million; $2 million left for closeout costs); Nonpoint Pollution Source Control grants ($5 million); Endowment for Children's Educational Television ($2.5 million); Contributions to U.N. Industrial Dev. Organization ($28 million); Competitive Policy Council ($1 million); and Ounce of Prevention Council ($1.5 million).

Labor, HHS (House eliminations).—Summer Youth ($871 million); Low Income Home Energy Assistance ($1 billion); Goals 2000 ($372 million); Library Constitution & Categoricals ($37 million); Corporation for National and Community Service/Americorps ($577 million); Community Development Financial Institutions ($125 million); Council on Environmental Quality ($1.19 million); Chemical Safety and Hazards Investigation Board ($500,000); Severely Distressed Public Housing ($500 million); Flexible Subsidy Fund—HUD ($50 million); Congregate Services—HUD ($25 million); HOPE grants ($50 million); Youthbuild Program—HUD ($50 million); and National Homeownership Trust Demonstration Program ($50 million).

Department of Labor

Employment and Training Administration.—Youth Fair Chance ($24 million); Rural Concentrated Employment ($3.8 million); JTPA Concentrated Employment ($6 million); National Commission for Employment Policy ($2.2 million); American Samoans (Training & Employment Services) ($5 million); Microenterprise Grants ($2.25 million); National Occupational Information Committee ($6 million); National Center for the Workplace ($1.1 million); Office of the American Workplace Departmental Management ($7.4 million); National Veteran's Training Institute ($2.9 million).

Department of Health and Human Services

Public Health Services.—Trauma Care—Public Health Service ($4.7 million); Black Lung Clinics ($4.1 million); Payments to Hawaii-Hansen's Disease ($2.9 million); Pacific Basin Initiative—Public Health Service ($2.8 million); Native Hawaiian Health Care ($4.5 million); and National Institute Occupational Safety & Health Training ($12.8 million).

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.—Community Support Demonstrations—Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Admin. ($24 million); Treatment Grants to Crisis Areas—Substance Abuse Services ($35 million); Comprehensive Comm. Treatment Program—Substance Abuse Services ($27 million); Training—Training Improvement Demos. ($5.5 million); High Risk Youth—Prevention Demonstrations ($65 million); Other Programs—Prevention Demonstration ($6.6 million); Community Partnerships ($114 million); and Prevention Education/Dissemination ($13.4 million).

Assistant Secretary for Health.—Office of Disease Prevention & Health Promotion ($4.6 million); Emergency Preparedness ($2.1 million); and Health Care Reform Data Analysis ($2.7 million).

Health Care Financing Administration.—Counseling Program ($4.5 million); and New Rural Health Grants ($1.7 million).

Administration for Children and Families.—Civics & English Education Grants ($6 million); Child Development Associate Scholarships ($1.3 million); ABCAN ($288,000); Child Welfare Research ($6.3 million); Social Services Research ($14.9 million); Family Support Centers ($7 million); Community Based Resource Centers ($31.3 million); Rural Housing ($2.9 million); Farmworker Assistance ($3 million); and Demonstration Partnerships ($7.9 million).

Administration on Aging.—Ombudsman Services ($4.4 million); Pension Counseling ($1.9 million); Preventive Health ($16.9 million); Aging Research & Special Project ($26.5 million); Federal Council on Aging ($176,000); and White House Conference on Aging ($3 million).

Department of Education

State School Improvement ($27 million); and Impact Aid-Payments for Federal Property ($16 million).

School Improvement Programs.—Safe & Drug Free Schools-National Programs ($25 million); Education Infrastructure ($35 million); Law Related Education ($5.8 million); Christa McAuliffe Scholarship ($1.9 million); Women's Educational Equity ($3.9 million); Training and Advisory Services ($21.4 million); Dropout Prevention Demonstrations ($28 million); and Ellender Fellowships (Close-Up).

Education for Native Hawaiians ($12 million); Foreign Language Assistance ($10 million); Training in Early Childhood ($13 million); Comp. Regional Assistance Centers ($44 million); and Family and Community Endeavor Schools ($11 million).

Bilingual and Immigrant Education.—Support Services ($14 million); and Professional Development ($25 million).

Special Education.—Innovation and Development ($20 million); Technology Applications ($10 million); Special Studies ($4 million); Personnel Development ($91 million); Parent Training ($13 million); Clearinghouses ($2 million); Regional Resources Centers ($7 million); Endowment Grants-National Tech. Institute for the Deaf ($336,000); Construction-National Tech. Institute for the Deaf ($150,000); and Endowment Grants-Gallaudet University ($1 million).

Vocational and Adult Education.—Community Based Organizations ($9 million); Consumer and Homemaker Education ($34 million); State Councils ($8.8 million); Demonstrations-National Program ($20 million); National Occupational Info. Coord. Committee ($6 million); Evaluation & Technical Assistance-Adult Education ($3.9 million); National Institute for Literacy ($4.8 million); and Workplace Literacy Partnerships ($18 million).

Student Financial Assistance.—Federal Perkins Loans-Capital Contributions ($158 million); State Student Incentive Grants ($63 million); and State Post-Secondary Review Program ($20 million).

Higher Education.—Endowment Grants ($6 million); HBCU Set-aside ($2 million); Evaluation ($1 million); Native Hawaiian & Alaska Native Cultural Arts ($1 million); Eisenhower Leadership Program ($4 million); Innovation Projects in Community Service ($1.4 million); Institute for International Public Policy ($1 million); Cooperative Education ($6.9 million); Law School Clinical Experience ($14.9 million); Urban Community Service ($13 million); Student Financial Aid Database ($496,000); and Mary McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center ($4 million).

National Early Intervention Scholarship & Partnerships ($3.1 million); Byrd Scholarships ($29 million); National Science Scholarships ($4.4 million); National Academy of Science, Space & Technology ($2 million); Douglas Teacher Scholarships ($14.5 million); Olympic Scholarships ($1 million); Teacher Corps ($1.8 million); Harris Scholarships ($20 million); Javits Fellowships ($7 million); Faculty Development Fellowships ($3.7 million); School, College and University Partnerships ($3.8 million); and Legal Training for the Disadvantaged ($2.9 million).

Howard University.—Regular Program-Endowment Program ($3.5 million); Clinical Law Center-Endowment Program ($5.5 million); Research ($4.6 million); Construction ($5 million); and College housing & Acad. Facilities Loans ($1 million).

Education Research, Statistics & Improvements.—21st Century Learning ($750,000); Eisenhower Prof. Development-Nat. Programs ($21 million); Eisenhower Math/Science Education Consortia ($15 million); National Writing Project ($3.2 million); National Diffusion Network ($14 million); Star Schools ($30 million); Ready to Learn TV ($7 million); and Telecommunications Demo for Math ($2 million).

Libraries.—Construction ($17 million); Library Literacy Programs ($8 million); Library Education and Training ($4.9 million) and Research and Demonstrations ($6.5 million).

Department Management.—National Board of the Fund for the Improv. of Post Secondary Ed. ($128,000); President's Ad. Comm. on Ed. Excellence for Hispanic Am. ($286,000); and President's Bd. of Advisors on Hist. Black Colleges & Univ. ($128,000).

Related Agencies.—Vista Literacy Corps-Domestic ($5 million); Senior Demonstration Program ($1 million); National Education Goals Panel ($3 million); and National Ed. Standards & Improvement Council ($2 million).

MAJOR CUTS IN PROGRAMS

Agriculture.—Congressional Affairs activities ($1.1 million or 25%); USDA advisory committees ($278,000 or 30%); Rural Housing Preservation Grants ($11 million or 50%); Sect. 515 rental housing program ($40 million or 21%); and Title III—commodity grants and P.L. 480 ($67 million or 57%).

Transportation.—Essential Air Service ($10.8 million); Transit formula grants ($457 million); Transit operating assistance ($310 million); Northeast corridor improvement program ($85 million); and Amtrak operating subsidies ($198 million).

Legislative Branch.—One-third Committee reduction ($45 million); Eliminated 6,000 daily copies of The Congressional Record ($1.5 million); Recording studio and photographers ($1.2 million); Closed captioning ($800,000); Joint committees ($2.6 million or 22.8%); Architect of the Capitol ($16.7 million); Govt. Accounting Office ($75 million or 15%); Congressional Printing and Binding ($6 million); and GPO Superintendent of Documents ($1.9 million).

Energy and Water.—Army Corps of Engineers ($138 million); Bureau of Reclamation ($31 million); Dept. of Energy ($173 million); Appalachian Regional Commission ($102 million); Tennessee Valley Authority ($29 million); and Nuclear Regulatory Commission ($52 million).

Interior.—Territories ($31 million); Bureau of Indian Affairs ($160 million); Department of Energy ($87 million); National Endowment on the Arts ($52 million); National Endowment on Humanities ($51.5 million); Institute of Museum Services ($8.8 million); Natural Resources Research ($25 million); Office of Surface Mining ($24 million); and Natural Resource Agencies ($200 million) (non-essential construction, land acquisition and grants).

VA-HUD, Indep. Agencies.—NASA ($556 million); HUD ($6.1 billion); Superfund ($267 million); Environmental Protection Agency ($1.5 billion); Academic Research Infrastructure ($150 million); and Property Disposition ($289 million).

National Security.—Technology Reinvestment Program ($305 million); Consultants/research centers ($90 million); Environmental

restoration ($200 million); Cooperative Threat Reduction ($71 million); Energy management programs ($199 million); Defense acquisition/management ($164 million); UN peacekeeping assessment ($65 million); and Travel/support aircraft operations ($129 million).

Commerce, Justice, State.—Department of Commerce ($578 million); Asia Foundation ($10 million); Contributions to Inter'l Organizations ($172 million); Contributions to Inter'l Peacekeeping ($293 million); Arms Control and Disarmament Agency ($14.7 million); U.S. Information Agency ($310 million); East-West Center ($13 million); Federal Communications Commission ($9.5 million); Legal Services Corporation ($122 million); and State Justice Institute ($8.3 million).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, 2½ minutes is insufficient time to correct all the misstatements, I am sure, that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] made just now, so I will not endeavor to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we need to understand what we are doing. We are continuing to play games. The Committee on Rules has reported out this resolution, which they purport to be the President's provision in response to their reconciliation. Everybody honestly knows that is not the case.

This is the Republican reconciliation bill. Does anybody in this House believe this is an analogous document? Does anybody believe this is an analogous, fair, alternative proposal that the Republicans are putting on the floor? Does anybody? I do not believe it.

Mr. Speaker, these are six bills, smaller than the bill that I just raised. They are the appropriation bills that would run Government if we could pass them. The gentleman from Louisiana just got on the floor recently and said, ''Where is the Labor-Health bill? It is being filibustered in the Senate.'' Why? Not on the money issue, but because they put an extraneous provision on that bill called strikebreaker so that people can be fired without notice.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that is their position. We do not agree with it. But it should not be on that bill and it should not be on any one of these six. We ought to make them law.

Mr. Speaker, this is a continuing resolution. It is simple and it says we will continue to operate Government. While we debate the differences we have in this bill, we will pass this simple bill and say America is paying for its Government, and we are going to deliver it.

Mr. Speaker, we could pass this simple little resolution in 5 minutes. We have already passed one twice. We will take the figures that our Republican colleagues put in their resolution last time and simply say, Let us go to January 3 or 17 or 29, and then let us try to figure out, as adults, as responsible Americans sent here to represent our fellow citizens, how do we resolve the differences in this bill? But it is the failure to pass this one that has shut down parts of Government. That brings no credit to us or to this institution.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS].

(Mr. ROBERTS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I realize there is a great deal of concern on the part of my Democrat colleagues regarding this debate and vote. They say the President' budget is not really a budget, it is more like a plan or a proposal or an internal working document. In any case, they say that we should not be voting on it, whatever it is.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the agriculture title of the President's budget is very real. There are 187 pages of specific policy recommendations from the Office of Management and Budget. Just for the record, when specific and real budgets were presented by Republican Presidents in the past years, the Democratic majority made it a regular ritual to call for a vote and to put everybody on the record, so today it is no different.

Mr. Speaker, despite all of the welcome and helpful efforts of various Democrats, those who call themselves the Blue Dogs, those who are part of the coalition group, this document right here really contains the only current and specific policy recommendations on agriculture by this administration.

What are the proposals for farm country? Well, farmers are not freed from massive USDA regulation. The Secretary of Agriculture is given broad authority to arbitrarily establish mandatory land set-asides. The budget that the President vetoed deregulates all of that practice.

The President revives the off-farm income means test for farm programs that calls for farmers and ranchers to surrender their income tax return to the Department. That is the very reason the House overwhelmingly rejected this idea earlier this year.

Marketing loans and other programs that farmers file for all year are wrecked by the President's plan for cotton, rice, and peanuts.

Sugar farmers do not have that problem. The President simply eliminates their program after 2 years, with no mechanism to ease the transition.

There are new taxes in the form of user fees and assessments. They are levied on producers to finance marketing orders and the peanut program. There is a new tax levied on the crop protection industry.

Assessments on dairy farmers are retained and the scheduled decrease is canceled. All Republican dairy proposals are premised on eliminating the assessments entirely.

The bulk of the agriculture savings in the President's budget comes from increasing the acres for which no payments will be made. That is a straight cut in income support. There is no protection against any future budget cuts though deregulation; no effort to help farmers make an assisted transition to market-oriented farming. The President offers farmers cuts in income, more cuts to come, and the status quo.

The President has stressed how important it is to protect farmers in this budget process; that cuts in ag should be limited to $5 billion instead of the $12 billion in the balanced budget that he vetoed. But the crucial issue is how much help farmers will get, not about how much is cut.

The budget he vetoed contained $44 billion as an investment in farm program reform over 7 years. The President's budget contains only $37 billion. I want to make it very clear to those who care about the future of American agriculture what is at stake in this debate. If we can bring the Federal budget into balance, interest rates will fall, and farmers who are among the heaviest users of credit in this country will save $15 billion in borrowing costs.

If we fail in this task, if we fail, if we delay, the Federal Reserve Chairman, Alan Greenspan, has warned that interest rates will sharply rise, heavily impacting farmers. The longer we delay, the worse agriculture will fare in this budget process as we struggle with a collapsing baseline.

My colleagues, America needs a balanced budget bill that will really balance the budget. The President has vetoed one serious budget effort. We need to send a strong signal to the President that a status quo ag policy that does not preserve an adequate investment in agriculture is a nonstarter. Let us renew our efforts for a budget plan that truly balances the budget and treats our farmers fairly.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the time on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WATT].

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, over the last 30 days or so, I have really started to worry about whether I am in the right place. I am worried about whether we are following somebody who has any sense of responsibility to the American people.

A Speaker who would close down the Government because he had to get off the back of a plane; a Speaker who would lead us to default on the obligations that the U.S. Government has to people that it owes money to; a Speaker that would close down the Government 2 or 3 days before the Christmas holiday.

Yet, we spend our time dealing with trivia that has no meaning, like this bill.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER].

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about what is happening here today. I am afraid that our government has been taken hostage by a

stubborn gang of right-wingers, left-wingers, and campaign consultants.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this budget disagreement is a serious debate about real issues and the future of our country. This fight is about principles. But sooner or later, the public interest requires that even principled fighters settle on something.

I have done a little research back in my office. I first consulted my Bible, and I learned that Moses went up on that mountain and came down with the Ten Commandments 40 days later. I consulted the Bicentennial edition of the U.S. Constitution and I learned that the Founders wrote the Constitution of the United States of America in less than 4 months.

Mr. Speaker, we have been in session since January. That is 350 days. That is 12 months. That is a year. Now we have shut down the Government twice, and still have not finished our work.

Mr. Speaker, I say the President and the Republican leadership ought to put their plans on the table and come to a compromise. If they cannot agree on how to run the Government, then they ought to put the coalition budget on the table and go from there. The coalition plan is not perfect, but I think that if Moses or the Founders or the American people could have their say, they would give them the same advice.

Mr. Speaker, if some politicians think it is in their interest to continue this posturing and carry this debate into the 1996 elections, then I hope the electorate will send us some good old-fashioned, practical Americans.

□ 1630

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL].

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity on the eve of those people that are able to celebrate the birth of Christ and their own religious holidays to realize that what we are doing today has nothing to do with balancing the budget. All of the things that my Republican friends are talking about can and should be done. As a matter of fact, it should have been done a long time ago.

It is one thing to hold the President of the United States hostage, to force him to do what you would want him to do by closing down the Government. It is another thing to take the American people who have nothing to do with the dilemma we find ourselves in and to say, you are not going to vote for a continuing resolution until you make them suffer the pain, until you make certain that those that have a responsibility to take care of their family are now just going to be angry with government in general.

If my colleagues really believe that these mean-spirited tactics are going to make their party and their Speaker popular, then why do they not talk with the people that have the responsibility of providing the care to the poor and to the sick, talk with the Catholic bishops who say that these programs make no sense, the nuns and the women and the teachers and the doctors that provide for those people that even our Lord said are the lesser among us, that we would have their budgets cut, for what? To balance the budget?

Do we balance a budget really by starting off saying that we are going to give $245 billion to the richest Americans? My colleagues, do not do it. So play around with Democrats and Republicans. Do what we have to do for the Presidential election. But as we go into the celebration of the birth of Christ, do not take these holidays and play politics with the American people.

People cannot even go to the Statue of Liberty, a place that is symbolic for what this country stands for, and we are down here just playing politics without allowing Government to continue.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

(Mr. STENHOLM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the first budget the President submitted this year and stated so in the Committee on the Budget because it did not do what I want done, and that is balance the budget in 7 years.

I opposed his second budget but applauded him for moving into the 10-year balanced budget frame. I applauded the President when he moved again a week ago, not as far as I would like to see, and I certainly will vote against this so-called budget today, which really is not a budget. It is an opportunity to talk about whatever it is we have been talking about.

But I also voted against the Republican budget. We hear a lot about the deficit. And I have a lot of agreements with the Republican budget. I think we will find whenever we can start negotiating that we will have some agreements. I have a lot of strong disagreements. The biggest one is I do not believe it makes sense to borrow 53 billion more dollars over the next 3 years in order to give ourselves a tax cut.

If my colleagues are concerned about deficits, it seems to me that the good-faith first effort ought to be reduce the deficit, not cut taxes.

We talk about negotiations. I have not seen any movement on this as yet. Does it really make sense to borrow 53 billion more dollars when we are talking about reducing the deficit? I ask my colleagues to justify that one.

We have heard a lot about honest numbers. Again let me repeat, honest numbers, real numbers, CBO, all of this that I support, but CBO adjusted their real, honest numbers 135 billion since we started the fussing.

I am on the nonnegotiating team. I hope today as our leaders have met, I hope that later today we will hear that the negotiators can sit down and start working out the differences between the various ideas and that we come to an agreement, and that budget agreement will be signed by the President because he has said, I will sign a 7-year CBO-scored budget. But we will not get there with what we are doing this afternoon.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GOODLATTE].

(Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to President Clinton's unbalanced budget and in support of the balanced budget that has already passed this Congress.

The President has now had four tries at sending the Congress a balanced budget. And, he still has not gotten close to honoring the commitment he made to the American people and the law he signed 29 days ago agreeing to a balanced budget in 7 years using real numbers, not smoke and mirrors. President Clinton's latest budget keeps piling on the debt—an estimated $265 billion in the red.

While the President cannot send us a budget that actually balances, he can stand over at the White House and scare our seniors, scare our families, and scare our veterans with dire rhetoric and self-serving political posturing that lacks one essential element—the truth.

The President has his seasons mixed up. It is Christmas, not Halloween. So maybe he should put away the ''senior-scare'' tactics and ''bogey-man'' budgets and join the Congress in actually helping our Nation by balancing the budget.

Today, each and every member of Congress faces a crystal clear decision. Members can vote for President Clinton's fourth budget and with their vote they will say to their folks back home, ''I agree with President Clinton. We simply don't want to balance the budget so let's not even try. Let's just keep piling on the debt that our children and grandchildren will be stuck with anyway. And, we'll keep playing the tried and true Washington political game of saying one thing and doing another. Saying we want a balanced budget, but voting to keep up the outrageous spend-a-thon.'' That's what some wrongheaded members might say.

Or, Members of Congress can vote ''no'' on President Clinton's budget. By voting ''no,'' a Member of Congress is saying, ''President Clinton, it really is time to finally balance the budget. No more Washington, DC gimmicks. No more political games. No more divisive grandstanding. Let's do the right thing. Let's balance the budget. Let's put our government back to work.''

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to vote ''no'' and send a bipartisan message to President Clinton that we are ready to move forward to balance the budget and it is about time that he joined us.

The American people are waiting and watching.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I want to briefly comment on the significant differences between the administration's recent unbalanced budget proposal and the Republican balanced budget plan.

The Republican plan stops a decade-long hemorrhage in defense spending, in the President's 5-year defense plan. We do not know how much further the President might be cutting the defense budget because his latest proposal does not provide specific budget function numbers. While the Republican defense plan is far from a cure-all, it does begin to restore quality of life for our personnel and their families. It does sustain readiness. It does begin the long and expensive process of reinvigorating a faltering modernization program, and it does initiate long overdue Pentagon reforms.

Mr. Speaker, let me cite just one important example where the President's recent proposal is not only inconsistent with the bipartisan congressional priorities but breaks faith with our military personnel.

Two years ago the President signed into law reconciliation legislation that disproportionately delayed the payment of military retiree COLA's relative to their Federal civilian counterparts. Realizing the error of his ways, the President finally requested the restoral of COLA equity in his budget submission earlier this year. The Republican balanced budget plan endorsed COLA equity. Just last Friday the House passed a fiscal year 1966 defense authorization conference report containing the statutory changes necessary to implement COLA equity.

Yet it appears that the President has had a change of heart. His most recent unbalanced budget proposal would once again unfairly penalize our military retirees by delaying payments of their COLA's to October while endorsing the payment of Federal civilian retiree COLA's to April. To use another's famous words, it is deja vu all over again.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, the last gentleman described the Republican reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, the country moves on. In fact today Alan Greenspan reduced interest rates by a quarter of a percent so the country can grow at a quicker rate. Only the Government shuts down. Only we in Congress can open it. Yet while Rome burns, the leadership of the Republican Party fiddles.

Thanks to the Speaker, the Federal Government is shut down again, 250,000 employees are out of work because the Speaker's nose is out of joint. Happy holidays. Instead of passing a continuing resolution, putting people back to work and going back to the negotiating table, we are voting on a poorly plagiarized budget document.

I support a balanced budget. I support the President's commitment to do so while protecting Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment. But this is not the President's budget. This is a gimmick.

Mr. Speaker, stop wasting our time. Go back to the negotiating table and stop holding Federal employees hostage, just because the Gingrich-Kasich budget is a loser to the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOBSON] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman form Minnesota [Mr. SABO] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, what we are engaging in here tonight is in fact a charade. This is certainly a family unfriendly Congress. There is a legitimate budget on the table, that is the coalition's budget. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDIT], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ORTON], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], for having the courage to set forth earlier in this year a very detailed, a very difficult budget that makes very difficult choices. That is what we ought to be negotiating here today, not this mindless game that we are playing here, where we are not really getting anywhere.

We are in fact holding Federal employees hostage. They are sitting out there wondering if this is in fact the way Government should work. No, it is not. Let us get serious. Let us look at the coalition budget and let us do the job that the American people sent us here to do.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the honorable ranking member for his leadership on these budget issues.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we need to take this budget misrepresentation off of the congressional agenda. This is not a budget. This has not been offered by the President. We need to get rid of the $270 billion tax cut, talk seriously about reducing the deficit, stop eliminating Medicare and Medicaid, hurting the hospitals in Houston and in Texas, stop eliminating summer jobs for our youth, stop a welfare reform plan that does not allow people to become independent, and stop the foolish ego fight that the Republican majority is engaged in. This Congress, in a bipartisian manner, should put forward an American budget that all Americans can support. This is not a time for an unneeded tax cut. It is time for a reasonable approach to get a balanced budget. This is not a time to not accept an unnamed, unscared, and unacceptable proposal that the Republicans have without reason placed on this House floor for a vote.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAMBLISS].

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, this country is at war. Everyone in this Congress and people throughout America recognize that this country is at war. Mr. Speaker, this country it is at war with an issue that has the potential of wreaking more destruction on this great Nation and more hurt on the American people than any war in our history. This issue, of course, Mr. Speaker, is the budget deficit, a fact of life for every American over the last quarter century that has made products more expensive, created higher interest rates, and depressed an economy and a nation that is poised for economic boom.

Last November, the American people elected a new leadership in Washington. In doing so the American people sent to battle the troops they believed would carry the flag of responsibility and reason. The war over our economic future is a fight we cannot afford to lose—the stakes are too high.

Mr. Speaker, there are very close parallels between this Nation's national security and this budget war. Just as Americans have asked our brave sons and daughters to spend the holidays in a cold and distant land in Europe, now is the time to ask our Nation's political leaders to join the battle and balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said before that ''It is Morning in America.'' And I firmly believe that this week we are on the threshold of greatness once again. There will be no brighter dawn than the hopes and dreams made possible by a sound economy. We have an opportunity at this time to balance the budget for the first time in a quarter century and preserve the future for every American—a new dawn, indeed.

Mr. Speaker, this is the President's call to arms. Now is the time for the President to join the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body who are willing to do all it takes to balance the budget of this great Nation.

Certainly, it will require sacrifice. Certainly, it will require tough decisions. But Mr. Speaker we must win this very important battle today if we are to balance the people's books tomorrow. Oppose the latest Clinton unbalanced budget plan and support a serious plan to reach a balanced budget by 2002.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], distinguished minority whip and my good friend.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Minnesota for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want us to balance the Federal Budget.

They would like us to do it in 7 years. That is a true fact. But it is also a true fact that 75 percent of the American people reject the Republican plan. they reject cuts in Medicare. They reject cuts in Medicaid. They reject cuts in education and the environment. They reject tax breaks for the wealthiest individuals and corporations in America that are in the Republican proposal.

My colleagues have put their budget before the American people, and the American people have said no, that budget goes too far. But instead of sitting down and negotiating, instead of coming up with a balanced budget that protects Medicare and Medicaid, the environment, education, things that we said in the last CR we were going to protect, for the second time in less than a month, Speaker GINGRICH has closed down the government, has manufactured a crisis in an attempt to ram through the Republican budget plan.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, it is not going to work. Blackmail did not work the first time, and it is not going to work the second time. We are not going to be forced to accept a budget that devastates seniors, the disabled, children, students, and working families all over this country.

My colleagues want to talk about priorities? Well, let us talk about the Republican tax breaks. Eighty percent, 80 percent of America, has not seen a raise in wages in the last 20 years. That is a fact. Yet over 50 percent of the tax breaks in their budget go to people making over $100,000 a year or more. No wonder all those corporate CEO's, and the Washington Post, and the New York Times today took out a full-page ad, a full-page ad. Under the Republican plan wealthy corporations, they are going to be the biggest winners of all, and if everything is going to be on the table in this debate, then corporate welfare and corporate tax breaks have to be on the table, too.

And I say to these gentlemen here they want a balanced budget? Come on down and participate, participate. It is not fair to ask our seniors to pay more, to ask working families throughout this country to pay more, if they are not willing to ask the wealthiest corporations in America to at least do something in the way of tax expenditures and corporate welfare.

They want to talk about keeping their promises? Well, let us talk about what the Republican Medicare and Medicaid proposals do to seniors. Let us listen to what Consumer Reports has to say. Everybody knows Consumer Reports. My colleagues want to buy a TV, want to buy a cart, they go to Consumer Reports, they try to get a rundown on what is a good deal. They came out with a report, and this is what they said, and I quote:

''What Congress isn't telling you: Families of nursing home residents may face financial ruin under Federal Medicaid bill.''

That is what they say they do to Medicaid in their budget proposal. This report says that if the Republican budget passes, and I quote, 36 million Americans will lose Medicaid protection they have now, and an estimated 395,000 long-term care patients are likely to reduce Medicaid payments for their nursing home care next year.

Do my colleagues want to talk about keeping promises? What about all the promises we have made to our parents and to our grandparents? Their budget abandons them.

Do my colleagues want to talk about accounting gimmicks? Let us talk about years 8, 9, and 10 under their budget. Just look at what the tax breaks do, the Republican tax breaks do. They dip down in year 7, in the year 2002. What happens in years 8, 9, and 10? They explode, they go through the ceiling.

Now how are we going to pay for this? More cuts in Medicare, more cuts in Medicaid, more cuts in education.

Mr. Speaker, we all want a balanced budget, but, if we want to get to a balanced budget in 7 years, we have got to make sure that it stays balanced, and we have got to guarantee our children's future, not guarantee the future of the wealthy through these exploding tax breaks.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the President's budget proposal. It does not balance the budget.

By contrast, the Congress has repeatedly demonstrated its determination to balance the budget with real deficit reduction, not phoney numbers.

As a member of the Budget Committee and the Resources and Agriculture Committees, I know first hand that all of the Committees have worked hard to carry out their mandate for deficit reduction.

The Resources Committee has worked on the difficult task of ensuring the wise use and protection of our nation's natural resources.

Strong environmental protections are critical. There is no question here. Those of us who represent the West know first hand how important it is to protect our nation's resources. We have grown up amidst those resources and we understand the principle of ''wise use.''

The goal of the Resources Committee has been to restore some balance to the equation. In many of our states, the federal government owns over a third or more of the land. We are simply asking that our citizens have some say over the manner in which those lands and resources are maintained and protected.

We are also working to protect the interests of the working families whose wise use of our resources is critical to their livelihood and to our nation's future.

The Resources Committee has produced over $2.3 billion in savings through 2002. This will help us balance the budget and ensure a better future for our children.

All our opponents have done is complain about our plan. My question is, where is their plan? The President's budget never gets to balance.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not balance the budget, our children will pay the price. Already, a child born today will pay $187,000 in taxes just to pay for their share of interest on the debt.

The Congress has not balanced the budget since 1969. We cannot wait any longer. Our children are depending on us to finally do the responsible thing, and end these endless deficits.

This is not easy work, it involves tough choices and tough votes. Unfortunately, the President has declined to join with us in the heavy lifting.

Last month, the President gave the Congress and the American people his word that he would submit a budget that achieves balance in seven years with real numbers. So far, he has not fulfilled his commitment.

Mr. Speaker, the reason there is conflict this week in our government is because this Congress is different. We promised the American people a balanced budget, and we are going to deliver.

The easy course would be to postpone the tough choices to a future Congress. After all, Congress has been doing this since 1969.

Mr. Speaker, this time we are not going to pass the buck. We are here, we are ready to negotiate, and we are ready to work with the President to produce the balanced budget he has promised.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Budget Committee's majority members and staff has taken it upon themselves to speak for the President of the United States and his staff by introducing House Concurrent Resolution 122. It is wrong and misleading to the public and to this body to present before this House a phoney budget which has not been issued by the President. I am distressed by this not only because it is wrong to mislead the House and the public as to the authorship of a document but also because it detracts from the real issues of this debate.

We need to address the real proposals in front of us. We do not have time to play around when 260,000 dedicated Federal workers are sitting at home, unsure if they will be paid, 6 days before Christmas. We do not have time to play around when Members are trying to get home to their families and their districts in time for the holidays. We do not have time to play around while the future of this Nation hangs in the balance.

I urge my colleagues to stop playing politics and start paying attention to the real issues here—the people—the senior citizens, veterans, students, and children who will be hurt by the current Republican budget proposals. It is time to get down to business, it is time to end this second Government shutdown and to pass a balanced budget that is good for the people of this country.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, Monday the President vetoed and VA–HUD appropriations

bill. No doubt one of the reasons behind this veto was the elimination of funding for his pet program, AmeriCorps.

Most of us have served as volunteers in our local communities and never thought of being paid in the process. The AmeriCorps National Service Program is the Democrat initiative for paying people to volunteer. During the 1993 debate on the program, a senior Democrat Senator declared ''Congress will not, and should not fund a program if it is unsuccessful. I do not believe it will happen but if it does I would favor cutting the program.'' I, and many others, question the success of AmeriCorps. After 3 years, the program has developed an average cost per volunteer between $26,000 and $31,000. And, one-fourth of AmeriCorps so-called volunteers don't work in their communities—they work in Government or Government funded agencies. In my opinion, this program runs contrary to the idea of selflessly giving of ones time and talents for the betterment of the greater community.

We agree with the Senior Democrat Senator who said that if a program's unsuccessful to its original goal, eliminate it. Unfortunately, it seems that President Clinton prefers to continue supporting this wasteful program.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the tactics of my Republican colleagues. Rather than trying to score political points, we should be working to balance the budget and to restore Government services to our constituents. The current shutdown is costing the American people more than $100 million a day. It is also creating problems such as delaying benefits for our veterans and seniors.

We must protect future generations from being saddled with debt. However, the balanced budget we enact must meet several fundamental principles which have been stated by the President many times.

It must protect Medicare, Medicaid, education, veterans medical care and benefits, nutrition programs for children and the elderly, and the environment.

My Republican colleagues agreed to these same principles last month. Yet, they refuse to talk. And, they are unwilling to negotiate any significant changes to their extreme budget proposal which targets our most vulnerable citizens to give the rich a generous tax cut. They would rather see the Government close and risk default.

The President's budget, which this bill represents in name only, does not take that mean-spirited, reckless approach. It protects health care for the elderly and the disabled persons of this Nation. It also makes sure that our children receive a decent meal and a quality education in a safe environment.

The Republicans claim that the President's budget will not reach balance in 7 years. However, it may. The fact of the matter is we don't know. Seven years is a long time, and there is no way to predict with certainty what our economic growth will be over that period.

Furthermore, history teaches us that every time Republicans put their stamp on a budget deal, the deficit has ballooned. The 1990 Budget deal that President Bush signed was supposed to bring the budget to balance. It ultimately led to the highest annual deficits on record—well above $300 billion.

The first Reagan budget also was supposed to balance the budget. It too failed miserably. In 1981, when President Reagan took office, the national debt stood at $1 trillion. After 12 years of Republican administrations pushing their failed economic policies, the debt skyrocketed to more than $4 trillion.

My Republican colleagues are fond of claiming that the escalation of the national debt is the fault of the Democrats. I would remind them that Congress cut every budget request that Presidents Reagan and Bush submitted except one.

The record of President Clinton on deficit reduction is quite different. Rather than merely talking about deficit reduction, President Clinton set out on day one to address a problem he did not create but inherited from his predecessors. He did so in a fair and responsible manner, and with great success.

President Clinton's 1993 budget cut the deficit by $700 billion. During his Presidency, the deficit has fallen 3 years in a row—that has not happened since President Harry S. Truman was in office. It now stands at the lowest level in 12 years.

We can and must build upon this progress. We should not, however, shut down the Government, break off negotiations, and bring up proposals that are invented to represent the President's budget. Sadly, this is just what the Republicans have done. Why? Because the President is unwilling to accept their extreme budget plan, or should I say their tax cut.

When it comes time to vote, I will stand with the President who has shown the American people he knows how to reduce the deficit. I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I call upon the leadership to put aside this political charade and begin the work of the people.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the fourth Clinton budget is before us.

Once again, it continues to rob our children and grandchildren because it doesn't balance.

Once again, it does not abide by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office projections.

Once again, it breaks Clinton's promise to use CBO numbers—because they're more accurate than those cooked up by White House appointees.

And once again, Mr. Speaker, a Clinton budget will lose badly on the House floor.

Bill Clinton has not told the truth about our effort to balance the budget.

The fact is, the only condition we are holding him to during the current stalemate is that he use real, honest, nonpartisan CBO numbers. That's all. He already promised to do that, both in his first State of the Union Address and in the last continuing resolution.

Those on the far left side of the aisle use the word ''extremists'' almost daily.

Mr. Speaker, it's not extremism to care more about the next generation than the next election.

And it's not extremism to follow through on promises like balancing the budget and saving Medicare.

The only extremism I see comes from people who don't keep their word and demagogue honest efforts to do the right thing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight concerns I have regarding the administration's budget and its impact on agriculture. At first glance it appears the President is reducing agriculture spending much less than the Republican budget. Below, I list reasons why the Republican budget does more for agriculture than the administration's bill.

Although the administration proposes reductions in agriculture spending of $5 billion over 7 years, as compared to $12.3 as proposed by the Republicans, the President's proposal will spend $37 billion over the next 7 years. This compares to $44 billion that Republicans have budgeted over the same period. As you can see, Republicans are doing more for the American family farmer.

President Clinton wants to continue the same 60 year antiquated farm program that restricts farmers in what they plant. The Republican plan allows farmers to respond to market conditions to determine what they plant.

Also eliminated by the Republicans are land set-asides. This market distorting practice pays farmers not to plant crops in demand in the world marketplace.

The President's plan stresses high commodity prices as the only barometer of farm profitability. Surely, our self-proclaimed agriculture expert President understands that yield and other factors contribute to the farmers' bottom line. Just ask those farmers who experienced a crop failure this year, how well they like Mr. Clinton's proposal.

The sugar program is not even mentioned in the administration's budget. Under this scenario, authority to even have a sugar program would expire in 2 years.

Farmers will be freed from massive USDA regulation. No more signing up for an annual program and then returning to the local office to certify that what was planted was what he or she said they would plant. Also eliminated would be restrictions on how many acres of a particular crop could be planted.

Every congressional proposal regarding dairy eliminates farmer assessments; the administration's does not.

The President proposes means testing those with more than $100,000 off-farm income from receiving farm payments. This may sound good, but in my Illinois district, some 75 percent of all land is owned by someone who does not farm the land. Means testing would shift farm land rents to a cash rent system where small family farmers will assume all the risk.

The President's budget will leave farmers exposed to future budget reductions, while the Republican budget will preserve agricultural spending.

In closing, the Republicans left Washington and went to rural America for input on the 1995 farm bill. Nineteen field hearings were held and four common issues consistently mentioned: First, no more land set-asides; second, give us planting flexibility; third, make the programs ''user friendly''; fourth, provide certainty in payments.

In the interest of farmers, agribusiness, and rural America, I support the Republican budget proposal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). All time expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 309, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 412, answered ''present'' 5, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 869]

NAYS—412

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

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—5

Clyburn
Engel
Filner
Mink
Williams

NOT VOTING—16

Berman
Chapman
Coleman
Edwards
Gephardt
Kaptur
Lantos
Murtha
Pryce
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rush
Scarborough
White
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 1711

Messrs. HILLIARD, DURBIN, BEREUTER, RIGGS, and Mrs. CHENOWETH changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to my mother-in-law's death, I was unable to be present for the vote on House Concurrent Resolution 122 and, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably caught in traffic during the vote on rollcall vote 869. If I had been here, I would have voted ''no.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

□ 1715

PROVIDING FOR PROVISIONAL APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS ISSUED BY OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 123), to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to certain covered employing offices and covered employees and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 123

Resolved,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF REGULATIONS.

The regulations applicable to employing offices which are not the House of Representatives or the Senate and covered employees who are not the employees of the House of Representatives or the Senate which are to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996, are hereby approved on a provisional basis until such time as such regulations are approved in accordance with section 304(c) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1384(c)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 123 is a companion resolution to House Resolution 311 that we looked at earlier in the day and accepted. House Resolution 311 applied to the House of Representatives, and the House Concurrent Resolution 123 applies to covered employee offices and others, such as the Architect, and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, recall the situation in which probably a provision of rules will be passed on January 8. We probably will not be here. We will accept these provisionally. When we come back on January 23, we will examine and then approve the final orders.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. It has been a very cooperative effort on the part of the majority and the minority to develop standards and guidelines that we can all benefit from as we live with the new law that applies all of the laws that this Congress has passed to ourselves at some point during the next calendar year. I believe

that the step that we are taking today is appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] for yielding me this time.

As I did earlier today, I rise in support of this resolution, which I think is an appropriate resolution. I congratulate the chairman of the Committee on House Oversight for bringing it to the floor and for moving this process forward.

However, as I did this morning, I take this opportunity to rise to consider legislation and resolutions which move the process forward of extending to employees protections to which I think they are entitled and which will enhance morale and the quality of our work force. I rise because I think that we have taken action in recent weeks to undermine both of those objectives.

I will not repeat the facts as I know them to be with reference to the nine employees who were removed by the Clerk just a few days ago, shortly before the Christmas holidays, some of whom have spent more than two decades as employees of this body. Suffice it to say that none of them were removed for cause.

The reason I rise is because the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Oversight made some observations at the end of that debate which I want to comment on. The gentleman observed that the majority had not indicated that it would not take further actions after reorganization had been completed to eliminate redundant positions, to eliminate, in effect, featherbedding which might have been created, he did not use that term, but that was the implication, that had been created under the patronage-plagued system that the gentleman alleged existed under the Democrats. Not getting into that argument, let me say that the unfortunate implication was that any of these positions fall in that category.

None of them do, Mr. Speaker. Let me repeat, none of the nine fall into a category of being eliminated because they were described as was characterized by the chairman. I do not say that the gentleman form California [Mr. THOMAS] was characterizing these positions. I do not know that the gentleman was doing that at all. However, the implication could have been drawn that in fact that was the rationale for this action.

In my opinion, it was not. That opinion is drawn after personal conversations with the Clerk, Ms. Carle, and after correspondence from her.

I rise once again to discuss this issue simply because we are moving a process forward which in a bipartisan way we agree will accomplish an objective of depoliticizing and professionalizing the ministerial staff that serves this institution. When I refer to ministerial staff, I simply mean that staff which is not involved in the formulation or promulgation of policy, but simply involved in making sure that the day-to-day operations of the House of Representatives are as efficient and honest as they possibly can be.

That is, of course, the objective we want to both accomplish. When I say both, both the majority party and the minority party.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that as we go through this season, as we adopt, probably unanimously, perhaps without a vote, this resolution and the previous resolution, that the majority party will look once again at the actions that have been taken with respect to these nine individuals, and see if that might be reconsidered: see if very loyal, very hard-working, very effective employees might be reinstated to the duties that I think they have done so well.

Furthermore, within the course of that review, ensure that other employees equally talented, equally essential are not subjected to the same precipitous, and that is my word, not anybody else's termination of their services, not because of lack of performance, but simply because a decision is made that their services are no longer needed.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would reiterate that a manual has been distributed to the employees of the Office of the Clerk which sets forth that terminations will be done in a manner that will provide employees with an opportunity to be heard.

It does not imply, nor do I interpret it to mean, that termination at will has been changed. In fact, I believe that House employees should be in the status of being terminated at will. But in that context of professionalizing our staff, they ought to have a sense that it will not be an arbitrary or political determination that leads to that action. Rather, it should be based upon their professional performance on the job.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to oppose this resolution; indeed, I support this resolution, and I support the chairman and our committee's efforts to move this process forward.

I appreciate the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] giving me this opportunity to again call to the attention of the House a matter that I think is important not from a political standpoint, but from the standpoint of professionalizing this House. That is the stated intent of the majority. I congratulate and applaud them for that effort. It is an effort in which I and many, I think all, of my colleagues join.

It is an effort, however, that needs to be more than rhetoric. It needs to be reality for each and every one of our employees. I hope we will accomplish that objective, and I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me the time.

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

If anyone has watched the House of Commons, one of the things that goes on there is something that we might adopt; and I will see if we can work it today. I will refer the gentleman to comments the chairman made a few hours ago in response to his statement, but I will also say that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is certainly entitled to his opinions.

The Clerk has indicated that the reorganization was not based upon arbitrary or political reasons, and I am not going to replace the Clerk's judgment with the opinions of the gentleman from Maryland.

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

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this side, so I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, 123.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTPONING CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996, UNTIL WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1995

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent if the Chair lays before he House a veto message from the President on the bill, H.R. 2076 today, that the objections of the President be spread at large upon the Journal and that the message and bill be ordered printed as a House document; and that consideration of the veto message be postponed until tomorrow, December 20, 1995.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1730

POSTPONING CONSIDERATION OF VETO MESSAGE ON H.R. 1058, SECURITIES LITIGATION REFORM ACT UNTIL WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1995

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, if the Chair lays before the House a veto message from the President on the bill, H.R. 1058 today, that the objections of the President be spread at large upon the Journal and that the message and bill be ordered printed as a House document; and that consideration of the veto message be postponed until tomorrow, December 20, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA FOR CEREMONY COMMEMORATING VICTIMS OF THE HOLOCAUST

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 106) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 106

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used from 8 o'clock ante meridiem until 3 o'clock post meridiem on April 16, 1996, for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the week of April 14 to 21, 1996, has been designated as the Days of Remembrance by the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council. This particular week is chosen to commemorate the liberation of the Dachau concentration camp by American troops on April 19, 1945.

I believe it is entirely appropriate for a society, indeed, societies around the world and cultures to remember the pleasant human experiences, the triumphs and the achievements of mankind. I think it is also important that we remember man at his basest hour so that we will not repeat, but that the memories will be held forever in terms of how man can degrade his fellow man.

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

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 106, sponsored by our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. YATES, and wish to also commend the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on House Oversight, Mr. THOMAS, for the expeditious consideration of this bill.

House Concurrent Resolution 106 will permit the use of our great congressional rotunda for the annual ceremony to commemorate ''the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust.'' The annual days of remembrance, sponsored by the Holocaust Memorial Council of which Mr. Yates and I are both congressional members, will be held on April 16, 1996. This important commemorative program allows Congress and our Nation to appropriately observe the days of remembrance for victims of the Holocaust, to pay tribute to the American liberators of the concentration camp's survivors, and by commemorating this enormous tragedy, ensure that it will never happen again anywhere in the world.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge swift adoption of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the minority strongly supports this resolution which has passed numerous times here in the House of Representatives. It has been once again cosponsored by a child of Holocaust survivors, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], who is the only Member of Congress to have survived the Holocaust, and has been authored for many years by a colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. Those are Members on our side who have a particular and personal interest in this, but we all share the views expressed by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. Speaker, with those comments, I yield back the balance of my time and urge once again this resolution be adopted.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 106, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the concurrent resolution was amended so as to read: ''Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. COYLE POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1398) to designate the U.S. Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, MO, as the ''Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1398

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, Missouri, shall be known and designated as the ''Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2 REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight voted favorably on H.R. 1398. This legislation was introduced by Representative WILLIAM CLAY of Missouri and was cosponsored by the entire House delegation of the State of Missouri as required by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This bill designates the U.S. Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, MO, as the ''Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building''.

Mr. Coyle, who is honored in this legislation, was a U.S. Army veteran before he started his career with the Post Office Department in 1960. He started in the clerk craft and later served as a letter carrier. He was active with the National Association of Letter Carriers in his local chapter and at the national level. He later served as that organization's national secretary/treasurer in 1994. Charlie Coyle died on February 18, 1995, at the age of 60.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all our colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1398, legislation sponsored by Congressman WILLIAM L. CLAY, designating the U.S. Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road in St. Louis, MO, as the ''Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building.''

Charles Coyle began his career with the Postal Service in 1960, working in the clerk craft. Within a very short time he moved up to letter carrier only to feel the need to affect change within the union structure. In 1973, Mr. Coyle was elected president of his Branch, number 343, and served as a full-time union officer at the local and national levels for the rest of his career. He served with pride and worked hard for

a strong and responsive National Association of Letter Carriers Union.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY].

(Mr. CLAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, first of all I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, Charles Coyle was a postal worker who rose from clerk to secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Letter Carriers. He served in many and various positions in the union. He was president of Branch 343, correspondent to the Postal Record, and member of the branch negotiating team. In addition to that, he was president of that local.

In 1994 he was elected secretary-treasurer of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Mr. Speaker, although Charlie served in office during a very turbulent time of change for the Postal Service, he demonstrated a deep and abiding commitment to improving conditions of letter carriers. He established training programs and initiated a newsletter to keep the membership better informed about the issues and the events. He also maintained a long-term association with the University of Missouri in an advisory capacity in the field of labor studies.

Charlie Coyle left a legacy of accomplishments which greatly benefited letter carriers and the entire Postal Service. Mr. Speaker, his memory deserves to be honored. I would like to thank the other members of the Missouri delegation for cosponsoring this piece of legislation.

Thus, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill to designate the post office at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road in St. Louis as the Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1398.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. 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. 1398, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

EDWARD MADIGAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1880, to designate the United States Post Office located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1880

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, the measure before us was voted on favorably by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1880 was introduced by Representative RAY LAHOOD of Illinois and it is cosponsored by the entire House Delegation of the State of Illinois per the requirement of the committee rules.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1880 honors the late Edward Madigan. Mr. Madigan was a respected member of this body and was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives 10 times by his Illinois constituents. While serving in the House, Mr. Madigan became the ranking Republican member on the Agriculture Committee in the 98th Congress. In 1991, President Bush nominated Mr. Madigan to be the 24th Secretary of Agriculture; he was confirmed by the Senate by a vote of 99 to 0. Mr. Madigan was a native of Lincoln, IL, and a graduate of Lincoln College.

I urge all our colleagues to support H.R. 1880.

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

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1880, legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] designating the U.S. Post Office building located at 102 South McLean in Lincoln, IL, as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building.''

Former Congressman Edward Madigan had a very distinguished career in Congress, and he was well known for his ability to influence people and secure results. Congressional Quarterly's Politics in America described him best by saying, ''Madigan does not often have to resort to obstructionist tactics because usually he has a well-placed seat at the bargaining table.''

Being a smart, savvy and skillful legislator certainly paid off for Congressman Madigan. I am pleased to support the naming of a post office in his hometown after such a man.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1880, legislation sponsored by Congressman LAHOOD, designating the U.S. Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, in Lincoln, IL, as the ''Edward Madigan Post Office Building.'' As a cosponsor of this measure, I am pleased we have chosen to honor a postal facility after former Congressman Madigan in his hometown of Lincoln, IL.

Ed Madigan was a fighter. He was also a skillful and successful negotiator, using his influence and leadership to move legislation through committee and on the floor. His sphere of influence included the House Agriculture Committee and the former House Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and the Environment where he served as the ranking minority member. I was pleased to have served with him on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Congressman Madigan was relentless in his pursuit of workable and sensible compromise legislation. I am sorry he is not around in the 104th Congress. Many of my colleagues could have taken pointers on his style and method of conducting legislative business.

Former Congressman Ed Madigan was a man of integrity and a person comfortable with having an open mind and speaking and acting his conscience. I fear those characteristics are becoming a lost art in this Congress. So, as we consider this measure, I urge my colleagues to remember Ed Madigan. We could all benefit from such a refreshing change in the manner in which we treat each other and pass legislation.

☐ 1745

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD] and those that have joined him in introducing it.

I had the great privilege to know Ed Madigan as a friend, as a fellow colleague, and then we had the responsibility of the Committee on Agriculture, I as chairman and he as ranking member. We worked together as a team. We left the imprints from the Committee on Agriculture on the future of thousands, not only in the United States but throughout the world. Ed Madigan was certainly a person that I enjoyed working with. We had many opportunities to have legislation on the floor.

Finally, I would like to say on a lighter note that we went to Spain, I to look for my Spanish roots, and then we went to Ireland, he to look for his Irish roots. When we went to Spain, to northern Spain to Galicia, I went there to find out that they say they are Celtic, that they are not Spanish. So I came back a Celt. We went to Ireland looking for Mr. Madigan's roots and found out that there was no Madigan name in the Irish genealogy chart, that it had been formerly a Spanish name, Madegano. So, Madigan came back a Spaniard, and I came back a Celt, but we continued our relationship on the committee.

I think it is very appropriate that a Federal building will bear his name for all to see and hopefully to remember the major contribution that he made to this country, to his district, and to the world.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD], the prime sponsor of this legislation.

(Mr. LAHOOD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for allowing me this time.

It is a very proud moment in my very short legislative career here to say that the first bill that I have introduced and will be passed is a bill in honor of a dear friend of so many Members on both sides of the aisle, former Congressman Ed Madigan. The Madigan family resides in my congressional district in Lincoln, IL. I am proud to call a number of members of his family my constituents. I know that the people of Lincoln, IL are going to be very proud to see his name emblazoned above the post office in Lincoln, IL, because he is Lincoln. He represented Lincoln, IL so well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today of H.R. 1880, the Edward Madigan Post Office Designation Act of 1995.

It is, indeed, a privilege to be on the floor speaking on behalf of this measure commemorating Edward Madigan, a Congressman, a Cabinet Secretary, and above all, a respected citizen of the State of Illinois.

This bill honors not only a great legislator—one that made significant contributions to this institution and this country—but, this bill, also honors the citizens of Edward Madigan's hometown, Lincoln, IL.

Mr. Madigan's career in public service is impressive: He served in the U.S. House of Representatives for 18 years. And, during those 18 years, he rose to the rank of chief deputy whip and ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture.

His expertise in agricultural issues was duly recognized in January 1991 when he was appointed by President Bush to the post of Secretary of Agriculture.

Throughout his career, Mr. Madigan conducted himself with integrity and with decency, and I urge all Members to support H.R. 1880 so that we may rightfully honor Edward Madigan, his family, and his hometown.

This bill is but a small tribute to one of Illinois' finest public servants. The legacy of leadership and service that Edward Madigan left to Illinois, and to this Nation, will not be soon forgotten.

And, if one takes a look at Mr. Madigan's career, it is easy to see why; his achievements were eminently impressive.

Mr. Madigan's public service career spanned nearly 30 years, with service to both the State of Illinois and the U.S. Government.

He began in 1966 as a member of the Illinois State House of Representatives, where he served with distinction for 6 years.

Carrying forward his experience and knowledge that he gained in the State House, Mr. Madigan moved on to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1973, where he served for 18 years.

During his tenure in Congress, Mr. Madigan ascended to various leadership positions, including ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture and chief deputy whip.

Mr. Madigan's accomplishments as a member of Congress were also impressive.

In 1985 and 1990, as the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, he was instrumental in shepherding two farm bills through the House of Representatives.

He also led the effort to protect farm income and expand export markets.

In 1990, as part of the Clean Air Act amendments, Mr. Madigan, as a senior member of the energy and Commerce Committee, put forth legislation that would encourage the use of alternative fuels, such as ethanol.

Other accomplishments of Mr. Madigan include legislation that helped deregulate the railroad freight industry, as well as legislation that helped bring stability to the Rural Electrification Administration revolving fund.

He also worked hard to improve health care in rural areas and was instrumental in creating a nursing research center at the National Institutes of Health.

These, and many other legislative initiatives, owe their success, in no small part, to Mr. Madigan's relentless determination and exceptional leadership.

Just as Mr. Madigan's experiences in the Illinois State House served him well in the House of Representatives, his experiences gained in Congress proved to be a tremendous asset when he was appointed in January 1991 to be the Secretary of Agriculture under former President George Bush.

Confirmed by the Senate on March 8, 1991, by a vote of 99 to 0, Mr. Madigan served with great regard as a member of the Cabinet.

During Mr. Madigan's tenure as Secretary of Agriculture, he lead the agricultural negotiations during the discussions on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and he was responsible for overseeing agricultural aid to the Republics of the former Soviet Union.

And, as with his service in Congress, Mr. Madigan always placed the needs of the public first.

Perhaps, the former House minority leader Bob Michel, best summed up Mr. Madigan's legacy when he remarked at Mr. Madigan's funeral that ''Ed Madigan's life is the answer to give to those who doubt that a genuine sense of public service still lives in this country.''

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for H.R. 1880.

Passage of this bill will bring great honor to the Madigan family and the citizens of Lincoln, IL, and will help preserve the legacy of Edward Madigan's distinguished public service.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, a friend of Ed Madigan's.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the gentleman's timely remarks and his tribute and for his leadership in naming Ed's hometown post office in his name.

He was a good friend, a colleague and a mentor for many of us. Like Mr. DE LA GARZA, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman emeritus of the committee, has indicated, we have worked together long and hard on many matters in regard to farmers and ranchers and agriculture in general.

I would think the gentleman from Illinois is certainly following his example on the House Committee on Agriculture in terms of his demeanor and in working hard for agriculture and his farmers and ranchers. I would only add that Ed Madigan is now certainly sorely missed by his friends and colleagues. We certainly need him in the midst of the agriculture debate that we are having in regard to the reconciliation bill.

One thought is that I would not be surprised if the good citizens of his hometown of Lincoln, IL, will now be assured of the best postal service of any in the country. Ed would not have it any other way.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct privilege of following Ed Madigan to this body after he became Secretary of Agriculture. Ed Madigan and I were born in the same county, in the same year, grew up in the same time. Our families were friends throughout our lives.

I did not know Ed as well as a young man as I got to know him later. Our political careers paralleled themselves, and it was in the general assembly, and he came to Congress. But I have represented that county when I first came here before reapportionment. I had most of the old Ed Madigan district.

He was, indeed, revered by the people he served. He did an excellent job in his work here in the Congress and in representing the people from our district. He was, of course, a marvel on the stump because he could tell such great Irish jokes, even if he was not Irish. If he was Spanish, he told great Irish jokes. He had a number of jokes about my father, who was a horse trader, who had supposedly taken his father on a bad horse deal. But we had so many memorable occasions.

He was indeed a great Congressman, a great leader. His wife Evelyn is back in Lincoln. He has a daughter who lives in my district. They are great people. His brother is a State senator, and I know that they will be indeed proud for the tribute today to Ed Madigan and to have this post office as a living and continuing memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1880, which officially renames the U.S. Post Office building located at 102 South McLean in Lincoln, IL, in honor of Edward Madigan.

Ed Madigan served the citizens of central Illinois with great distinction during his tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives, and later as President Bush's Secretary of Agriculture. Although Ed is sadly no longer with us, his service, dedication, honor, charisma, and love of family continue to inspire each of us and should serve as a role model for all to follow.

As the Member of Congress who followed Ed Madigan into office, I want to take just a moment to share some of Ed Madigan's life with the House. Ed was born on January 13, 1936, and he remained a life-long resident of Lincoln, IL. He was first elected to the Illinois House of Representatives in 1966, where he served for 6 years until he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972. Ed continued to serve the citizens of central Illinois in the House until he accepted President Bush's invitation to serve as our Nation's 24th Secretary of Agriculture.

In such a short time it is difficult to appropriately commemorate Ed Madigan's distinguished public service and personal richness, but I think H.R. 1880 embodies a fitting tribute to our dear former colleague. Although current residents of Lincoln need no reminder of who Ed Madigan was, Ed Madigan deserves to be properly memorialized in the town and amongst the people he loved and served so proudly.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1880.

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], esteemed deputy majority whip.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I can remember coming to the Congress, and Ed Madigan would sit over there on the side. If you needed some wisdom or if he thought you needed a little wisdom, he would have you come over and sit down. We would have a little talk, and I learned a lot from Ed Madigan. He certainly was sage. He was wise.

I think he was a politician in the finest sense of the word politician. He knew how to make a deal. He knew how to bring people into the picture. He knew how to compromise. He knew how to put things together.

I tell the story, I guess it links up with something the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] was talking about. We talked about his heritage a lot, growing up in Lincoln, IL. I guess his father, too, was a horse trader, and they had a livery business. That meant you rented out horses. That livery business grew into a taxicab business. Ed's first job was to run the taxicab in Lincoln, IL.

Out of that he had a fondness of cars. He especially had a fondness for Packard automobiles. I do not know how many taxicabs were Packards back then. Anyway, he collected Packard automobiles. But the stories that he told about the livery business and horse trading, I guess if you ever got into a deal with Ed Madigan, you knew that he was a pretty good horse trader.

He knew how to make a deal, and he knew the value of what he was putting together. He certainly was a valued Member of this Congress in both the Committee on Energy and Commerce, which I had the privilege of serving with him, and also in the Ag Committee. He, as I said, was a Member who was a Member's Member. He could put things together. He understands people.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I want to join my colleagues in this tribute and thank the gentleman for naming this Federal post office facility for our former colleague, Ed Madigan. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] has touched upon what many of us felt about Congressman Madigan, and that was his wisdom. And he was wise. He would offer some advice sometimes when he thought maybe you had gone a little too far one way or another.

I happened to share an area in the House gymnasium, and, even when he was Secretary of Agriculture, he would come in late at night. We would talk about what it was like to be Secretary of Agriculture and about the House. He was a Member's Member.

He had a great sense of individuals, of personalities, of the needs of people. Maybe sometimes when this place got a little off track, Ed Madigan was one of the people that would try to bring us back and to be a little bit more civil and understanding of one another.

I just wanted to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and thank him.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I guess in closing we will remember Ed as a gentle man, a man of great humility, a man who had a great sense about this House and the history of this House, and certainly aptly coming from a town named after Abraham Lincoln.

I served with Ed's brother who served in the Illinois House and now in the Illinois Senate. I certainly stand with a great deal of pride with that family knowing this post office in Lincoln, IL, will be named after Ed and wish them very, very well.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation and in tribute to a good friend and a great leader, Ed Madigan.

Ed left his mark on this institution and this Nation through his thoughtful leadership and quiet effectiveness. Both as a Member of the House and as our Secretary of Agriculture under President Bush, Ed's expertise and common sense helped guide America toward a sound farm policy. Ed Madigan provided me with a great deal of guidance on Agriculture issues and helped me to learn and understand the needs of the farmers and how to approach these issues.

But beyond his wise judgment, I will always cherish Ed's great strength of character and his personal warmth. He was not only a leader who informed our debates, but a friend whose great courage in facing cancer inspired all of us. He was not only a representative who knew how to get the job done, but someone who knew how to keep things in perspective.

Ed was a consummate legislator and—both in his role as ranking member of the full House Agriculture Committee, and of Energy and Commerce Health Subcommittee—he understood how to obtain bipartisan agreement on contentious matters, a skill that is unfortunately too often in short supply in this body.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for bringing this legislation to the floor today, it is a fitting tribute to a great American and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1880.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McHUGH. 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. 1880, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

HOLK POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. McHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2262) to designate the United States Post Office building located at 218 North Alston Street in Foley, AL, as the ''Holk Post Office Building.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2262

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office building located at 218 North Alston Street in Foley, Alabama, shall be known and designated as the ''Holk Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Holk Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] will each be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York, [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us has been approved by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 2262 was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and joined by the entire House Delegation of the State of Alabama as required by the rules of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

This legislation honors Arthur A. Holk and his father, George Holk. Arthur Holk was elected as mayor of the city of Foley in 1979 and is presently serving his fifth term. George Holk also served as mayor of the city of Foley from 1924 to 1928. Both father and son have participated actively in various city organizations and on the city and county school boards.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support H.R. 2262.

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

□ 1800

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN], the prime sponsor of this bill.

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] for yielding this time to me, and I appreciate the committee bringing this measure before the House today naming this post office in my district after two mayors, a mayor current, Arthur Holk, the mayor of Foley, AL, as well as his father, George, and it is a distinct honor for me to have introduced this legislation, and I introduce the following statement for the RECORD and urge favorable passage of this resolution:

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to lend my strong support for H.R. 2262, a bill to designate the U.S. post office building in Foley, AL, as the "Holk Post Office Building."

I first want to thank the full Government and Oversight Committee chairman, Mr. CLINGER, and the Postal Service Subcommittee chairman, Mr. MCHUGH, for their diligence in bringing this bill to the floor in such a timely manner. The professionalism of you and your staff is most appreciated.

I introduced this bill to honor my good friend, Mayor Arthur A. Holk and his father, George. These two men have been inspirational in contributing to the city of Foley, AL, over the past two generations.

George Holk served as mayor of the city of Foley from 1924–1928. He was a past member of the Baldwin County Board of Education and the Foley American Legion Club.

His legacy continues to live in his son, Arthur. Arthur Holk's list of accomplishments are most impressive. He is currently serving on the board of directors of several companies in south Alabama and has previously served on the Foley school board. He was a charter member and past president of the Foley Rotary, and is a Rotary International Paul Harris Fellow.

Mayor Holk has also been active in many charitable organizations. Among other things he served as past chairman of the Baldwin County Heart Fund and the Baldwin County Crippled Children's Society.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a better way to honor these two men than to name the post office in Foley after them. The people of Foley support this bill 100 percent and I am confident they will be proud to have their post office bear the Holk name.

I thank you for your time and hope you will support a bill very important to the people of Foley, AL.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2262.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. 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. 2262, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

CHARLES A. HAYES POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2704) to provide that the U.S. post office building that is to be located on the 2600 block of East 75th Street in Chicago, IL, shall be known and designated as the ''Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building'' as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2704

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office building that is to be located at 7436 South Exchange Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the ''Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH].

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight voted favorably on the measure before us. Congresswoman COLLINS of Illinois, ranking minority member of the committee, introduced H.R. 2704 and was joined by the State delegation in cosponsoring this bill, as required by committee policy. The bill was amended in committee to accurately identify the address of the facility to be renamed.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation honors former Representative Charles Hayes. He was a labor organizer and served as a Member of this body. Charlie Hayes was first elected to Congress in 1983, in a special election succeeding former Representative Harold Washington, who had resigned his seat after being sworn in as mayor of Chicago. Prior to his departure from Congress, Representative Hayes served as chairman of the former Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to support H.R. 2704 as amended, a bill which would name a post office in Chicago after one of our colleagues who served his constituents in the First District of Illinois.

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

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2704, legislation sponsored by two members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation, Congresswoman CARDISS COLLINS and Congressman DENNIS HASTERT. H.R. 2704, as amended in Committee, would designate the post office to be located at 7436 South Exchange Avenue in Chicago, Illinois as

the ''Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building.''

Former Congressman Charles A. Hayes, better known as ''Charlie'' was a ''man for the unions'' and working people. One of his many accomplishments before coming to Congress in 1983 was when he was elected International Vice President of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union, one of the largest unions in the AFL–CIO. He fought hard to protect the rights of workers and left this distinguished body with a 100% lifetime voting record on issues important to labor. I am truly proud that his colleagues, Congresswoman CARDISS COLLINS and Congressman DENNIS HASTERT chose to recognize him in such a manner.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, on December 5, 1995, in the spirit of bipartisanship, Congressman DENNIS HASTERT and I introduced H.R. 2704, legislation naming a U.S. post office in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Charles A. Hayes Post Office.'' The post office will be located at 7436 South Exchange Avenue in Chicago.

I wish to thank my friend and Illinois colleague, Congressman DENNIS HASTERT for joining me in sponsoring H.R. 2704 and Congressman MCHUGH, chairman of the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on the Postal Service for having this bill considered for full committee action.

Congressman Charles A. Hayes was first elected to Congress in 1983, in a special election, succeeding our former colleague, Harold Washington, who resigned from the House after being sworn in as mayor of Chicago. He was the first international union leader to be elected to Congress and spend his early years as a working man, organizing his first union. ''Charlie'' was elected to his first union office as President of Local 1424 of the Carpenter's International Union at age 20.

Congressman Hayes went on to secure bargaining rights for workers in Chicago's stockyards through the United Packinghouse Workers of America. In 1954, he was elected District Director of the Packinghouse Union and moved continuously through the ranks and after several mergers became International Vice President of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union which was at that time the largest union in the AFL–CIO. Rising from the small town of Cairo, Illinois, ''Charlie'' became one of the most important labor leaders in America.

While serving here in the House, Charlie Hayes fought fiercely to protect American jobs and was active in the fight to increase Federal funds for schools, to increase funds for public works and to protect the rights of ordinary workers. He introduced full employment legislation and denounced unemployment as ''morally unacceptable.'' He supported National Health Insurance from his earliest union days throughout his service in Congress and is to be commended for his 100 percent lifetime voting record on issues important to labor.

Prior to his departure, Congressman Charles A. Hayes chaired the Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on Postal Personnel and Modernization. He was known to his friends as the ''Labor Democrat'' and is widely recognized as a first-rate public servant and first-class friend, a man who worked hard to ensure that workers across the country had food on the table, pensions that were protected, and safe working conditions.

When I called Charlie, about 2 or 3 weeks ago to say, ''Charlie, how would you like to have a post office named after yourself,'' he said, ''Gosh, CARDISS, I'd be absolutely honored to have that. Do you think it will happen?''

I said, ''I think it will happen because everybody knows you, Charlie, everybody knows how dedicated you were as a Member of Congress, everybody knows that you fought for the things that you believe in.'' So, Mr. Speaker, I am really very pleased to have this opportunity to stand here and be about the business of presenting this piece of legislation on the floor with the help of the subcommittee chair, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT], who cosponsored this legislation, of the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] who is a ranking member on the subcommittee.

She mentioned Charlie's ''regular order'' call. Charlie used to sit over in the fourth row around the corner all the time, and it got to be quite a joke that when everybody was busy talking, and what have you, he had this deep gravel voice, ''Regular order,'' and everybody knew that that was Charlie because that was his trademark, if my colleagues will, and so it seems to me that the one thing I miss most about Charlie, besides his wonderful smile, besides his very sincere efforts to do good for working people, is the fact that we do not happen to hear that regular order anymore.

Mr. speaker, we are pleased to have this honor and to have a post office named after him in behalf of working Americans, and I thank all of the Illinois delegation and all of those here in this House who are supporting it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me in closing extend my words of appreciation and thanks both to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS], the ranking member on the subcommittee, and to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], the ranking member on the full committee, for their support, and their efforts, and their leadership on these bills. We are all very appreciative of their efforts.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCHUGH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2704, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to provide that the United States Post Office building that is to be located at 7436 South Exchange Avenue, Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the 'Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building'.''

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. 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. 2704, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

FARM CREDIT SYSTEM REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 1995

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2029) to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to provide regulatory relief, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2029

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Farm Credit System Regulatory Relief Act of 1995''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. References.
Sec. 3. Regulatory review.
Sec. 4. Examination of Farm Credit System institutions.
Sec. 5. Farm Credit Insurance Fund operations.
Sec. 6. Powers with respect to troubled insured System banks.
Sec. 7. Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation board of directors.
Sec. 8. Conservatorship and receiverships.
Sec. 9. Oversight and regulatory actions by the Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation.
Sec. 10. Formation of administrative service entities.
Sec. 11. Requirements for loans sold into the secondary market.

Sec. 12. Removal of antiquated and unnecessary paperwork requirements.
Sec. 13. Removal of government certification requirement for certain private sector financing.
Sec. 14. Reform of regulatory limitations on the dividend, member business, and voting practices of eligible farmer-owned cooperatives.
Sec. 15. Extension of interest rate reduction program for 5 years.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Farm Credit Act of 1971.

SEC. 3. REGULATORY REVIEW.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the Farm Credit Administration, in its role as an arms-length, safety and soundness regulator, has made considerable progress in reducing the regulatory burden on Farm Credit System institutions;

(2) the efforts of the Farm Credit Administration in this regard have resulted in cost savings for Farm Credit System institutions; and

(3) such cost savings ultimately benefit the Nation's farmers, ranchers, agricultural cooperatives, and rural residents.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR CONTINUED REVIEW.—The Farm Credit Administration shall continue its comprehensive review of regulations governing the Farm Credit System in order to further identify and eliminate, consistent with safety and soundness, all regulations that are unnecessary, unduly burdensome or costly, or not based on statute.

SEC. 4. EXAMINATION OF FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS.

Section 5.19(a) (12 U.S.C. 2254(a)) is amended by striking ''each year'' in the first sentence and inserting ''every 18 months''.

SEC. 5. FARM CREDIT INSURANCE FUND OPERATIONS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT OF PREMIUMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 5.55(a) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–4(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''Until the aggregate of amounts in the Farm Credit Insurance Fund exceeds the secure base amount, the annual premium due from any insured System bank for any calendar year shall'' and inserting ''If, at the end of any calendar year, the aggregate of the amounts in the Farm Credit Insurance Fund does not exceed the secure base amount, the annual premium due from any insured System bank for that calendar year shall, subject to paragraph (2),''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3) and inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) REDUCED PREMIUMS.—The Corporation, in its sole discretion, may reduce, by a percentage uniformly applied to all insured System banks, the annual premium due from each insured System bank during any calendar year, as determined under paragraph (1).''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) SECTION 5.55(b).—Section 5.55(b) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–4(b)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''Insurance Fund'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Farm Credit Insurance Fund'';

(ii) by striking ''for the following calendar year''; and

(iii) by striking ''subsection (a)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(1)''.

(B) SECTION 5.56(a).—Section 5.56(a) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–5(a)) is amended in each of paragraphs (2) and (3) by striking ''section 5.55(a)(2)'' and inserting ''section 5.55(a)(3)''.

(C) SECTION 1.12(b).—Section 1.12(b) (12 U.S.C. 2020(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''(as defined in section 5.55(a)(3))'' after ''government-guaranteed loans''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3), by inserting ''(as so defined)'' after ''government-guaranteed loans'' each place such term appears.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 5.55(d) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–4(d)) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''and (c)'' and inserting '', (c), and (e)''; and

(B) by striking ''a Farm Credit Bank'' and inserting ''an insured System bank''; and

(2) by striking ''Farm Credit Bank'' each subsequent place such term appears and inserting ''insured System bank''.

(c) ALLOCATION TO INSURED SYSTEM BANKS AND OTHER SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS OF EXCESS AMOUNTS IN THE FARM CREDIT INSURANCE FUND.—Section 5.55 (12 U.S.C. 2277a–4) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ALLOCATION TO SYSTEM INSTITUTIONS OF EXCESS RESERVES.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF ALLOCATED INSURANCE RESERVES ACCOUNTS.—There is hereby established within the Farm Credit Insurance Fund—

''(A) for each insured System bank; and

''(B) subject to paragraph (5)(C), for all holders, in the aggregate, of Financial Assistance Corporation stock,

an Allocated Insurance Reserves Account. Amounts in any Allocated Insurance Reserves Account shall be considered to be part of the Farm Credit Insurance Fund.

''(2) ANNUAL ALLOCATIONS.—If, at the end of any calendar year, the aggregate of the amounts in the Farm Credit Insurance Fund exceeds the average secure base amount for the calendar year (as calculated on an average daily balance basis), the Corporation shall allocate to the Allocated Insurance Reserves Accounts such excess amount less the amount that the Corporation, in its sole discretion, determines to be the sum of the estimated operating expenses and estimated insurance obligations of the Corporation for the immediately succeeding calendar year.

''(3) ALLOCATION FORMULA.—From the total amount required to be allocated at the end of a calendar year pursuant to paragraph (2)—

''(A) 10 percent of such total amount shall be credited to the Allocated Insurance Reserves Account established under paragraph (1)(B), subject to paragraph (5)(C); and

''(B) there shall be credited to the Allocated Insurance Reserves Account of each insured System bank an amount that bears the same ratio to such total amount (less any reduction under subparagraph (A)) as the average principal outstanding for the 3-year period ending with the end of such calendar year on loans made by the bank that are in accrual status bears to the average principal outstanding for such 3-year period on loans made by all insured System banks that are in accrual status (excluding, in each case, the guaranteed portions of government-guaranteed loans described in subsection (a)(1)(C)).

''(4) USE OF FUNDS IN ALLOCATED INSURANCE RESERVES ACCOUNTS.—To the extent that the sum of the operating expenses of the Corporation and the insurance obligations of the Corporation for a calendar year exceeds the estimated sum described in paragraph (2) for the calendar year, the Corporation shall cover such expenses and obligations by reducing each Allocated Insurance Reserves Account by the same proportion and expending the amounts so obtained, before expending other monies in the Fund.

''(5) OTHER DISPOSITION OF ACCOUNT FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in calendar year 2003, if the aggregate of the amounts in the Farm Credit Insurance Fund exceeds the secure base amount, the Corporation may—

''(i) subject to subparagraph (D), pay to each insured System bank, in a manner determined by the Corporation, an amount equal to the lesser of—

''(I) 20 percent of the balance in the bank's Allocated Insurance Reserves Account as of the preceding December 31; or

''(II) 20 percent of the balance in the bank's Allocated Insurance Reserves Account on the date of payment; and

''(ii) subject to subparagraphs (C) and (E), pay to each System bank and association holding Financial Assistance Corporation stock its proportionate share, determined by dividing the number of shares of Financial Assistance Corporation stock held by such institution by the total number of shares of Financial Assistance Corporation stock outstanding, of the lesser of—

''(I) 20 percent of the balance in the Allocated Insurance Reserves Account established under paragraph (1)(B) as of the preceding December 31; or

''(II) 20 percent of the balance in the Allocated Insurance Reserves Account established under paragraph (1)(B) on the date of the payment.

''(B) AUTHORITY TO ELIMINATE OR REDUCE PAYMENTS.—The Corporation may eliminate or reduce payments under subparagraph (A) if the Corporation determines, in its sole discretion, that such payments, or other circumstances that might require use of the Farm Credit Insurance Fund, could cause the amount in the Farm Credit Insurance Fund during that calendar year to be less than the secure base amount.

''(C) REIMBURSEMENT FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION STOCK.—

''(i) SUFFICIENT FUNDING.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3)(A), upon provision by the Corporation for the accumulation in the account established under paragraph (1)(B) of funds in an amount equal to $56 million, the Corporation shall not allocate any further funds to such account except to replenish such account in the event that funds are diminished below such amount by the Corporation pursuant to paragraph (4).

''(ii) WIND DOWN AND TERMINATION.—

''(I) FINAL DISBURSEMENTS.—Upon disbursement of a total of $53 million from such Allocated Insurance Reserves Account, the Corporation shall disburse the remaining amounts in such account, as determined under paragraph (5)(A)(ii), without regard to the percentage limitation in subclauses (I) and (II) thereof.

''(II) TERMINATION OF ACCOUNT.—Upon disbursement of a total of $56 million from such Allocated Insurance Reserves Account established under paragraph (1)(B), the Corporation shall close the Allocated Insurance Reserves Account established under paragraph (1)(B) and transfer any remaining funds in such Account to the remaining Allocated Insurance Reserves Accounts in accordance with the formula in paragraph (3)(B) for the calendar year in which the transfer occurs.

''(D) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS RECEIVED.—Within 60 days after receipt of a payment made under subparagraph (5)(A)(i), each insured System bank, in consultation with its affiliated associations, and taking into account the direct or indirect payment of insurance premiums by such associations, shall develop and implement an equitable plan to distribute payments received pursuant to subparagraph (5)(A)(i) among the bank and its associations.

''(E) EXCEPTION FOR PREVIOUSLY REIMBURSED ASSOCIATIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (5)(A)(ii), in any Farm Credit District in which the funding bank has reimbursed one or more of its affiliated associations for the previously unreimbursed portion of the Financial Assistance stock held by such associations, the funding bank shall be deemed to be the holder of the shares of Financial Assistance Corporation stock for which it has provided such reimbursement.''.

SEC. 6. POWERS WITH RESPECT TO TROUBLED INSURED SYSTEM BANKS.

(a) LEAST-COST RESOLUTION.—Section 5.61(a)(3) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–10(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (F); and

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

''(A) LEAST-COST RESOLUTION.—Assistance may not be provided to an insured System bank under this subsection unless the total amount of such assistance is the least costly to the Farm Credit Insurance Fund of all possible alternatives available to the Corporation, including liquidation of the bank (including paying the insured obligations issued on behalf of the bank). Before making a least-cost determination under this subparagraph, the Corporation shall accord such other insured System banks as the Corporation determines appropriate the opportunity to submit information relating to such determination.

''(B) PROCEDURAL RULES.—In determining the least costly alternative under subparagraph (A), the Corporation shall—

''(i) evaluate alternatives on a present-value basis, using a reasonable discount rate;

''(ii) document that evaluation and the assumptions on which the evaluation is based; and

''(iii) retain the documentation for not less than 5 years.

''(C) TIME OF DETERMINATION.—

''(i) COST OF ASSISTANCE.—For purposes of this subsection, the determination of the costs of providing any assistance under any provision of this section with respect to any insured System bank shall be made as of the date on which the Corporation makes the determination to provide such assistance to the institution under this section.

''(ii) COST OF LIQUIDATION.—For purposes of this subsection, the determination of the costs of liquidation of any insured System bank shall be made as of the earliest of—

''(I) the date on which a conservator is appointed for the bank;

''(II) the date on which a receiver is appointed for the bank; or

''(III) the date on which the Corporation makes any determination to provide any assistance under this section with respect to the bank.

''(D) EVALUATION OF MANAGEMENT.—Before providing any assistance under paragraph (1), the Corporation shall evaluate the adequacy of the managerial resources of the bank. The continued service of any director or senior ranking officer who serves in a policymaking role for the assisted bank, as determined by the Corporation, shall be subject to approval by the Corporation as a condition of such assistance.

''(E) DISCRETIONARY DETERMINATION.—Any determination that the Corporation makes under this paragraph shall be in the sole discretion of the Corporation.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5.61(a) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–10(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''IN GENERAL'' and inserting ''STAND-ALONE ASSISTANCE''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking ''ENUMERATED POWERS'' and inserting ''FACILITATION OF MERGERS OR CONSOLIDATION''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''FACILITATION OF MERGERS OR CONSOLIDATION'' and inserting ''IN GENERAL''.

SEC. 7. FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSURANCE CORPORATION BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Section 201 of the Farm Credit Banks and Associations Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (106 Stat. 4104–4105) is repealed.

SEC. 8. CONSERVATORSHIP AND RECEIVERSHIPS.

(a) INCLUSION AMONG GENERAL CORPORATE POWERS.—Section 5.58(9) (12 U.S.C. 2277a–7(9)) is amended to read as follows:

''(9) CONSERVATOR OR RECEIVER.—The Corporation may act as conservator or receiver.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 5.51 (12 U.S.C. 2277a) is amended by striking paragraph (5) and redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (5).

SEC. 9. OVERSIGHT AND REGULATORY ACTIONS BY THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM INSURANCE CORPORATION.

Part E of title V of the Farm Credit Act of 1971 (12 U.S.C. 2277–2277a–14) is amended by inserting after section 5.61 the following:

''SEC. 5.61A. AUTHORITY TO REGULATE GOLDEN PARACHUTE AND INDEMNIFICATION PAYMENTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Corporation may prohibit or limit, by regulation or order, any golden parachute payment or indemnification payment by a Farm Credit System institution (including the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation and any conservator or receiver for the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) in troubled condition (as defined in regulations issued by the Corporation).

''(b) FACTORS TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The Corporation shall prescribe, by regulation, the factors to be considered by the Corporation in taking any action under subsection (a), which may include the following:

''(1) Whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that the institution-related party has committed any fraudulent act or omission, breach of trust or fiduciary duty, or insider abuse with regard to the Farm Credit System institution involved that has had a material effect on the financial condition of the institution.

''(2) Whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that the institution-related party is substantially responsible for the insolvency of the Farm Credit System institution, the appointment of a conservator or receiver for the institution, or the institution's troubled condition (as defined in regulations prescribed by the Corporation).

''(3) Whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that the institution-related party has materially violated any applicable law or regulation that has had a material effect on the financial condition of the institution.

''(4) Whether there is a reasonable basis to believe that the institution-related party has violated or conspired to violate—

''(A) section 215, 657, 1006, 1014, or 1344 of title 18, United States Code; or

''(B) section 1341 or 1343 of title 18, United States Code, affecting a Farm Credit System institution.

''(5) Whether the institution-related party was in a position of managerial or fiduciary responsibility.

''(6) The length of time that the party was related with the Farm Credit System institution and the degree to which—

''(A) the payment reasonably reflects compensation earned over the period of employment; and

''(B) the compensation involved represents a reasonable payment for services rendered.

''(c) CERTAIN PAYMENTS PROHIBITED.—No Farm Credit System institution may prepay the salary or any liability or legal expense of any institution-related party if such payment—

''(1) is made in contemplation of the insolvency of such institution or after the commission of an act of insolvency; and

''(2) is made with a view to, or has the result of—

''(A) preventing the proper application of the assets of the institution to creditors; or

''(B) preferring one creditor over another.

''(d) GOLDEN PARACHUTE PAYMENT DEFINED.—As used in this section:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'golden parachute payment' means any payment (or any agreement to make any payment) in the nature of compensation by any Farm Credit System institution for the benefit of any institution-related party under an obligation of the institution that—

''(A) is contingent on the termination of the party's relationship with the institution; and

''(B) is received on or after the date on which—

''(i) the institution is insolvent;

''(ii) any conservator or receiver is appointed for the institution;

''(iii) the Farm Credit Administration has assigned the institution a composite CAMEL rating of 4 or 5 under the Farm Credit Administration Rating System, or an equivalent rating; or

''(iv) the Corporation otherwise determines that the institution is in a troubled condition (as defined in regulations issued by the Corporation).

''(2) CERTAIN PAYMENTS IN CONTEMPLATION OF AN EVENT.—Any payment that would be a golden parachute payment but for the fact that the payment was made before the date referred to in paragraph (1)(B) shall be treated as a golden parachute payment if the payment was made in contemplation of the occurrence of an event described in any clause of such paragraph.

''(3) CERTAIN PAYMENTS NOT INCLUDED.—The term 'golden parachute payment' shall not include—

''(A) any payment made under a retirement plan that is qualified (or is intended to be qualified) under section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 or other nondiscriminatory benefit plan;

''(B) any payment made under a bona fide deferred compensation plan or arrangement that the Corporation determines, by regulation or order, to be permissible; or

''(C) any payment made by reason of the death or disability of an institution-related party.

''(e) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

''(1) INDEMNIFICATION PAYMENT.—The term 'indemnification payment' means any payment (or any agreement to make any payment) by any Farm Credit System institution for the benefit of any person who is or was an institution-related party, to pay or reimburse the person for any liability or legal expense with regard to any administrative proceeding or civil action instituted by the Farm Credit Administration that results in a final order under which the person—

''(A) is assessed a civil money penalty; or

''(B) is removed or prohibited from participating in the conduct of the affairs of the institution.

''(2) LIABILITY OR LEGAL EXPENSE.—The term 'liability or legal expense' means—

''(A) any legal or other professional expense incurred in connection with any claim, proceeding, or action;

''(B) the amount of, and any cost incurred in connection with, any settlement of any claim, proceeding, or action; and

''(C) the amount of, and any cost incurred in connection with, any judgment or penalty imposed with respect to any claim, proceeding, or action.

''(3) PAYMENT.—The term 'payment' means—

''(A) any direct or indirect transfer of any funds or any asset; and

''(B) any segregation of any funds or assets for the purpose of making, or under an agreement to make, any payment after the date on which such funds or assets are segregated, without regard to whether the obligation to make such payment is contingent on—

''(i) the determination, after such date, of the liability for the payment of such amount; or

''(ii) the liquidation, after such date, of the amount of such payment.

''(4) INSTITUTION-RELATED PARTY.—The term 'institution-related party' means—

''(A) any director, officer, employee, or agent for a Farm Credit System institution;

''(B) any stockholder (other than another Farm Credit System institution), consultant, joint venture partner, or any other person determined by the Farm Credit Administration to be a participant in the conduct of the affairs of a Farm Credit System institution;

''(C) any independent contractor (including any attorney, appraiser, or accountant) who knowingly or recklessly participates in any violation of any law or regulation, any breach of fiduciary duty, or any unsafe or unsound practice that caused or is likely to cause more than a minimal financial loss to, or a significant adverse effect on, the Farm Credit System institution; or

''(D) any receiver or conservator of a Farm Credit System institution.

''(f) SPECIAL RULE.—No provision of this section may be construed as prohibiting any Farm Credit System institution from purchasing any commercial insurance policy or fidelity bond, except that such insurance policy or bond shall not cover any legal or liability expense of the institution that is described in subsection (e)(1).

''(g) SPECIAL RULE REGARDING THE FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION.—No provision of this section may be construed as limiting the powers, functions, or responsibilities of the Farm Credit Administration.''.

SEC. 10. FORMATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE ENTITIES.

Part E of title IV (12 U.S.C. 2211–2214) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 4.28A. DEFINITION OF BANK.

''As used in this part, the term 'bank' includes each association operating under title II.''.

SEC. 11. REQUIREMENTS FOR LOANS SOLD INTO THE SECONDARY MARKET.

(a) BORROWER STOCK.—Section 4.3A (12 U.S.C. 2154a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

''(f) LOANS DESIGNATED FOR SALE OR SOLD INTO THE SECONDARY MARKET.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section:

''(1) GENERAL RULE.—Subject to paragraph (2), the bylaws adopted by any bank or association under subsection (b) may provide—

''(A) for any loan made on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection that is designated, at the time the loan is made, for sale into a secondary market under title VIII or otherwise, that no voting stock or participation certificate purchase requirement shall apply to the borrower of the loan; and

''(B) for any loan made before the date of the enactment of this subsection that is sold into a secondary market under title VIII or otherwise, that all outstanding voting stock or participation certificates held by the borrower with respect to the loan shall, subject to subsection (d)(1), be retired.

''(2) EXCEPTION.—If a loan designated for sale as described in paragraph (1)(A) is not sold into a secondary market within 180 days after the designation, the voting stock or participation certificate purchase requirement that would otherwise apply to the loan in the absence of bylaw provisions adopted under paragraph (1)(A) shall be effective, except that the bylaws may provide that if such a loan is thereafter sold into a secondary market, all outstanding voting stock or participation certificates held by the borrower with respect to such loan shall, subject to subsection (d)(1), be retired.''.

(b) BORROWER RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 4.14A(a)(5) (12 U.S.C. 2202a(a)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) LOAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'loan' means a loan made to a farmer, rancher, or producer or harvester of aquatic products, for any agricultural or aquatic purpose and other credit needs of the borrower, including financing for basic processing and marketing directly related to the borrower's operations and those of other eligible farmers, ranchers, and producers or harvesters of aquatic products.

''(B) EXCLUSION OF LOANS DESIGNATED FOR SALE INTO A SECONDARY MARKET.—The term 'loan' does not include a loan made on or after the date of enactment of this subparagraph that, at the time the loan is made, is designated for sale into a secondary market under title VIII or otherwise, except as provided in subparagraph (C).

''(C) SPECIAL RULE.—If a loan designated for sale into a secondary market is not sold into a secondary market within 180 days after such designation, the provisions of sections 4.14, 4.14A, 4.14B, 4.14C, 4.14D, and 4.36 that would apply to the loan in the absence of subparagraph (B) shall apply to the loan until the loan is so sold.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8.9(b) (12 U.S.C. 2279aa–9(b)) is amended by inserting ''(as defined in section 4.14A(a)(5))'' after ''At the time of application for a loan''.

SEC. 12. REMOVAL OF ANTIQUATED AND UNNECESSARY PAPERWORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DISCLOSURE ON ADJUSTABLE RATE LOANS.—Section 4.13(a)(4) (12 U.S.C. 2199(a)(4)) is amended by inserting '', except that any regulation of the Farm Credit Administration implementing this paragraph shall include a provision permitting notice to a borrower of a change in the interest rate applicable to the borrower's loan to be made within a reasonable time after the effective date of the change'' before the semicolon.

(b) COMPENSATION OF ASSOCIATION PERSONNEL.—Section 1.5(13) (12 U.S.C. 2013(13)) is amended by striking ''and the appointment and compensation of the chief executive officer thereof,''.

(c) JOINT MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—Section 5.17(a)(2)(A) (12 U.S.C. 2252(a)(2)(A)) is amended in the 1st sentence by striking ''or management agreements''.

(d) REMOVAL OF CERTAIN BORROWER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—Section 1.10(a) (12 U.S.C. 2018(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(e) USE OF PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1.10(a)(1) (12 U.S.C. 2018(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) PRIVATE MORTGAGE INSURANCE.—Loans on which private mortgage insurance is obtained may exceed 85 percent of the appraised value of the real estate security to the extent that the loan amount in excess of such 85 percent is covered by the insurance.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1.10(a)(1)(A) (12 U.S.C. 2018(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking ''paragraphs (2) and (3)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (C) and (D)''.

(f) DISSEMINATION OF QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Section 5.17(a)(8) (12 U.S.C. 2252(a)(8)) is amended by inserting ''the requirements of the Farm Credit Administration governing the dissemination to stockholders of quarterly reports of System institutions may not be more burdensome or costly than the requirements applicable to national banks, and'' after ''except that''.

SEC. 13. REMOVAL OF GOVERNMENT CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN PRIVATE SECTOR FINANCING.

Section 3.8(b)(1)(A) (12 U.S.C. 2129(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''have been certified by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration to be eligible for such'' and inserting ''are eligible under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 for''; and

(2) by striking ''loan guarantee, and'' and inserting ''loan guarantee from such agencies (or their successors), and''.

SEC. 14. REFORM OF REGULATORY LIMITATIONS ON THE DIVIDEND, MEMBER BUSINESS, AND VOTING PRACTICES OF ELIGIBLE FARMER-OWNED COOPERATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3.8(a) (12 U.S.C. 2129(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Any such association that has received a loan from a bank for cooperatives shall, without regard to the requirements of the preceding sentence, continue to be so eligible for so long as more than 50 percent (or such higher percentage as is established by the bank board) of the voting control of the association is held by farmers, producers or harvesters of aquatic products, or eligible cooperative associations.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 3.8(b)(1)(D) (12 U.S.C. 2129(b)(1)(D)) is amended by inserting '', or under the last sentence,'' after ''(4)''.

SEC. 15. EXTENSION OF INTEREST RATE REDUCTION PROGRAM FOR 5 YEARS.

Section 1320 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1999 note) is amended by striking ''1995'' and inserting ''2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 2029, the Farm Credit System Regulatory Relief Act of 1995. H.R. 2029 provides regulatory relief for the Farm Credit System and gives further flexibility for the Farm Credit Administration, the regulator of the System. This legislation has the bipartisan support of the House Agriculture Committee and was reported out of subcommittee and committee on a voice vote. H.R. 2029 cuts back on paperwork on the System and, according to the FCA, saves between $18 and $20 million over the next 5 years by eliminating an unnecessary board of directors and eliminating unnecessary regulations. I would like to enter into the RECORD a letter from the FCA outlining the savings. The CBO has also scored this and they indicate that implementation of H.R. 2029 would not have any pay-go implications.

This legislation will also provide greater flexibility to the FCA should a problem rise at a System bank. It will allow them to review management at a trouble bank and make changes in management if necessary. It will also allow them to nullify golden parachutes at troubled institutions if they are being paid to bank management who are responsible for the troubled condition of the bank. None of these changes will result in expanded authorities for the System and none of these changes will place the safety and soundness of the System at risk. These changes only reflect the better financial condition of the System in 1995. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letter:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION,
McLean, VA, August 11, 1995.

Hon. PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for providing the Farm Credit Administration (FCA) with the opportunity to communicate our support for H.R. 2029, a bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971. It was a pleasure for me to testify before Chairman Allard and Members of the Subcommittee on Resource Conservation, Research, and Forestry on this legislation.

You have asked that FCA provide an estimate of the cost of enacting H.R. 209. After careful review, it has been determined that significant savings could be realized were this bill to be adopted by Congress. Estimated savings of as much as $4 million annually could be achieved under two provisions of H.R. 2029, the 18-month examination schedule extension and retention of the current three member Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation (FCSIC) Board.

The Agency estimates that adoption of an 18 month examination schedule for many of our institutions, in lieu of the current 12 month examination schedule, could save as much as $2 million annually. This change would further streamline RCA without compromising the safety and soundness of the institutions it regulates.

If the statutory requirement for establishment of an independent FCSIC Board is repealed, as proposed by H.R. 2029, additional costs can be avoided. The implementation of an independent, full time three member Board of Directors would increase FCSIC administrative costs by approximately $2.0 million annually. Under H.R. 2029, FCSIC would continue to benefit from access to FCA professional and administrative resources under the same operating procedures that have been in place since 1990.

Were H.R. 2029 enacted with the extended examination schedule and the repeal of an independent FCSIC Board, a cost savings of $18 to $20 million could be realized over the next five years.

Should you have additional questions regarding H.R. 2029, please let me know.

Sincerely,

MARSHA MARTIN,
Chairman.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2029, and a statement on behalf of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] will be submitted to appear at the appropriate place in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for moving this bill through the Committee on Agriculture in an expeditious manner, and I also would like to commend the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], and the ranking member, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], for their hard work in guiding the regulatory relief through their subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker I rise today in support of H.R. 2029. I would like to thank Chairman ROBERTS for moving this bill through the Committee on Agriculture in an expeditious manner. I would also like to commend Subcommittee Chairman ALLARD and the ranking member, Mr. JOHNSON, for their hard work in guiding the regulatory relief bill through their subcommittee.

The bill before the House today reflects the hard work of Members from both sides of the aisle. It is the product of a careful review of current regulations, and it targets those regulations that have become outdated. For example, the legislation removes an outdated certification procedure for certain Banks for Cooperatives lending activities, without changing eligibility requirements in current law.

Other changes will give the system more flexibility, and provide farmers and ranchers with better loan rates. Section 4 will give the Farm Credit Administration more flexibility in carrying out its examinations of Farm Credit System institutions. Section 5 of the bill authorizes the Insurance Corporation to reduce premiums it receives from System banks and to distribute to System Institutions amounts in the insurance fund [Fund] that are in excess of the secure base amount. Section 10 authorizes associations to jointly form administrative service entities, which will reduce operating expenses.

These changes will result in lower costs to the System and lower interest rates for farmers, ranchers, and rural homeowners. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of the bill, H.R. 2029, as amended, and I look forward to continuing work with Chairman ROBERTS toward enactment of this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2029, the Farm Credit System Regulatory Relief Act of 1995. I was pleased to have joined Chairman ALLARD in the introduction of H.R. 2029 and to have worked with both he and Chairman ROBERTS to bring the bill to the floor. This legislation would provide flexibility to the regulator of the Farm Credit System banks and institutions as well as removing some of the rigidity of the Farm Credit Act, which governs the activities of the System.

I am hopeful that our efforts will provide the Farm Credit System with the ability to reduce their internal paperwork and bureaucracy, and in turn, pass that reduction in costs on to their farm and ranch borrowers. As one of the few members of the Agriculture Committee who was here in 1987, when we faced a crisis in agricultural credit, I am confidant that we have adequate protection and tools in place to ensure that the Farm Credit System will be able to weather any downswings in the agriculture sector.

I supported the regulatory relief legislation for the commercial banking sector that moved through Congress in the last session and hopefully additional legislation that will move yet this year, and I am pleased to have been involved in this similar effort for the Farm Credit System. I want to assure my colleagues that this bill is not about expanded authorities or other contentious issues, but about cutting down on unnecessary redtape and ensuring balanced competitiveness of the Farm Credit System institutions with commercial banks.

Included in the bill during full committee consideration were several provisions which should be of interest to our colleagues, including the specific inclusion of Farmer Mac in the section precluding the granting of golden parachutes to institutions considered to be troubled. I'm also pleased that Chairmen ROBERTS and ALLARD included an extension of the authority for the interest rate assistance program, so that commercial banks and farm credit institutions will have an assurance that the program will be available this spring to help farm and ranch borrowers receive guaranteed loans. It is also my hope that we will have reached a compromise on the issue of Financial Assistance Corporation stock purchase that will put the issue to rest.

As the result of a request during the Resource Conservation Subcommittee hearing held on H.R. 2029, we heard from the Farm Credit Administration in regard to additional technical changes they would like to have changed in their statute. It is my hope that we can address these provisions during consideration of the credit title in the farm bill in the coming year.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation for the benefit of their farm and ranch constituents.

Mr. HEINEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2029, the Farm Credit System Regulatory Relief Act of 1995. H.R. 2029 eases unnecessary regulatory requirements on the Farm Credit System. These burdensome regulatory costs have increased the amount that farmers pay for credit.

Currently, regulators are required to review lenders yearly. Yearly review is overly burdensome and costly on the Farm Credit System. Those higher costs are then passed on to our Nation's farmers. H.R. 2029 would allow regulators to review lenders every 18 months and reduces a number of other regulatory burdens on the Farm Credit System that have become outdated.

This legislation will give the Farm Credit System and farmers some much needed relief. The Farm Credit Administration has estimated that this legislation will save an estimated $18 million to $20 million dollars over the next 5 years.

Farm credit institutions are very important to North Carolina's farmers. H.R. 2029 will give farm credits more flexibility to provide farmers with better service and loan rates. I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's farmers, vote for H.R. 2029.

□ 1815

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2029, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to provide regulatory relief, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–149)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2076, the ''Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the

Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996.''

This bill does not meet the priorities and needs of our Nation and people. It would undermine our ability to fight the war on crime; decimate technology programs that are critical to building a strong U.S. economy; and weaken our leadership in the world by drastically cutting funding for international organizations, peacekeeping, and other international affairs activities.

First, the bill represents an unacceptable retreat in our fight against crime and drugs. It eliminates my COPS initiative (Community Oriented Policing Services) to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. Already, this initiative has put thousands of police on the street, working hand-in-hand with their communities to fight crime. The block grant that H.R. 2076 would offer instead would not guarantee a single new police officer. That's not what the American people want, and I won't accept it. As I have said, I will not sign any version of this bill that does not fund the COPS initiative as a free-standing, discretionary grant program, as authorized.

The bill also eliminates my ''drug courts'' initiative. And it unwisely abandons crime prevention efforts such as the Ounce of Prevention Council and the Community Relations Service. I am also disappointed that the funding levels in the bill fall short of my request for the Drug Enforcement Administration, and OCDETF (Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force). This is no time to let down our guard in the fight against drugs.

Second, the bill constitutes a short-sighted assault on the Commerce Department's technology programs that work effectively with business to expand our economy, help Americans compete in the global marketplace, and create high quality jobs. As we approach a new, technology-driven century, it makes no sense to eliminate an industry-driven, highly competitive, cost-shared initiative like our Advanced Technology Program (ATP), which fosters technology development, promotes industrial alliances, and creates jobs. Nor does it make sense to sharply cut funding for measures that will help assure our long-term growth and competitiveness—such as our National Information Infrastructure grants program, which helps connect schools, hospitals, and libraries to the information superhighway; the GLOBE program, which promotes the study of science and the environment in our schools; the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which helps small manufacturers meet the hi-tech demands of the new marketplace; Defense Conversion; or the Technology Administration. And I oppose the bill's harmful cuts for the Census Bureau and for economic and statistical analysis.

Third, I am deeply concerned that this bill would undermine our global leadership and impair our ability to protect and defend important U.S. interests around the world—both by making unwise cuts in funding for international organizations and peacekeeping activities, and by cutting programs of the State Department, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the United States Information Agency. These cuts would impair our ability to support important activities such as the nonproliferation of weapons, the promotion of human rights, and the control of infectious disease like the Ebola virus. Moreover, sections of the bill include inappropriate restrictive language, including language limiting the conduct of U.S. diplomatic relations with Vietnam, that I believe infringe on Presidential prerogatives. And I cannot accept the provision that would cut off all funding for these agencies on April 1, 1996, unless the State Department Authorization Act and related legislation had been signed into law.

Fourth, the bill includes three additional provisions that I cannot accept.

It cripples the capacity of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) to fulfill its historic mission of serving people in need—slashing its overall funding, sharply limiting the administrative funds LSC needs to conduct its business, and imposing excessive restrictions on LSC's operations. LSC should be allowed to carry on its work in an appropriate manner, both in its basic programs and in special initiatives like the migrant legal services program.

Section 103 of the bill would prohibit the use of funds for performing abortions, except in cases involving rape or danger to the life of the mother. The Justice Department has advised that there is a substantial risk that this provision would be held unconstitutional as applied to female prison inmates.

The bill also includes an ill-considered legislative rider that would impose a moratorium on future listings under the Endangered Species Act by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other agencies. That rider not only would make bad policy, it also has no place in this bill.

Finally, I would urge the Congress to continue the Associate Attorney General's office.

For these reasons and others my Administration has conveyed to the Congress in earlier communications, I cannot accept this bill. H.R. 2076 does not reflect my priorities or the values of the American people. I urge the Congress to send me an appropriations bill that truly serves this Nation and its people.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 19, 1995.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, consideration of the veto message is postponed until tomorrow, December 20, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT SHOWS BALANCED BUDGET WILL IMPROVE FAMILY INCOME

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago the Speaker of the House and the President concluded a meeting on which we hope there was substantial progress on negotiations toward a balanced budget.

I take this opportunity this evening to speak of a Joint Economic Committee report which shows clearly that there is a marked effect on family income and on the economic status of a family because of our movement which will eventually conclude in a balanced budget.

First, Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out, and this is extra from the report that I want to talk about today, that the individual share of the national debt that we have collectively accrued for each of the 280 million people who live in this country is about $18,000. That is right, for every man, woman, and child who is a citizen of the United States of America, the individual share of the national debt amounts to just about $18,000.

To bring that close to home, to let us see clearly what it means to each person, obviously, off in the abstract someplace there is a problem because there is an $18,000 debt, but it is kind of out of sight until we understand that when we pay our income tax bill each year there is interest that must be paid on that $18,000 debt.

If I went down to the bank to borrow $18,000 and the person at the bank said, ''OK, Mr. SAXTON, we will lend you the $18,000, but you need to know that you have to pay interest on it,'' the interest on that $18,000 note that I would take out would amount to somewhere, if it were a 7-percent note or thereabouts, it would amount to about $1,060 a year that I would have to pay on that $18,000 loan that I took out at the bank.

That is precisely what happens with the $18,000 that we each owe the Federal Government. When we pay our Federal income taxes each year, on average, about $1,060 goes to pay the interest on our $18,000 share of the national debt. Of course, for an average family of four, that gets a little expensive, because $1,060 times four comes out to about $42,040 a year. So there is a definite economic impact on each and every individual and on each and every family.

Further, the Joint Economic Committee Report, which Members have

access to by calling my office, the Joint Economic Committee report that we published shows that there is a further impact on each American family that amounts to a very significant amount of money. As a matter of fact, it amounts to about $2,308 a year. It is interesting to see how this report takes us there, because all of our families have certain things in common. If your individual family does not face these exact facts, you will at least be able to relate to them, because they are not uncommon.

For example, we believe that balancing the budget, and most economists believe that balancing the budget and Alan Greenspan believes that our balancing the budget will have a significant impact on interest rates. As a matter of fact, on most interest rates they are projecting about 2.2 percent lower at the conclusion of our 7-year balanced budget plan. So in the plan that we passed, and we provided for that economic benefit.

For a family that has a mortgage on their home, a $100,000 mortgage, as is used in the case here, and the interest rate drops by 2 percent, it amounts to a whopping $1,456 a year in savings on that home mortgage. So we jump right out front with a big savings for the individual homeowner of about $1,456.

It also would not be unusual for a family of, let us say, three, as is the case in this example, for a family of three, it would not be unusual for that family to have a student loan. If we reduced the interest rate on that student loan, like we did for the interest rate on the home mortgage, we see here there would be an additional $50 a year in savings, another significant amount, as we add up this total pie.

It would not also be unusual for a family like our family to have a car loan. That car loan at $15,000 and a lowered interest rate by 2.22 percent would produce a savings of $108 a year.

In the plan that we passed to balance the budget, as Members will recall, we had a $500 per child tax credit. So in this family, you see, we have another 500 savings. There would also be some savings or some additional income because we know that if we put our fiscal house in order, it will have a positive effect on our economy. We believe that it will produce jobs, and we also believe it will produce higher rates of wages, higher rates of pay, so our economist friends projected that additional income would amount to about $194 a year.

Adding all of these savings up from a better fiscal situation for our government and a better economic situation for our country, in actual savings for American families, we come up with a net savings of $2,308 a year for this family of three.

The conclusion that we almost draw from this, Mr. Speaker, is that the facts presented in this analysis, which, again, is available by calling my office, lead to but one conclusion: The price of higher spending and greater debt accumulation is far too high not to balance the budget. Refusing to bring spending in line with revenue will cost a typical American family $192 a month, and over $2,300 a year.

So I invite all of my colleagues and anyone else on Capitol Hill or around the country that is interested to give a call. We will be happy to send out a copy of this economic analysis, which shows these facts very clearly.

□ 1830

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2359, ICC TERMINATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–425) on the resolution (H. Res. 312) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 558, THE TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL CONSENT ACT

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–426) on the resolution (H. Res. 313) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 558) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET LACKS ADEQUATE FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 month ago today we adopted a continuing resolution which was a commitment on the part of the President and the Members of Congress by a vast majority in both parties to achieving a balanced budget by the year 2002. That was 1 month ago today.

In the intervening 1 month, we have seen not a single one of the budget bills which is necessary to run the government for fiscal year 1996, not a single one of those bills has been signed into law. Indeed, three of them have actually reached the President's desk and he has vetoed them, including the Commerce-State-Justice bill, for which you just heard the veto message read. That veto message gives very profound and good reasons for why it was vetoed; and the other two, similarly.

However, the other three budget bills, including the major legislation for the Labor, Health and Human Service Departments and Education Department, all of those have never even been taken up by the Senate; they are not even close to being passed.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution that was adopted 1 month ago said that the President and the Congress shall agree, and agree to working toward a balanced budget that must, ''provide adequate funding for Medicaid and education and agriculture and national defense and veterans and the environment,'' and continuing the quote, ''Further, the balanced budget will adopt tax policies to help working families.'' That is a section of the quote from that continuing resolution.

Here we are 1 month later and what has been the progress on providing adequate funding? Let me take just a couple of these areas that have been so specifically spoken of in the continuing resolution that Members of both parties and the President agreed would guide how we would go about creating that balanced budget for the year 2002.

What about adequate funding for Medicaid? Well, what we know, Mr. Speaker, is that the Medicaid budget, as passed by the Congress and sent to the President, has $133 billion worth of cuts in Medicaid. That is revised by the latest CBO numbers. Now, is that adequate funding for Medicaid?

Well, let us examine what it is that Medicaid provides for. It provides long-term care, Mr. Speaker, Long-term care is mostly for elders, for senior citizens in this country who have used every bit of their resources and are now destitute and need to be in nursing homes, need long-term care. So that $133 billion cut comes out of long-term care for destitute elderly people in this country.

Number 2, it covers the safety net for poor families and where there may be no sympathy for poor people on the Republican side here, the legislation does provide health care, Medicaid does provide health care for children, for little children, little children who happen to be growing up in low-income statuses and surely deserve to have health care, as good a health care as my child, as good a health care as any child of any Member in this Congress has. But that, with the $133 billion of cuts in Medicaid, is jeopardized.

Then the other major thing is disabled Americans, the most tragic cases of people that we have to deal with as members of Congress and among our constituents, people, mostly younger people, who have crippling birth defects or have debilitating or progressive diseases and need again the assistance from Medicaid that is provided to people who are disabled; and again, that $133 billion of cuts in Medicaid taken from them.

What about the question of adequate funding for education? Well, the budget that the Republicans keep pushing as the correct budget is one that continues to take money from financial aid for college students, $5 billion over 7

years from financial aid for college students, including the elimination of the direct lending program.

The Speaker is telling me that my time is up, so I can assure my colleagues that the list goes on here, but we need to follow the continuing resolution and provide for adequate funding for Medicaid and education and the environment and make certain that that balanced budget will indeed adopt tax policies to help working families.

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

[Mr. DICKEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CORPORATE LEADERS SHOULD SHARE SACRIFICES TO BALANCE BUDGET

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

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this morning we woke up to an advertisement, a full-page ad in today's New York Times and in the Washington Post that called on President Clinton and the congressional leaders of both parties to expedite agreements on a budget plan that would balance the budget within 7 years.

The advertisement, which echoed much of the frustration felt by many Americans, was signed by the presidents and the CEOs of America's largest corporations. However this budget dispute is resolved, millions of Americans and, in all likelihood, Americans with the very least are going to be asked to give up more. Working families, children, students, the elderly and the sick and the poor and the disabled are going to be asked to give up more in this dispute than anyone who signed this ad from these corporations.

What is at stake in this debate is how the burdens of reaching a balanced budgeted are apportioned, how will we share the pain, how will we share the burden?

The Republican party and their budget is grossly unfair, placing the overwhelming burden of cuts, rollbacks and denials of services on the backs of vulnerable Americans.

I recognize that the corporate officers who signed yesterday's advertisement are sincere in their desire for a balanced budget, but there is something unseemly, something unfair about some of the richest men in America who lead some of the biggest corporations in America lecturing us to pass a budget that, when all is said and done, preserves many of their privileges, their profits and their perks on the backs of the average working man and woman in this country.

The wealth of these corporations is due not only to the hard work of their employees, including their very generously compensated CEOs, but also to billions of dollars in the Federal spending that underwrites them. Most of that Federal spending remains untouched in this budget proposal. In fact, for many, the passage of the balanced budget will mean a multibillion dollar windfall as millions of Americans are denied basic medical care, education, nutrition, child care, and income support.

The signatories to this advertisement are questionable spokesmen for tightening our belts. These are men who have made many millions of dollars, in some cases many millions of dollars in just the last year.

Allied Signal's Lawrence Bossidy was reportedly paid $12.3 million. American International's M.R. Greenberg was paid $12 million. Chrysler's Robert Eaton was paid $6.1 million. Nation's Bank Hugh McColl earned $13 million. Xerox's Paul Allaire made $6.8 million. They all signed this ad suggesting that we could arrive at a balanced budget.

Most of these others earn between $1 million and $6 million a year, who sign these ads. Many of these companies are not only doing well because of their product line and their marketing skills, but because they very same government that they ask now to balance the budget is showering them with benefits.

The pharmaceutical companies like Abbot Laboratories and American Home Products and Baxter International and Johnson & Johnson enjoy multimillion dollar tax breaks through the 936 subsidy program which is preserved in the balanced budget that they want others to pay for.

Major corporations like AT&T, Exxon, Ford Motor and GTE Corporation have enjoyed millions through foreign sales assistance through the OPIC program that is a subsidy provided by the Federal Government to some of the wealthiest corporations in the country.

Financial corporations like the Blackstone Group, the Bloomberg Financial Services, Dean Witter, Goldman Sachs, Merrill Lynch, all are expecting the windfalls that they believe will arrive from the capital gains tax, most of which goes to the wealthiest people in this Nation, and yet these people who are paid millions have said to us that others should pay to balance the budget.

The energy corporations like Amoco and Exxon and Chevron benefit from a royalty holiday, a holiday from paying the people of the United States a royalty for the oil and the gas that they extract from the people's lands in the Gulf of Mexico. ASARCO benefits by not paying a royalty on the minerals it extracts from the public lands, and yet they sign an ad and tell us how easy it is to balance the budget. Alcoa, the aluminum company, will profit from continued subsidizing of the hydroelectric power that allows them to make aluminum in the Pacific Northwest subsidized by the taxpayers.

These gentlemen are not suggesting that they offer up this corporate welfare to help us balance the budget, this perk, this privilege. No, they are suggesting that others should have to pay to balance the budget.

These corporate leaders have got it wrong. They too must help to contribute to balance the budget. They too must put their perks and privileges on the table.

PUTTING A FACE ON GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, yesterday this House, by a resounding vote of 351 to 40, voted for a resolution for a balanced budget in 7 years using CBO numbers. The President has indicated that he is in favor of it; certainly the leadership in Congress is in favor of it. Let us get on with it. Let us get on with it.

What is happening with this Government shutdown, Mr. Speaker, is that we have Federal employees and those who have Federal contracts and those in the community that really are victims of the fact that Congress and the administration have not come to grips with balancing this budget.

I want to put a face on this Federal shutdown. This is shutdown No. 2. This is shutdown No. 2 that has said to 260,000 Federal employees and their families, we do not need you; there is no work for you now. This is the third day of Hannukah. In 6 days it will be Christmas, and yet we have these people and their families who have been told they are nonemergency. I do not even use that term, ''nonessential,'' because everybody is essential who works for the Federal Government. But nonessential, or nonemergency is probably the term to use.

I have heard from a woman who was deemed emergency and who made prearranged plans to take time off, time that she had accrued for the holidays, but she has been told that because she is emergency, she cannot take that prearranged time off; she must report to work. If she takes that vacation time, her agency told her that under the rules, she would be fired.

I had another extraordinary situation which we are trying to work out, and that is again somebody who had claimed time off for a honeymoon that was told, you are essential and we do not believe that you can take the time off for a honeymoon, even though it was planned months and months in advance.

□ 1845

I have a person at the National Institutes of Health, and this is pretty typical, a pharmacist, a pharmacist who had been deemed emergency because people across the country depend on

the prescriptions that he fills. Although he is at work filling these prescriptions, he cannot send them out. Why? Because the mail room is closed.

During the last shutdown, he sent them out with his own money, but he does not know whether he can afford it this time. Can you imagine that?

I have some neighbors down the street from me in Montgomery County, MD, and I noticed their cars were parked in their driveway this morning at 7:15 in the morning. Ordinarily they are gone at about 6:45 or certainly by 7. Why were they there? Because one works for Health and Human Services and the other one works for the Department of Commerce. They have 4 children, 2 are in college, and I am sure they are looking for gifts for Hanukkah and Christmas but I am not sure that they are going to be able to feel that they can transcend that anxiety and the angst of not having work.

I just think that we must look at the human factor of this shutdown and those people who are being unfairly victimized and held hostage for it. It should let us know that we have got to lead, very soon, like within the next few moments say that we can come together as we are supposed to.

But I also want you to know that there are others who are affected adversely by this shutdown, too. The local economy, hotels and restaurants, Federal contracts, certainly I can use as an example the National Institutes of Health grants, research that has been slowed down.

There is an article in the paper today that come out, too. It said that the National Institutes of Health, this is the time of year officials normally would be deciding how to hand out more than $2 billion in research grants. ''They have gone through peer review, have been found to be excellent science and we're about ready to fund them.''

This is research. This is important research. However, we cannot do it. We cannot do it because we do not know what is going to happen with the budget, and we have been told that we must shut down that facet of government.

So there are thousands of Federal workers in Maryland who are on furlough—this comes from the newspaper story—for the second time in 2 months, feeling the most immediate impact of the inability of President Clinton and Congress to agree on a budget.

But there is also a trickle-down effect, and I would like to point that out, albeit briefly, the trickle-down effect to the local economy. I have a letter from a suburban Maryland high technology council talking about those people who are on Federal contracts, who will not be reimbursed.

I say, Mr. Speaker, to this distinguished body, let our people go back to work. Let us balance this budget.

THE BUDGET AND CHRISTMAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, today we witnessed the Republicans playing raw politics by putting up senseless resolutions that are designed to make noise and avoid making policy.

The result is that we are giving the American people a Gingrich Christmas, a Gingrich Christmas of 250,000 Federal employees or more who have a joyless gift of being furloughed and called nonessential in their effort to serve America with their vital services.

A Gingrich Christmas for children means virtually eliminating nutrition programs through block grants and creating 50 different standards, cutting current levels of SSI benefits for children with disability by 25 percent, eliminating the immunization program, eliminating the guarantee of child care and providing inadequate funding, making it difficult if not impossible for their parents to go to work.

A Gingrich Christmas for senior citizens means cutting Medicare by $270 billion, cutting Medicaid by $163 billion, eliminating the guaranteed coverage for health care, eliminating home heating assistance for the poor, radically restructuring nursing home care.

A Gingrich Christmas for the wealthy, however, means a tax cut of $245 billion and welfare for corporate America.

The President would like to give the American people a fair opportunity to be productive and to contribute to this great Nation through their work. The President would like to put those furloughed Federal employees back to work who should not be held hostage just before Christmastime.

The President Clinton Christmas for children would mean maintaining nutritional programs with one Federal standard across America, making sure that there is a hearty breakfast and a healthy lunch for needy children, keeping SSI benefits for children with disabilities, making sure that every needy child gets immunized against polio, tuberculosis and every other disease, retaining the guarantee for child care and providing adequate funds so that their parents who need to go back to work can go back to work and become independent from dependency on this Government.

A President Christmas for senior citizens would mean providing Medicare coverage for American poor elderly, 90 percent of whom have such coverage now in America, protecting the guarantee of Medicaid for the poor, the disabled and children, retaining the 30-year guarantee of health care coverage, maintaining home heating assistance, and keeping nursing home care and providing the same standard of care in those homes.

The President's Christmas to the wealthy Americans would mean, however, a fair tax rather than a free tax ride, for all Americans. A balanced budget in 7 years? Yes, making sure we have a strong, stable and working economy.

Mr. Speaker, Christmas is a time that should bring out the best in America, not the worst in America. The best in America means a real chance for children, real genuine security for our senior citizens.

Christmas is less than a week away, 6 days. The question today is, what will Congress do to ensure that America experiences a joyful Christmas? There will be no joy nor happiness nor excitement if Federal workers are out of work, if children have no reason to smile, and if seniors face undue pain in their most vulnerable years.

Christmas has become important in America today. Christmas is really a holy day, a righteous day where we should celebrate the expectation of a coming of Christ. It is a day where we care about our fellow Americans or our fellow human beings.

Congress must not transform this cheer and this religiously significant day into a day of gloom. We must get on and do the work that we should do to make Christmas a happy day for all Americans.

THE LACK OF POWER OF THE PRESIDENT TO COMMIT TROOPS ABROAD WITHOUT CONGRESSIONAL AUTHORIZATION

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, we have a President with a lack of will on the budget but an excess of will on having troops in Bosnia.

The excess of will includes the use of an excess of power that in reality does not exist. If George Washington, our greatest President, and John Marshall, our greatest Chief Justice, were here today, they would not believe what the President has done.

Why do I say that? Very simply. Washington presided over the Constitutional Convention. He knew what the Framers meant when they gave the President the power to be Commander in Chief gave the President the power to be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. So did Marshall and his court, a court he dominated for over three decades. They made the basic interpretations of what the Constitution was meant to be.

In ''The Federalist'' No. 74 Alexander Hamilton said, very simply, ''The President of the United States is to be 'Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.'

But when the first President, Washington, confronted a situation such as the current President confronted, he deferred to Congress, as did John Adams, as did Thomas Jefferson, as did most other Presidents.

The expert on this area is Dr. Louis Fisher, senior specialist in separation of powers of the Office of Senior Specialists of the Congressional Research Service in the Library of Congress. Dr. Fisher, in his essay ''The Barbary Wars: Legal Precedent for Invading Haiti?'' noted this: That George Washington and John Adams in their ''military action conformed to the framers' expectation that the decision to go to war or to mount military operations was reserved to Congress and required advance authorization.''

For example, ''President Washington's military actions against Indian tribes were initially authorized by Congress.'' In his writings, George Washington noted specifically that ''military operations were confined to defensive measures. Offensive action required authority from Congress.''

Each President that I have mentioned—Washington, Adams, and Jefferson—said the same thing. Jefferson listened to his Cabinet on the subject of the use of force against the Barbary powers (Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli), and their various theories of when Jefferson decided to act he based his action ''on statutory authority rather than theories of inherent presidential power,'' something we have heard a lot about since 1933.

As Dr. Fisher restates this history, he observes that Jefferson cited the statute of March 3, 1801 as a basis for his action. A directive of May 20th ordered a captain of the Navy to take his squadron to the Mediterranean to protect American commerce against the Barbary powers. Jefferson settled on consulting Congress. Between 1802 and 1815, a dozen statutes were passed by Congress and approved by Presidents Jefferson and Madison to deal with the Barbary pirates who were hurting United States shipping. ''By the end of 1815,'' as Dr. Fisher sums up, ''Madison could report to Congress on the successful termination of the war with Algiers.''

Jefferson recognized there was a difference—as had Washington—that between defensive and offensive military operations. That was not surprising. After all, Jefferson had been Washington's Secretary of State. In fact, Washington said in 1793, ''the Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress; therefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.''

We also have in modern times a wise Secretary of Defense who set out some fairly substantial criteria that any President or any Secretary of Defense should meet before committing American troops abroad. In a very significant speech on November 28, 1984, on ''The Uses of Military Power,'' then Secretary of Defense Casper W. Weinberger suggested that there are at least six tests that must be met if American forces are to be used.

Let me just read a few lines from the Secretary's remarks and then we will put the rest in the RECORD.

''First, the United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that or our allies * * *.''

Fourth, he noted still later that when the forces do change, in terms of size, composition and disposition, then so must our combat requirements be continually reassessed. He cautioned: ''We must continuously keep as a beacon light before us the basic questions. Is this conflict in our national interest?

Fifth, he noted that ''before the U.S. commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected representatives in Congress. This support cannot be achieved unless we are candid in making clear the threats we face; the support cannot be sustained without continuing and close consultation.''

He means with Congress as his next sentence clearly states: ''We cannot fight a battle with the Congress at home while asking our troops to win a war overseas or, as in the case of Vietnam, in effect asking our troops not to win but just to be there.''

Finally, said Secretary Weinberger, ''the commitment of U.S. forces to combat should be a last resort.''

Those are wise words, wise decisions made by George Washington, made by John Adams, made by Thomas Jefferson, made by the Supreme Court of the United States and the Chief Justice of the United States, John Marshall, and in modern times seconded by one of the major Secretaries of Defense of the post-war period.

Mr. Speaker, our troops should not be in Bosnia. Of course, we support them once they are put there. We came within five votes in the House of Representatives in not having our troops in Bosnia when we voted for the Dornan amendment. It is sad that we lost a majority. That was a mistake. It is too bad we did not pick up a few votes on that, but now that our armed services are there, we do have to help.

But ''help our troops'' has also been the ruse that two Presidents found to keep soldiers in Vietnam when it was clear that they should not be there. Of course we support the troops. Every single Member of this body supports the troops. The question is: ''Should they be there in the first place?''

Mr. Speaker, I include the following documents for the RECORD:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS ON ''THE USES OF MILITARY POWER'' BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CASPAR W. WEINBERGER BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, NOVEMBER 28, 1984:

I believe the postwar period has taught us several lessons, and from them I have developed six major tests to be applied when we are weighing the use of U.S. Combat Forces abroad. Let me now share them with you:

(1) First, the United States should not commit forces to combat overseas unless the particular engagement or occasion is deemed vital to our national interest or that of our allies. That emphatically does not mean that we should declare beforehand, as we did with Korea in 1950, that a particular area is outside our strategic perimeter.

(2) Second, if we decide it is necessary to put combat troops into a given situation, we should do so wholeheartedly, and with the clear intention of winning. If we are unwilling to commit the forces or resources necessary to achieve our objectives, we should not commit them at all. Of course if the particular situation requires only limited force to win our objectives, then we should not hesitate to commit forces sized accordingly. When Hitler broke treaties and remilitarized the Rhineland, small combat forces then could perhaps have prevented the Holocaust of World War II.

(3) Third, if we do decide to commit forces to combat overseas, we should have clearly defined political and military objectives. And we should know precisely how our forces can accomplish those clearly defined objectives. And we should have and send the forces needed to do just that. As Clausewitz wrote, ''no one starts a war—or rather, no one in his senses ought to do so—without first being clear in his mind what he intends to achieve by that war, and how he intends to conduct it.''

War may be different today than in Clausewitz's time, but the need for well-defined objectives and a consistent strategy is still essential. If we determine that a combat mission has become necessary for our vital national interests, then we must send forces capable to do the job—and not assign a combat mission to a force configured for peacekeeping.

(4) Fourth, the relationship between our objectives and the forces we have committed—their size, composition and disposition—must be continually reassessed and adjusted if necessary. Conditions and objectives invariably change during the course of a conflict. When they do change, then so must our combat requirements. We must continuously keep as a beacon light before us the basic questions: ''Is this conflict in our national interest?'' ''Does our national interest require us to fight, to use force of arms?'' If the answers are ''yes'', then we must win. If the answers are ''no'', then we should not be in combat.

(5) Fifth, before the United States commits combat forces abroad, there must be some reasonable assurance we will have the support of the American people and their elected Representatives in Congress. This support cannot be achieved unless we are candid in making clear the threats we face; the support cannot be sustained without continuing and close consultation. We cannot fight a battle with the congress at home while asking our troops to win a war overseas or, as in the case of Vietnam, in effect asking our troops not to win, but just to be there.

(6) Finally, the commitment of U.S. Forces to combat should be a last resort.

THE BARBARY WARS: LEGAL PRECEDENT FOR INVADING HAITI?

SUMMARY

The claim that President Clinton has constitutional authority to invade Haiti without first obtaining congressional authority is often linked to early presidential actions. Supporters of broad executive power argue that a President may deploy troops on his own authority and that Congress can restrain him only after he acts. As support for this position, the Barbary Wars during the time of Presidents Jefferson and Madison are often cited. However. the historical record demonstrates that these military operations received advance authority from Congress.

To the extent that presidential initiatives were taken before congressional action, they were defensive in nature and not offensive (as contemplated for Haiti).

BACKGROUND

During the presidencies of George Washington and John Adams. U.S. military action conformed to the framers' expectation that the decision to go to war or to mount military operations was reserved to Congress and required advance authorization. For example, President Washington's military actions against Indian tribes were initially authorized by Congress. 1 Stat. 96, §5 (1789); 1 Stat. 121, §16 (1790); 1 Stat. 222 (1791). Consistent with these statutes, military operations were confined to defensive measures. Offensive action required authority from Congress. 33 The Writings of George Washington 73 (John C. Fitzpatrick ed. 1939).

Similarly, when President Washington used military force in the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794, he acted on the basis of statutory authority. 1 Stat. 264, §1 (1792). President John Adams engaged in the ''quasi-war'' with France from 1798 to 1800. Although Congress did not declare war, military activities were fully authorized by more than two dozen statutes in 1798. 1 Stat. 547–611.

ACTIONS BY JEFFERSON AND MADISON

Elected President in 1800, Thomas Jefferson inherited the pattern established during the Washington and Adams administrations: Congress had to authorize offensive military actions in advance. One of the first issues awaiting Jefferson was the practice of paying annual bribes (''tributes'') to four states of North Africa: Morocco, Algiers, Tunis, and Tripoli. Regular payments were made so that these countries would not interfere with American merchantmen. Over a period of ten years, Washington and Adams paid nearly $10,000,000 in tributes.

In his capacity as Secretary of State in 1790, Jefferson had identified for Congress a number of options in dealing with the Barbary powers. In each case it was up to Congress to establish national policy and the executive branch to implement it:

Upon the whole, it rests with Congress to decide between war, tribute, and ransom, as the means of reestablishing our Mediterranean commerce. If war, they will consider how far our own resources shall be called forth, and how far they will enable the Executive to engage, in the forms of the constitution, the co-operation of other Powers. If tribute or ransom, it will rest with them to limit and provide the amount; and with the Executive, observing the same constitutional forms, to make arrangements for employing it to the best advantage. 1 American State Papers: Foreign Relations 105 (Walter Lowrie & Matthew St. Clair Clarke, eds. 1832).

On March 3, 1801, one day before Jefferson took office as President, Congress passed legislation to provide for a ''naval peace establishment.'' 2 Stat. 110, §2 (1801). On May 15, Jefferson's Cabinet debated the President's authority to use force against the Barbary powers. The Cabinet agreed that American vessels could repel an attack, but some departmental heads insisted on a larger definition of executive power. For example, Albert Gallatin, Secretary of the Treasury, remarked: ''The Executive can not put us in a state of war, but if we be put into that state either by the decree of Congress or of the other nation, the command and direction of the public force then belongs to the Executive.'' Other departmental heads expressed different views. Franklin B. Sawvel, ed., The Complete Anas of Thomas Jefferson 213 (1903).

After hearing these opinions from his Cabinet, Jefferson chose to rely on statutory authority rather than theories of inherent presidential power. Citing the statute of March 3, the State Department issued a directive on May 20 to Captain Richard Dale of the U.S. Navy, stating that under ''this [statutory] authority'' Jefferson had directed that a squadron be sent to the Mediterranean. If the Barbary powers declared war on the United States, American vessels were ordered to ''protect our commerce & chastise their insolence—by sinking, burning or destroying their ships & Vessels wherever you shall find them.'' 1 Naval Documents Relating to the United States Wars With the Barbary Powers 467 (1939). Having issued that order, based on congressional authority, Jefferson also wrote that it was up to Congress to decide what policy to pursue in the Mediterranean: ''The real alternative before us is whether to abandon the Mediterranean or to keep up a cruise in it, perhaps in rotation with other powers who would join us as soon as there is peace. But this Congress must decide.'' 8 The Writings of Thomas Jefferson 63–64 (Ford ed. 1897).

Insisting on a larger tribute, the Pasha of Tripoli declared war on the United States. Jefferson did not interpret this action as authority for the President to engage in unlimited military activities. He informed Congress on December 8, 1801, about the demands of the Pasha. Unless the United States paid tribute, the Pasha threatened to seize American ships and citizens. Jefferson had sent a small squadron of frigates to the Mediterranean to protect against the attack. He then asked Congress for further guidance, stating that he was ''[u]nauthorized by the Constitution, without the sanction of Congress, to go beyond the line of defense * * *.'' It was up to Congress to authorize ''measures of offense also.'' Jefferson gave Congress all the documents and communications it needed so that the legislative branch, ''in the exercise of this important function confided by the Constitution to the Legislature exclusively,'' could consider the situation and act in the manner it considered most appropriate. 1 A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents 315 (James D. Richardson ed. 1897–1925) (hereafter ''Richardson'').

Alexander Hamilton, writing under the pseudonym ''Lucius Crassus,'' issued a strong critique of Jefferson's message to Congress. Hamilton believed that Jefferson had defined executive power with insufficient scope, deferring too much to Congress. But even Hamilton, pushing the edge of executive power, never argued that the President had full power to make war on other nations. Hamilton merely argued that when a foreign nation declares war on the United States, the President may respond to that fact without waiting for congressional authority:

The first thing in [the President's message], which excites our surprise, is the very extraordinary position, that though Tripoli had declared war in form against the United States, and had enforced it by actual hostility, yet that there was not power, for want of the sanction of Congress, to capture and detain her cruisers with their crews.

* * * [The Constitution] has only provided affirmatively, that, ''The Congress shall have power to declare War;'' the plain meaning of which is, that it is the peculiar and exclusive province of Congress, when the nation is at peace to change that state into a state of war; whether from calculations of policy, or from provocations, or injuries received: in other words, it belongs to Congress only, to go to War. But when a foreign nation declares, or openly and avowedly makes war upon the United States, they are then by the very fact already at war, and any declaration of the part of Congress is nugatory; it is at least unnecessary.'' 7 The Works of Alexander Hamilton 745–747 (John C. Hamilton ed.).

Congress responded to Jefferson's message by authorizing him to equip armed vessels to protect commerce and seamen in the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and adjoining seas. The statute authorized American ships to seize vessels belonging to the Bey of Tripoli, with the captured property distributed to those who brought the vessels into port. 2 Stat. 129 (1802). Legislators had no doubt about their constitutional authority and duties. ''The simple question now.'' said Cong. William Eustis, ''is whether [the President] shall be empowered to take offensive steps.'' Cong. Samuel Smith added: ''By the prescriptions of the law, the President deemed himself bound.'' Annals of Cong., 7th Cong., 1st Sess. 328–329 (1801).

Congress continued to pass legislation authorizing military action against the Barbary powers. Legislation in 1803 provided additional armament for the protection of seamen and U.S. commerce. 2 Stat. 106. Legislation the next year gave explicit support for ''warlike operations against the regency of Tripoli, or any other of the Barbary powers.'' 2 Stat. 291. Duties on foreign goods were placed in a ''Mediterranean Fund'' to finance these operations. Id. at 292, §2. Further legislation on the Barbary powers appeared in 1806, 1807, 1808, 1809, 1811, 1812, and 1813. 2 Stat. 391 (1806); 2 Stat. 436 (1807); 2 Stat. 456 (1808); 2 Stat. 511 (1809); 2 Stat. 616 (1811); 2 Stat. 675 (1812); 2 Stat. 809 (1813).

Jefferson often distinguished between defensive and offensive military operations, permitting presidential initiatives for the former but not for the latter. In 1805, he notified Congress about a conflict with the Spanish along the eastern boundary of the Louisiana Territory (West Florida). After detailing the problem he noted: ''Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force in any degree which could be avoided.'' 1 Richardson 377.

Military conflicts in the Mediterranean continued after Jefferson left office. The Dey of Algiers made war against U.S. citizens trading in that region and kept some in captivity. With the conclusion of the War of 1812 with England. President Madison recommended to Congress in 1815 that it declare war on Algiers: ''I recommend to Congress the expediency of an act declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States and the Dey and Regency of Algiers, and of such provisions as may be requisite for a vigorous prosecution of it to a successful issue.'' 2 Richardson 539. Instead of declaration of war, Congress passed legislation ''for the protection of the commerce of the United States against the Algerine cruisers.'' The first line of the statute read: ''Whereas the Dey of Algiers, on the coast of Barbary, has commenced a predatory warfare against the United States * * * .'' Congress gave Madison authority to use armed vessels for the purpose of protecting the commerce of U.S. seamen on the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and adjoining seas. U.S. vessels (both governmental and private) could ''subdue, seize, and make prize of all vessels, goods and effects of or belonging to the Dey of Algiers.'' 3 Stat. 230 (1815).

An American flotilla set sail for Algiers, where is captured two of the Dey's ships and forced him to stop the piracy, release all captives, and renounce the practice of annual tribute payments. Similar treaties were obtained from Tunis and Tripili. By the end of 1815. Madison could report to Congress on the successful termination of war with Algiers.

LEGISLATIVE CONTROLS OF PROSPECTIVE ACTIONS

Can Congress only authorize and declare war, or may it also establish limits on prospective presidential actions? The statutes authorizing President Washington to ''protect the inhabitants'' of the frontiers ''from hostile incursion of the Indians'' were interpreted by the Washington administration as authority for defensive, not offensive, actions. 1 Stat. 96. §5(1789); 1 Stat. 121. §16 (1790); 1 Stat. 222 (1791). Secretary of War Henry Knox wrote to Governor Blount on October 9, 1792: ''The Congress which possess the powers of declaring War will assemble on the 5th of next Month—Until their judgments shall be made known it seems essential to confine all your operations to defensive measures.'' 4 The Territorial Papers of the United States 196 (Clarence Edwin Carter ed. 1936). President Washington consistently held to this policy. Writing in 1793, he said that any offensive operations against the Creek Nation must await congressional action: ''The Constitution vests the power of declaring war with Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they have deliberated upon the subject, and authorized such a measure.'' 33 The Writings of George Washington 73.

The statute in 1792 upon which President Washington relied for his actions in the Whiskey Rebellion, conditioned the use of military force by the President upon an unusual judicial check. The legislation said that whenever the United States ''shall be invaded or be in imminent danger of invasion from any foreign nation or Indian tribe.'' the President may call forth the state militias to repel such invasions and to suppress insurrections.'' 1 Stat. 264, §1 (1792). However, whenever federal laws were opposed and their execution obstructed in any state. ''by combinations too powerful to be suppressed by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings, or by the powers vested in the marshals by the act,'' the President would have to be first notified of that fact by an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court or by a federal district judge. Only after that notice could the President call forth the militia of the state to suppress the insurrection. Id. §2.

In the legislation authorizing the Quasi-War of 1796. Congress placed limits on what President Adams could and could not do. One statute authorized him to seize vessels sailing to French ports. He acted beyond the terms of this statute by issuing an order directing American ships to capture vessels sailing to or from French ports. A naval captain followed his order by seizing a Danish ship sailing from a French port. He was sued for damages and the case came to the Supreme Court. Chief Justice John Marshall ruled for a unanimous court the President Adams had exceeded his statutory authority. Little v. Barreme. 6 U.S. (2 Cr.) 169 (1840).

The Neutrality Act of 1794 led to numerous cases before the federal courts. In one of the significant cases defining the power of Congress to restrict presidential war actions, a circuit court in 1806 reviewed the indictment of an individual who claimed that his military enterprise against Spain ''was begun, prepared, and set on foot with the knowledge and approbation of the executive department of our government.'' United States v. Smith. 27 Fed. Cas. 1192. 1229 (C.C.N.Y. 1806) (No. 16.342). The court repudiated this claim that a President could authorize military adventures that violated congressional policy. Executive officials were not at liberty to waive statutory provisions: ''if a private individual, even with the knowledge and approbation of this high and preeminent officer of our government [the President], should set on foot such a military expedition, how can he expect to be exonerated from the obligation of the law?'' The court said that the President ''cannot control the statute, nor dispense with its execution and still less can he authorize a person to do what the law forbids. If he could, it would render the execution of the laws dependent on his will and pleasure; which is a doctrine that has not been set up, and will not meet with any supporters in our government. In this particular, the law is paramount.'' The President could not direct a citizen to conduct a war ''against a nation with whom the United States are at peace.'' Id. at 1230. The court asked: ''Does [the President] possess the power of making war? That power is exclusively vested in congress * * * it is the exclusive province of congress to change a state of peace into a state of war.'' Id.

GOPAC

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss with my colleagues and those who are paying attention the recent allegations against GOPAC. Indeed, we have read a great deal about them. Much of the information that has been put forward has been put forward on the premise that it is fact.

Well, it is not fact. What is going on is a lawsuit, a partisan political lawsuit brought to stop a political movement, a movement which captured the hearts and minds of the American people over the last few years.

□ 1900

We ought to get some facts on the table. What are the facts? Is it true that GOPAC broke the law, the Federal Election Commission regulations which say that it cannot involve itself in Federal campaigns without first registering as a Federal PAC? That is the essence of the allegation.

Let us begin with one fact. When was the lawsuit brought? It was brought by the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee on the eve of Speaker GINGRICH's 1990 reelection campaign. Indeed, within 30 days of when he stood for reelection, a tough reelection campaign. You might ask yourself if the timing of that was at all political. I suggest it was.

That is almost 5 years ago that they brought those allegations against the Speaker and against GOPAC. The essence of the allegation was that GOPAC had crossed the line, that it had failed to register as a Federal election campaign committee and, therefore, had violated Federal law. And that was investigated by the FEC and ultimately a lawsuit was brought.

Last week they brought all kinds of new information to the table. The shocking thing about that information is that although it was presented as fact and as woefully damaging to GOPAC, in fact it was vacuous. It lacked any substance whatsoever.

Here is the issue. The allegation is that because people are involved in GOPAC, including the Speaker and his advisors, discussed their ultimate goal at retreats of winning the presidency and some day taking over the Congress of the United States for the Republican cause, for a conservative movement, for a movement which believes in limited government and lower taxes and sending authority away from Washington and giving it back to the people and the States, that because they generally discussed those ideas at GOPAC meetings, that was a violation of Federal law. Think about that theory. I call upon the ACLU across this nation to think about that theory.

The theory is that if you and a group of like-minded people sit down in a room and/or at a retreat and you discuss your goal, your goal is some day to have a Republican President, because we do not have one, or your goal is to take over Republican majority, a conservative majority of the United States Congress, because we do not have the right then, instantaneously, as a result of those discussions, you are required to register with the Federal Election Campaign Committee and to file their reports year in and year out. Every first amendment lawyer in America ought to be aghast at that allegation, but that is the premise that the FEC brought.

What does it mean? It means if you or your wife or your husband are the member of a Republican women's club or men's club back home or a Democrat women's club or men's club and if in fact you attend one of your meetings and in those discussions you talk about the fact that you would like to see a President elected of your party or you would like to see the Congress strengthen its hold in your party or take over the majority for your party, suddenly those mere discussions subject you to regulation by the FEC.

The notion is shocking. It is a frontal assault on the first amendment. And yet that is exactly what happened, because we learned that at the North Pole Basin retreat of GOPAC, where those involved in this movement, a grass roots movement, which admittedly had as its goal the election of State and local officials to State and local offices, who believed in the agenda of smaller government, who believed in lower taxes, that when they discussed those things, that that was okay until the moment that they said, and some day it would be nice to take over Congress or some day it would be nice to have a Republican President, suddenly at that moment because they had those discussions, there was a requirement that they register with the FEC and a requirement that they then comply with all of the laws.

I submit that that argument is so absurd that the reverse is true. If you had had a retreat of GOPAC and they had simply discussed the Super Bowl or whether or not somebody was going to win the national bake off, then there would have been shocking news. In fact, the allegations are vacuous, and

no one can substantiate what was said against the speaker or against GOPAC on those occasions.

WASTEFUL SPENDING BY FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND NAFTA ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak on two unrelated but very important national issues.

The first is wasteful and ridiculously expensive travel by Federal employees, particularly by certain Cabinet members who should be setting a better example.

Even members of the President's own Party, such as Senator REID of Nevada, have called for Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary's resignation.

She has been galavanting all over the world at horrendous expense to the taxpayer.

She has been chartering private jets, when she could easily have flown commercially, and she has consistently been staying in the most expensive hotels in the world.

She spent $2.6 million on just four of these trips—$845,000 for a trip to China, $500,000 for a trip to Pakistan, $560,000 for a trip to South Africa, and $720,000 for a trip to India.

No wonder we can't balance the budget.

This is a terrible abuse of taxpayer dollars, but then the easiest thing in the world to do is to spend other people's money.

Another Cabinet Secretary who has been wasting taxpayer funds on travel is Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt.

He has been traveling all over the United States to make political attacks on the Republican budget.

Almost all of his trips should have been paid for by the Democratic National Committee since he has been so blatantly partisan in his statements and press conferences.

And then the trip that really takes the cake is the one 400 Federal employees took to Disney World last month.

The Washington Post said that taxpayers paid ''hundreds of thousands of dollars so about 400 Federal employees could go to Disney World and stay at a four-star hotel.''

No wonder we have a five trillion dollar national debt.

The Associated Press said these employees were from the National Park Service, Army Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife Service, Forest Service, and the Bureau of Land Management.

These bureaucrats had training sessions on such topics as ''The Power of Magic in Shaping History,'' and ''Goofy (and Educational) Nature Songs.''

These agencies, plus almost all other Federal offices are screaming today about cuts and shortages of funds.

Well, there is no shortage of money if they can send employees on a trip like this. In fact, it appears that they have such a surplus of funds that they cannot even use good sense in how their money is spent.

Of course, the truth is that almost all Federal agencies are still getting increases. And the best question to ask is what were they getting 10 years ago.

Over that period, inflation has averaged only about 3 percent a year.

Their spending should have gone up by about ⅓ at the most, but almost all these Federal departments and agencies have increased spending at two or three or four times the rate of inflation.

The Head Start Program, for one, has gone up 300 percent in the last 10 years about 10 times the rate of inflation.

The budget for the EPA for 1995 is twice-double-what it was in 1985-a 100 percent increase.

We have allowed our Federal Government to get so big that it is simply out of control.

That is why you have abuses of the taxpayer like these.

Also, we have a civil service system that is so overly protective that Federal bureaucrats know that they can get away with almost anything.

Instead of letting Federal spending increase, but at a slower rate, as we do in the Republican budget, we should really be cutting a few things so the people can keep more of their money.

The second topic I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, is the NAFTA Accountability Act.

This act would require that we take another look at NAFTA to see if it is causing more harm than good.

Apparently, in an effort to sell NAFTA 2 years ago, we were given misleading or incomplete information about the Mexican economy.

Just a few days ago in my district in Tennessee, the two largest employers in Tellico Plains announced that they were leaving, one going to Mexico, one to Honduras.

At almost the same time, the largest employer in Etowah, TN announced that it was going into bankruptcy in large part due to NAFTA.

These three companies will mean almost 900 people in my district will lose their jobs. For these two small towns, the impact is devastating.

Now I do not know if the company moving to Honduras is using funds from the Caribbean Basin Initiative but ''60 Minutes'' and others have reported that we are making loans to American companies to set up branches in Central America and the Caribbean.

Through NAFTA and GATT, and all the money we contribute to the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, and things like the African Development Bank, and the Export-Import Bank, and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, all the money we spend overseas, through the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Defense Department, we seem to be giving our country away.

Then when you add in our direct foreign aid program to all these other giveaways and loans to foreign countries, and then the billions we have spent for nation-building in Rwanda, Somalia, Haiti, and now Bosnia, in addition to the multibillion bailout of Mexico. I repeat Mr. Speaker.

We seem to be giving away our own country and selling out our own people.

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

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. POSHARD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.]

A TABLE OF TWO PRESIDENTS

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell a story this evening. I will keep it short though it could last for hours. It is called a Tale of Two Presidents, a President in 1992 and 1993 and now a different President in 1993.

Two years ago the President and his top health care specialist, Hillary Rodham Clinton, told the American people again and again, we are talking about beginning to reduce the rate of increase in Medicare from about 11 percent annually to about 6 or 7 percent increase annually.

Mr. and Mrs. Clinton told Americans again and again, do not let people tell you these are cuts in Medicare. All we are doing is slowing the rate of increase. That is not a cut.

Remember those words very carefully because my colleagues are about to hear them again. Bill Clinton wanted to use those Medicare savings he was talking about in 1993 to help pay for his Government-run health care scheme.

Now let us move forward to early 1995. Medicare board of trustees reports Medicare part A will be bankrupt in 2002. The trustees, four of whom are Clinton appointees, also say Medicare part B was growing at an unsustainable rate.

So this Congress passed the Balanced Budget Act, which included a plan to

save Medicare for another decade. The plan slowed the rate of growth to more than 7 percent annually. Remember, the President said 2 years ago, that is not a cut. But guess what Bill Clinton has to say about essentially the same idea today?

He said, Republicans want to destroy, devastate and dismantle Medicare. He is talking about terrible cuts now. What happened to the President that was talking about slowing the rate of growth just 2 years ago? The Republican plan increases spending per senior from $4800 to $7100 in the year 2002. There are no cuts though the rate of spending increases are slowed slightly.

The Clinton plan would increase spending per senior to $7200 in the year 2002. That is a 2 percent differences, or little more than $100 a year 7 years from now. Remember, the President's Medicare proposal is not of a balanced budget, because even though he submitted four of them, none of them balance. More on that a little bit later.

Yet, Bill Clinton's accusations against the Republicans, that we are trying to destroy Medicare, the Nation's top elected official is telling these fictitious stories to the American people. Our President, our leader, the one on whom we depend to lead us through times of crisis and through times of need, is not coming forth and telling the American people what he was saying just 2 years ago, that we are not going to devastate Medicare. We are not cutting Medicare. We are slowing the rate of growth. He and Mrs. Clinton said 2 years ago, do not let them tell you that we are cutting.

□ 1915

Well, do not let them tell you today that we are cutting Medicare.

Let us talk about Medicare part A premiums. Seniors now pay $47 a month for part A premiums, and Bill Clinton and liberal Democrats have blasted Republicans and said they are doubling Medicare premiums. First of all, as every senior knows, Medicare part A premiums rise about almost every year. Even Bill Clinton and liberal Democrats know this. The Republican plan would see premiums rise from $47 to $87 a month in the year 2002. That is an increase, though it is not a doubling of the premium.

But here is the punch line: The President's plan would cost only $4 less per month than what we are proposing.

Bill Clinton says Republicans want to destroy Medicare, but the premiums in this plan are $83 instead of $87. That is 13 cents a day difference.

It gets worse. Most of this year we have heard Bill Clinton and other liberals accuse Republicans of trying to force seniors into managed care plans—even though every senior could remain in the current plan just as it is. They have also blasted our innovative proposals like medical savings accounts. Now, Bill Clinton has ''borrowed'' every good idea Republicans wanted to use to help save Medicare in his plan.

A few weeks ago, the Washington Post, no friend of conservatives, had this to say: ''The Democrats, led by the President, have shamelessly used this issue, demagogued on it because they think that's where the votes are.''

Mr. President, remember 1992, 1993. There are no cuts.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LET'S BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, the President has now had four tries at sending the Congress a balanced budget, and he still has not gotten close to honoring the commitment he made to the American people and the law he signed 29 days ago agreeing to a balanced budget in 7 years using real numbers, not smoke and mirrors. President Clinton's latest budget keeps piling on the debt, an estimated $265 billion in the red.

Mr. Speaker, we voted on that budget here in the House today, and Democrats and Republicans alike combined to reject it 412 to zero. That is right, not a single Member of the House in either party voted for the President's latest budget.

Yesterday we had a similar bipartisan vote in favor of a 7-year balanced budget using realistic assumptions about economic growth.

While the President cannot send us a budget that actually balances, he can stand over at the White House and scare our seniors, scare our families, scare our veterans with dire rhetoric and self-serving political posturing that lacks one essential element, the truth. He and his allies have spent an estimated $30 million attempting to mislead the American people about Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the Earned Income Tax Credit.

So let us look at the facts. He says Republicans are devastating Medicare, destroying Medicare. Here are the facts:

In this current year we are spending per senior citizen $4,816 on Medicare; in the year 2002, $7,101 per senior citizen on Medicare. Where is the cut? I would suggest to my colleagues that only in Washington, DC, can a $2,300 increase in spending on Medicare be called a cut. Only in Washington, DC, and on negative misleading ads such as the one the United Mine Workers are running in my district on the radio this week, absolutely false, totally intended to try and scare senior citizens, and for what? Purely political demagoguery and nothing else.

Medicaid. We are increasing the amount of money spent on Medicaid by nearly 50 percent over the next 7 years.

Education. The chairman of the committee is going to speak on this at great length, but let us take a look at just one example, a very important part of education, student loans. Cuts to student loans they say. Well, here in 1995 the total amount of money made available for student loans this year is $24.5 billion. In the year 2002 under our budget that has been sitting on the table waiting for a budget from the President to negotiate over we increase it to $36.4 billion over the next 7 years, more than, or nearly, a 50-percent increase in student loans, and yet the President would have the students of this country and their parents scared with the idea that we are trying to cut education. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Earned Income Tax Credit. The President says we are being unfair to hard-working, low-income families in this country, yet we are increasing the amount of money that is spent, that the amount of tax credits that are available for the Earned Income Tax Credit for low-income families by $5 billion in the 7th year of our budget, increasing again, and overall in the last 7 years we spent $9½ trillion. That is the total amount of money the Government spent; in the next 7 years with our budget, $12 trillion, a $2½ trillion increase, and yet the President wants to spend more, originally proposing to spend nearly $1 trillion more, still wanting to spend $300 billion more than what is necessary, more than what it takes to balance the budget in 7 years, and we cannot balance the budget using his smoke and mirrors.

Mr. Speaker, the President has got his seasons mixed up. It is Christmas, not Halloween, so maybe he should put away the senior scare tactics and bogie-man budgets and join the Congress in actually helping our Nation by balancing the budget.

Today each and every Member of Congress had a crystal-clear decision. Members could vote for President Clinton's fourth budget, and with their vote they would say to their folks back home, ''I agree with President Clinton; we simply don't want to balance the budget. So let's not even try. Let's just keep piling on the debt that our children and grandchildren will be stuck with, and we'll keep playing the tried and true Washington political game of saying one thing and doing another, saying we want a balanced budget, but voting to keep up the outrageous spendathon.''

Mr. Speaker, clearly that was rejected by the Members of this Congress today. Members today who voted no voted no and said, ''President Clinton, it is really time to finally balance the budget. The American people are waiting and watching.''

No more Washington, D.C. gimmicks. No more political games. No more divisive grandstanding. Let's do the right thing. Let's balance the budget. Let's put our government back to work.

The vote was unanimous. Republicans and Democrats voted ''no'' and sent a bipartisan message to President Clinton that we are moving forward to balance the budget and it's about time that he joined us.

The American people are waiting and watching.

STRENGTHENING, PRESERVING, AND PROTECTING MEDICARE

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to continue this dialog and discussion that we are having which the American people on Medicare, and I need to first begin with the 1995 April 3 trustees' report which said at the present financing schedule the Medicare Program is sufficient to insure the payment of benefits for only 7 years. It will be out of money in—it will be bankrupt in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Republican Congress has taken the steps to preserve, protect, and strengthen Medicare.

Now we are going this by ourselves. The Democrat Party, the President, has done absolutely nothing in this process to strengthen, preserve, and protect Medicare, but they are doing all kinds of things to scare the American people, saying, ''Cut, cut, Cut.'

Mr. Speaker, in response to that the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour, put out this ad and challenge to the Democrats. It said, ''If you can prove that we are cutting Medicare, come get a check for $1 million.''

Now what I would think with over 200 Democrats in the House, that they would have been lining up because all we have heard, Mr. Speaker, for 6 months is Republicans are cutting Medicare, and yet somehow, when there is a million dollars in it, suddenly there is silence, and I have never known Democrats to be overwhelmingly statesmanlike, so I assume, when it comes time to put money where their mouth is, that they are not interested in really participating because, Mr. Speaker, they know that the truth is that Medicare spending is going from $$,816 per person to $7,100, and with that kind of truth, then they do not want to come get their million-dollar check.

Now the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just helped keep these charts on the floor has also studied this very carefully with me. I know he is on top of Medicare, but also on the budget as well.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Congressman KINGSTON, I appreciate the opportunity for you to yield to me. The fact is that Medicare spending under the Republican proposal will go from $4,800 a year to at least $7,100 a year. This big increase is going to make sure that Medicare is going to be there for all seniors. The fact is the proposal also does some other important things. The American public should also know, and our colleagues, that we are going to reduce the cost of paperwork involved with Medicare from 12 percent to like 3 percent or less with electronic billing. We also, the medical education, the indirect and direct costs, instead of being part of Medicare will have its own separate item so that those funds will again go to seniors' health care. I think it is also important to note the options they have, the Medisave accounts and the managed care. All will make sure that Medicare goes up double the rate of inflation.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. Medicare is essentially 1964 Blue Cross plan, and I would not want my mama to be driving around in a 1964 Ford Falcon. I want her to have all the technology, and those options that you are talking about, she wants traditional Medicare, she can have it, but if she wants all the other options, she can.

Now you know what is interesting is that we had to have a trustees' report on Medicare to tell us it is going bankrupt. As Members of Congress, we should have known that already, but there is one thing that we do not need the trustees' report on, and that is the fact that the U.S. Government is going bankrupt.

We have a debt right now of $4.9 trillion which we are passing on to our children today, just because the Democrats and many others in Washington are acting like, well, this does not affect me. In some of the major newspapers in the country; I think the Wall Street Journal, the Washington Post, Washington Times, maybe the L.A. Times; the CEO's of many of the Fortune 500 companies in America took out an ad urging Congress, urging the President, to balance the budget within 7 years.

Now a lot of the colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been bad mouthing these people. Let me tell you who they are bad mouthing. I heard one of the speakers earlier tonight say how horrible these folks were. We are talking IBM, Ford Motor Co., Circuit City, Toys ''R'' Us, and, as I sat here and listened to what we used to call parlor pinks—parlor pinks, as you know, were Socialists. They are not quite Communists, but they do not like—they are collectivists. They do not like people making a profit—bad mouth all these companies, and these are companies that have products in every one of our households around America, but, more importantly than that, the jobs.

Where do these parlor pinks think jobs come from if not employers?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman would yield, I appreciate, Congressman KINGSTON, your bringing this topic forward because frankly most Americans want to see a balanced budget, a balanced budget, and these companies, and their executives, and their employees all agree that we balance the budget, we are going to be able to reduce the costs of car payments, mortgage costs, college expenses, health care costs. We have been spending almost the same size as the Defense Department just on our Nation's debt, and 25 years or 26 years of overspending have gotten us $4.9 trillion in debt.

Mr. KINGSTON. Well, have you ever thought about this, Mr. FOX? What if the children could vote? All we hear from here is oh, the children, the children. What if those children who are going to be paying $150,000 in interest on the national debt over a 75-year period of time on top of their Federal, on top of their State, on top of their local taxes, what if those 5 year olds that we are so, that they are allegedly so concerned now about out there on the playground, what if they could vote?

□ 1930

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Obviously, they would also want a balanced budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. Obviously they would say, wait a minute, mom and dad. You mean to say all of that stuff that you are charging, I have to pay for? Maybe we do not need all of those Federal spending programs after all. Maybe all those bureaucrats in Washington should go home.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the fact is that the vote today was very historic. The Clinton budget, which would give us nothing but more deficit, more spending, more tax increases, which would create less jobs, was in fact defeated 412 to zero. Republicans and Democrats together said that was not the answer.

ZERO VOTES ON PRESIDENT CLINTON'S BUDGET

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] to join me in this special order.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me start out by asking a question, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure what the gentleman said. The President had a balanced budget plan, is that correct?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. KINGSTON. He introduced it in Congress?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. We voted on it, right?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. So it obviously got over 200 votes on the Democrat side, who rejected the Republican vote?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It did not get any votes from either side.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, the gentleman from Missouri, DICK GEPHARDT, the leaders of the minority, voted against President Clinton's plan?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. No Democrat or Republican voted for it, or independent.

Mr. KINGSTON. The President of the United States, who has been bad mouthing Republicans in Congress assiduously for a year, has now introduced a budget that got zero Democrat votes? I find that bizarre, even for Washington.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Let me tell you why. It was bipartisan in its rejection because that budget would put us in the red by $265 billion. There is a better answer. It is having a budget that balances, just like counties do, States, school boards, families. We need to make sure that this government is, like the rest of those outside of Washington, outside the beltway, balancing our budget, spending money where government can make a difference, but not duplicating what is happening in the States or in the private sector.

Mr. KINGSTON. You, sir, have been in office 12 months now. You have a balanced budget. Your freshman class has supported a balanced budget. The President has had a 2-year jump, actually a 3-year jump on you. Remember, on June 4, 1992, he said on ''Larry King Live,'' he would have a balanced budget in 4 years. He has been in office 3 years. You have been in office in your freshman class 1 year. Are you saying to me that the President has yet to submit a balanced budget?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Yes, that is true. There have been four attempts. Each one has been over budget, in the red, in the deficit, and will not help us get out of the problem. What we need to do is make sure that the American people realize that what we need is a bipartisan budget in the Republican House and in the Republican Senate that will in fact balance, give people a chance to have the American dream, and not be overtaxed, overspent, and overregulated.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me ask you this, because the Democrats keep talking about, of course, they want a balanced budget. Surely they have submitted a balanced budget; is that right?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. They have?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. There has been a budget.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is a balanced budget?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It does not include the tax reforms for families.

Mr. KINGSTON. Is that the official budget or is that the rump caucus, the blue tick budget?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct, it is the latter.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is not even the official budget of the Democratic Party.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The official would be the Clinton budget, which was defeated today, 412 to zero.

Mr. KINGSTON. I find that appalling, just to think about that. That, I believe, is why they have taken a full page ad out. As you know, they are not asking anything, really, out of the blue, but they are saying, ''Let us use CBO, Congressional Budget Office numbers, let us balance the budget in 7 years, let us have both parties and all parties come to the table,'' and the part in bold print is what is most important. ''Without a balanced budget, the party is over, no matter which party you are in.''

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It is also important to point out that under the Republican proposal, which has a balanced budget, Medicare spending will increase 62 percent, from $178 billion this year to almost $290 billion by the year 2002. As well for Medicaid, that increase under the Republican budget will go from $89 billion this year to $127 billion by the year 2002, a 43 percent increase.

So the fact is the important programs that everyone wants, whether it be Medicaid, Medicare, earned income tax credit, education, child care, all those programs will be increased under the Republican budget, while still balancing the budget for the first time since 1969.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it is ironic that rather than cutting the budget, rather than freezing the budget, we are actually debating increasing it $3 trillion new dollars, as the Republican plan indicates, or $4 trillion new dollars, as the President wants, and all we are debating is the growth.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. The key feature here is that we are eliminating the fraud and abuse and waste. In Medicare alone, there is $30 billion in fraud, abuse and waste, in Medicaid it is $14 billion, by governmental figures. The fact is that if we just eliminate the fraud and abuse, we will go a long way to make sure the true services go back to those who are needy, whether they be seniors, children, or those who are poor. We want to make sure we take care of people. We are compassionate, Republicans and Democrats together, working to make sure we have a balanced budget. I know we can achieve that.

VACATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME AND REALLOCATION OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, because of the inclement weather, not nearly as bad as that of Bosnia, I do not want our staff to stay much later. I ask unanimous consent to reduce my 60-minute special order to 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

REAL SLEAZE IN THE NOT-SO-GAY NINETIES

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 said I would be procuring a cloisonne pin for the 1st Armored Division, Old Ironsides. It came in the mail today from one of the troopers of that division, and the package arrived later with about 10 of them. I will wear it for the entire year.

An interesting development in Bosnia over the weekend. I was not aware that the Mujaheddin from Afghanistan, from extremist elements in Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, from Pakistan, that they had an entire brigade there. One of the more well-known of their terrorists, Anwar Shaban, was executed over the weekend with four others, or killed in a firefight, we do not know which, by Croatian Bosnian troops.

If the remaining Mujaheddin, outside terrorists, we now have home-grown Bosnian terrorists of Islamic persuasion, but not faith, if they decide that this is because of the United States Dayton agreement pushing the confederation of Croatia and Bosnia internal governments to drive out all Mujaheddin volunteer fighters, then Americans will be targeted.

It has been snowing all day in Tuzla, but the fog is gone and our first C–17 Globemaster III arrived. I do not understand the agreement between the leadership of Congress and Clinton not to allow a single Congressman or Congresswoman on a codel for the rest of this month over the holidays, as I volunteered and deeply wanted to do, or anybody for the whole month of January to go from this Congress to that dangerous part of the world. I do not understand that. Harry Smith of the CBS Morning Show will be broadcasting from Tuzla tomorrow. Until today, there were more news people there than the less than 100 advanced military people on the ground.

In lieu of that special order tonight, Mr. Speaker, let me change subjects, one that our Speaker in the Chair has some knowledge about. Without mentioning any names, so as not to get in trouble with the parliamentarians, and knowing that I will not finish this but submitting it for the RECORD, let me tell everybody why we seem to be having a problem with people not living up to their word here.

I would call this Real Sleaze in the Not So Happy Nineties, taking into account that my dad was born in 1892 in

the probably over-romanticized gay nineties, but this is real sleaze in the not so gay nineties.

What does any thinking person associate with these names and events? I will break it down into the good guys, once bad, seeking redemption, that bad guys and gals, and then events.

Here we go, and I will just keep going until my time runs out. First, the good guys and gals: Jean Lewis and the other law-respecting workers at the Resolution Trust Corporation. Of whom could we think? Paula Corbin Jones, victim of criminal flashing, the ultimate sexual harassment, right up there with criminal groping a la Packwood, but far worse.

Billy Ray Dale, that is a good guy, and the six people whose reputations were partially destroyed. They are being rebuilt in the travel office. Not too many good guys and gals in this story.

B, once bad but now seeking redemption: Sally Perdue, Gennifer Flowers, Marilyn Jenkins, and unnamed others, one through who knows; and Arkansas troopers 1, 2, 3, 4, and particularly No. 5, nicknamed ''J.D.''

Now the bad guys and gals:

Bimbos IV through Roman numerals XX, XXX;

James McDougal, disgraced former owner of Madison Guaranty, cost the taxpayers $60 million;

Susan McDougal, wife and partner of James, partner of others, embezzler of Zubin Mehta in Los Angeles;

Bernard Nussbaum, former senior White House counsel, left under a cloud; current convict Webster Hubble, former Associate Attorney General, first fix-it man at Justice, actually over Janet Reno in the pecking order.

William Kennedy, III, former White House associate counsel;

Dan ''Cocaine'' Lassiter, ex-convict who laundered drug money through S&Ls, paid Roger's $10,000 cocaine debt, was pardoned by the Governor;

Margaret Williams, Chief of Staff, enemy of the truth;

Patsy Thomasson, F.O. and enemy of truth.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit the rest for the RECORD.

REAL SLEAZE IN THE NOT-SO-GAY NINETIES

I. Whom does any thinking person associate with these names and events?

A. First the Good Guys & Gals:

Jean Lewis and other law respecting workers at the Resolution Trust Corporation.

Paula Corbin Jones—victim of criminal flashing—the ultimate sexual harassment, right up there with criminal groping—worse.

Billy Ray Dale + 6.

B. Once Bad But Now Seeking Redemption:

Sally Perdue.

Gennifer Flowers.

Marilyn Jenkins.

Arkansas Troopers No. 1, No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, No. 5 (''J.D.'').

C. BAD GUYS AND GALS:

Bimbos IV through XX.

James McDougal, owner of Madison Guaranty.

Susan McDougal wife and partner of James, embezzler of Zubin Mehta.

Bernard Nussbaum, former senior White House Counsel.

Current convict Webster Hubbell, former Associate Attorney General (No. 1 fix-it man at justice).

William Kennedy III, former White House Associate Counsel.

Dan ''Cocaine'' Lasater, ex-convict who laundered drug money through S&L's and paid Rogers $10,000.00 cocaine debt, was pardoned by Governor.

Margaret Williams, Chief of Staff and Enemy of Truth.

Patsy Thomasson, FO and Enemy of Truth No. 2.

Morton Halperin, National Security Counsel, he was rejected for Asst. Sec. of Defense by U.S. Senate.

Hazel O'Leary, Energy Secretary, world traveler.

Bruce Babbitt, Interior Secretary, master of babble.

Strobe Talbott, No. 2 at State Department (Dayton Conference Greize eminence''—brother-in-law of Derek Shear.) Time Magazine lying F.O.B. in '92.

Ira Magaziner, former Health Care Reform Guru, can't add financial figures.

Robert Altman, BCCI.

Clark Clifford, BCCI, avoids justice trial due to ***

Ex Judge convicted David Hale, John Dean of 1995.

Ron Brown, Commerce Secretary, Rich F. of fired F.O.

Kristine Gebbie, former AIDS Czar.

Bruce Lindsey, Former Deputy Counsel (falsely claimed attorney/client privilege in Whitewater hearing on taxpayer payroll).

David Mixner, Senior Homosexual fundraiser.

Susan Thomases, FOH.

Betsey Wright, Bimbo Patrol ultra fixer-upper.

Jack Paladino, personal detective, ''fixer'' with heavy cash.

Jean Bertrand Aristide, defrocked priest, ''I love the smell of burning flesh,'' anti-Christian, anti-American accessory to multiple murders.

Paula Casey, belatedly self-recused U.S. attorney in Little Rock—bad memory.

Zoe Baird, botched Attorney General nominee (badly vetted Liberal Victim #1).

Kimba Wood, botched Attorney General nominee (badly vetted Liberal Victim #2).

Lani Guinier (badly vetted Liberal Victim #3).

Henry Foster, sometime Abortionist (badly vetted Liberal Victim #4).

Double dipping prior female Surgeon General who wanted to teach self-gratifiation to grade schoolers. Still does. Ugh.

Charles Ruff, liberal Democrat, prosecutor, potential Clinton appointee.

Vincent Foster, Marley's ghost for third Christmas in a row, former inside super fix-it Clinton lawyer, either a victim or guilt ridden over WACO children deaths and the vicious Travelgate assassination of reputations of 7 innocent working folks.

Christophe and the infamous $200 haircut at LAX.

Ex-trooper Captain Buddy Young, coverup artist and chief of procurers. Double income payoff at F.E.M.A.

II. Events associated with whom?:

Five ''culture of death'' executive orders pushing abortion-on-demand for any reason or no reason on first working day in office.

Bimbo turf, otherwise known as Astroturf in pickup truck.

Normalizing Relations with Vietnam in spite of live sightings and missing heroes (on advice of ol Raw Evil MacNamara)

Herb and Lois Shugart, parents of Medal of Honor recipient refusing to shake the President's hand, 25 May '93.

''Loathsome'' letter to Bataan Death March survivor, Colonel Gene Holmes stating we've come to loathe the military.

The Magnificent but suppressed Col. Holmes' response.

The return of anti-American psychotic defrocked priest to power in Haiti.

White House Travel Office Worker reputation assassinations.

Waco deaths of pregnant women and 20 or more children who were hostages of a cult guru.

Bootlicking by political appointees of Communist Poliburo in Hanoi.

Secretive Health Care Task Force of 511 socialists or pointy headed bureaucrats.

Bisexuals and homosexuals in the military.

On MTV: ''Is it boxers or briefs?''''Briefs.'' Ugh. Worn above or below copious lust handles??

19 heroes cut down in the alleys of Mogadishu, then heroes' bodies dragged by crowds, desecrated and burned.

Offensive photo ops:

4 May '93 30 U.S. on White House south lawn.

19 July '93 Joints Chiefs-of-Staff, four star rank, everyone, used as puppets for pro-homosexual charade. Now that is loathing the military.

50th Anniversary of D-Day 4 June '94 Omaha Beach loathsome posing.

1 December 1995 Baumholder, Germany, 1st Armored Division, 10 yard ''Follow me'' march to nowhere with Division staff.

Pornographic bi-sexual pro-homosexual ''AIDS in the Workplace Training'' for all federal employees—temporarily reduced until whatever happens on January 20, 1997.

Whitewater, financing of 1986 Arkansas Governors race, 1990 Arkansas Governors race.

Aug. 1993 Largest tax increase in the history of our nation—the history of any democracy ever!

Military officers ordered to serve hors d'oeuvres at White House picnic.

Socialized medicine for Americans, doctors and nurses be damned.

Encouraging condom ads during family hour, prime-time television programming.

Organizing pro-Hanoi demonstrations in a foreign country in 1969 and 1970.

Triple draft dodging, July 1968, April 1969, and political reversal of induction show-up date of 28 July 1969.

Attempting to disarm law abiding citizens.

Forcible return of Haitian refugees breaking promises made during '92 campaign.

''I didn't inhale'' vs. ''Sure I would, I tried once didn't I?'' (MTV June 1992)

Middle class tax cut—NOT!

Failed BTU tax.

Nannygate, over and over.

White House senior staff abusing U.S. Marine helicopters to zip over to golf courses.

Sacrilege of appropriating the Messiah's Self-description of ''New Covenant,'' Jesus Christ is the New and Everlasting Covenant. Amen.

Daughter to elite Sidwell Friends School.

Desire for UN control of U.S. troops, everywhere.

Heber Springs Hideaway, ''liaisons dangereuse.''

Vadis Bosnia? Whither goest our emperor's whims?

Mr. DORNAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, with this partial list of whom could I possibly be speaking. Who is at the center of this listing of ignominy?

THE FEDERAL DEBT

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

Mr. LONGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I saw the Monday night Nightline on what the gentleman is doing, and I thought it was absolutely compelling. It is bordering on the legendary, and I wish you good luck. If there is anything I or any of the more senior Members can do around here to advance your seeking the truth, please tell us.

Mr. LONGLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon the Federal debt is now $4,989,213,998,043.63, again a slight decline from yesterday of about $370 million, but still the national debt stands at about $89 billion, higher than what has been actually authorized by Congress, nor does this number include the additional $61 billion that the administration has chosen to borrow from the Civil Service employee retirement accounts.

I mention that because, in light of all the talk about the unfortunate result of this stalemate causing many Federal employees to be on furlough pending some resolution of the disagreements between the President and the Congress, I would suggest that the ultimate disrespect is the extent to which the administration is cavalierly dipping into these retirement fund accounts, again, to the tune of in excess of $60 billion. That is unprecedented.

I mentioned this morning briefly on the floor that given the current stalemate in Washington, that unfortunately I was not going to be able to return this week during Christmas recess. I spoke with my daughter Sarah this morning, who was very disappointed that I was going to be unable to attend her Christmas play tomorrow morning. Again, she has a role in the play and she is quite excited about it. Obviously, I am very disappointed that I will not be able to see her, because I am sure she is going to be very excited and do a tremendous job.

But, Mr. Speaker, I attempted to explain to my daughter, my 7-year-old, why it was important that we remain in Washington to deal with these issues. The plain facts are that this Congress has in the past, and will, at least for the next 5 or 6 or 7 years, be borrowing additionally, increasing this debt in order to continue to finance a level of spending that is in excess of our revenues and that ultimately my daughter Sarah, age 7, and my son Matt, age 11, are going to be faced with the obligation of retiring or redeeming this debt. The taxes in their lifetimes could well exceed over $100,000 just to keep up with the interest on the debts.

Earlier this morning I challenged Members on the other side who were parading about their concern for Medicare, welfare, education, veterans, and the environment, but yet they have been absolutely unwilling to put their names on a line telling us what they would want to spend; nor have they been willing to address their financial priorities in a manner that would allow us to balance the Federal budget, and that effectively, this fight is about truly whether or not this Congress is going to insist on a balanced Federal budget using legitimate, honest numbers as certified by the Congressional Budget Office. In fact, it is clear to me that this is at the root of the disagreement.

As a practical matter, the amount of money that we would spend is not that far off; a few, $10 billion or $20 billion here or there, which in Washington is not a large amount of money, given the fact that over the next 7 years this Federal Government will be spending in excess of $12 trillion. That amount of money totally dwarfs any of the issues we have been talking about.

There has been a great outcry about the $245 billion tax cut, with yet barely any attention whatsoever to the fact that $245 billion is barely 2 percent of the total amount of money that this Government will spend in the next 7 years. I have to raise the question whether this Government would be severely handicapped at the prospect of only spending 98 percent of $12 trillion, as opposed to 100 percent of $12 trillion.

I might also mention, let us talk about the issue of Medicare. As we all know, this is a program that is paid for by taxes on the wages of working people. It has become exceedingly clear that our failure to slow the rate of growth of Medicare spending could result in a doubling or a tripling of these highly regressive taxes on the wages of working people, working people who are already holding down two and three jobs, trying to make ends meet.

□ 1945

Nor has there been any attention to the fact that these dollars are invested in a trust fund which consists not only of taxes that are collected on the wages of working people, but also on the premiums that the seniors pay on a monthly basis. Nor has there been any attention to the fact that we are still maintaining a system whereby two-thirds of the senior's premium will be paid by the Federal Taxpayer in addition to the one-third that is paid by the beneficiary.

NO MORE EXCUSES

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to see you in the chair tonight. I very much appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LONGLEY]. In fact, perhaps we should leave this here at all time while we are proceeding with our business, the people's business, on the floor of the House; and I join my colleague from California, [Mr. DORNAN] in saluting the gentleman from Maine for his leadership in the balanced budget fight.

Mr. Speaker, it has been exactly 1 month, 30 days, since the President made a commitment in the form of a bill which he signed into law, a resolution to balance the budget in 7 years using honest numbers provided by the neutral, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. In fact, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, it has been 1,293 days since candidate Clinton promised on the Larry King show to balance the Federal budget in 5 years.

Sadly, the President has failed to keep his commitment, and now he says he will propose a 7-year balanced budget plan only if we go along with his Medicare charade.

Well, let me just tell my colleagues, for months now, and I think the American people are beginning to see through this smokescreen, but for months the President has demagogued many of the people in his party here in the Congress, they have demagogued on the issue of Medicare.

The President's real concern is to be able to spend billions of dollars to fund his liberal agenda and his liberal pet projects. He is concerned about keeping intact his political base. Of the $436 billion difference in total spending between the President's proposal and our plan, only about $32 billion is allocated toward Medicare. That would leave the President, if we did not insist on a balanced budget, with $404 billion to dole out to traditional Democratic social welfare programs.

Of course, there is no way the President can admit this, and that is really why he has never proposed a balanced budget, even though again, 30 days ago, back on November 19, he signed into law a bill that says, ''The President and the Congress shall,'' mandatory, not discretionary, ''shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.''

Again, the President has failed to keep his word, and in the process, he has caused the Government, at least part of the Government, to shut down again. He has also defied the wishes of Congress, because last night, the House of Representatives votes 351 to 40 in favor of a resolution reaffirming our commitment to a 7-year balanced budget using CBO scoring. Mr. Speaker, 133 Democrats and one Independent crossed the aisle, this center aisle right here, to join us Republicans in an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote.

Earlier today this House took a unanimous vote on the President's latest budget proposal, the Clinton budget ''IV'', if you will, which comes nowhere close to balancing the budget and projects annual deficits in the range of $200 billion well into the next century. So clearly, Mr. Speaker, it is not just Republicans who feel the President should be forced to keep his word.

I would also like to point out to my colleagues that today the leaders of 80 major American companies, Democrats and Republicans, concerned about the economic cost of failure to achieve a balanced budget took out a 2-page newspaper ad endorsing nothing less

than a balanced budget in 7 years, using Congressional Budget Office numbers.

So Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we Republicans have kept our word. We have done our job. We have made good on our promise and our commitment to the American people to pass a balanced budget and to finally get our Nation's fiscal house in order. We have worked hard, fought many battles over these past 11 months to develop the first balanced budget in 26 years and to do it in a way that offers real deficit reduction based on honest numbers and does not entail a major tax increase imposed on the backs of the American people. To the contrary, we want to relieve and reduce taxes on the middle and working classes.

So no matter how hard the President might try to wiggle out of his agreement, which again he signed 30 days ago, we Republicans are not going to settle now for a phony budget based on cooked White House numbers.

The worst thing, the worst thing that we could do now is to go along with the White House in pretending to balance the budget, while leaving all of the difficult decisions to be fought out again in future Congresses. So that is why, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we are insisting that in this session of Congress, before this month and this year are out, we work out a bipartisan agreement here in the Congress and with the President and his administration on a 7-year plan which balances the Federal budget, again using honest numbers provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

This is so important because the American people lose faith in their political institutions when politicians fail to keep their word.

Republicans in this Congress are establishing a new standard. We have said that from now on, any politician who makes a promise to the American people had better be prepared to keep it; and that certainly goes for Bill Clinton who again, 30 days ago, promised by signing this law to enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.

So no more excuses, no more Washington gimmicks, it is time for the President and our colleagues, Democratic colleagues here in the Congress, to do the right thing for our children's future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The Members are reminded that the President is to be referred to with the proper respect accorded him under the Rules of the House.

AMERICANS SEE THROUGH SCARE TACTICS

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, the administration and the minority have waged a real campaign of misinformation regarding the Republican Balanced Budget Act of 1995, and I think it is finally starting to catch up with them.

On Medicare they say that the Republican plan is extreme, will gut the program and will devastate the program, but ABC's Ted Koppel on ''Nightline'' last week showed that the President and the minority were misinforming the public, that the Republicans were increasing Medicare, and that senior citizens were the victims of an orchestrated scare campaign.

We have the same type of scare campaign lodged against Republicans with regard to what our balanced budget plan does with education, including student loans. The administration has used the power and the high profile of the office of the presidency to scare young people into believing Republicans plan to balance the budget, and that would prevent them from obtaining student loans. The President just as recently as last week said the Republicans cut deeply into student loans.

He also claims we are increasing the cost of student loans, and I think it is time to set the record straight. As you can see, in 1995, we spent $24.5 billion on student loans. At the end of our 7-year plan, we spend $36.4 billion. That is a 50 percent increase, hardly cutting student loans. Therefore, who knows how many young people out there have been scared by these tactics, have given up on college because they think loans will not be available? How many parents believe now that they will not be able to help their children with a college education because of the scare tactics that are used? As I said, it is time to set that record straight.

They also tell us in relationship to Pell grants that student should worry. Well, here is the Pell grant chart. In 1990, maximum grant $2,300; 1995, maximum grant, $2,340; in 1996, under our plan, $2,440, the highest point in history for Pell grants. So again, I think it is very important that we set the record straight so that we do not have students or parents worrying about what we may be doing or may not be doing with student loans and Pell grants.

Mr. Speaker, we hear the same thing about education in general, and I think it is very important that we take a look at this and set the record straight. You will notice from this chart that the minority, when they were in the majority during the previous 7 years, spent $315.1 billion over a 7-year period on elementary, secondary education, job training, student loan funding. Our 7-year proposal proposes to spend $340.8 billion during that 7-year period, which again shows that we plan to spend $25 billion more on education than what the minority spend during the last 7 years, again setting the record straight.

I would like to briefly review again some of the things that were said this afternoon when we had the debate in relationship to the President's budget. The minority leader indicated that he has real concerns about school lunch, and I said that I welcome him to the group who has that concern, because I have a real concern about student lunches. My concern is that after all of the money that we have spent from the Federal level, 50 percent of all of the students who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals are not participating, 50 percent. Where are those children getting any food? Where are they getting any nutrition? Are we trying to educate them on an empty stomach?

I am not so concerned about the fact that only 46 percent of the paying customers, the eligible paying customers participate, because obviously they have money for breakfast, obviously they have money for lunch; but what about that 50 percent who are eligible for free and reduced-price meals and are not participating? That is why the minority leader and I should have a concern; that is why we should do what the young lady from Arkansas said this afternoon.

She said she did not come here to promote the status quo, and I welcome her to our opportunity to change the status quo and do a better job in providing education for our youngsters and providing school lunch and child nutrition programs.

One other said that we are decimating education. Well, again, as I indicated here, we increase dramatically in a 7-year period our participation in education programs.

So again, I would hope that we can make sure that the public understands exactly what we are doing. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to get something straight. The President was on television the other night saying that he rejected, quote, the Republican package because among other things, according to him, it slashed and cut education.

Now, are these the same numbers, the increase, for example, in job training and student loan funding, the $340.8 billion that is projected under the Republican plan for the next 7 years, those numbers were in front of the President while he was standing there telling the American people that the plan cut education?

Mr. GOODLING. It is just the opposite of what we are doing. We are increasing by $25 billion over the next 7 years over what the former majority spent.

Mr. HUNTER. But he had that increase in front of him in the plan and obviously his analysts put it into executive summary for him: What it does in education, what it does in other areas; but he had that while he looked at the camera and said, this slashes education. He had those numbers in front of him, correct?

Mr. GOODLING. I am sure he had those numbers before him. Whether anyone in the administration has read the Republican budget, I cannot prove. If they had, they would not continue to misinform the American public about what we are doing in nutrition or disinform, because I was corrected by an English teacher who was watching me once before from some other person's district, and she said, he is using the word misinformation, it is disinformation, she said, because they know it is wrong.

□ 2000

Mr. HUNTER. I would just say to my friend, first, thanks. We all owe you a real debt of gratitude for setting the record straight.

But, second, this is kind of tragic, that the President of the United States, who has these numbers in front of him, has obviously scared a lot of people. If I had not seen the gentleman's numbers that he is presenting tonight and did not know anything about this plan and heard him describing the Republican education numbers, it would give me the impression that we were slashing that $315 billion that the Democrats spent over the last 7 years in half, or doing something like that. But there is no way that any reasonable individual could conclude from the President's remarks that we were actually increasing the amount of money to be spent on job training and student loan funding, which in fact we are under out program.

Mr. GOODLING. When the tragedy is of course that we are using children and we are using senior citizens to make whatever point the administration wants to make. That is a real tragedy, because you are upsetting the most vulnerable people we have in our entire constituency when it is not correct. The figures are incorrect. What we are doing is improving.

What we try to do, however, is insist on quality. That is where we run into a philosophical difference because of course the status quo is what they want. It has always been their philosophy to pour more money into the program, and somehow or other the program will get better.

As I will point out later after some of the others have an opportunity to participate, the programs have not gotten better, and the programs have not helped the disadvantaged that we were trying to help. My chairman used to say that all the time, ''The programs, BILL, are not helping those we were trying to help.''

I would always say, ''Let's change them.'' But we could never change them. Now we have an opportunity to change them so that we help the very people that we were trying to help but in fact we disadvantaged.

I yield to the gentleman from California, another member of the committee.

Mr. RIGGS. I very much appreciate the chairman yielding to me, since I have the honor and pleasure of serving under his chairmanship on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

I also find myself in sort of a dual capacity as an appropriator serving on the funding side of the equation, if you will, on the House Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittee. And I very much appreciate this special order opportunity to point out, I was going to say some of the misinformation and deliberate distortion that has taken place around the education and job training issues, specifically funding for the various Federal education and job training programs, but I think in fact disinformation is a more apt and correct description.

I want to start out by pointing out, Mr. Chairman, something that you already know, one of the best kept secrets in official Washington, and that is, in the President's own budget, the budget that no Democrat Member of the House or Senate would offer, but the budget that was offered by two Republican Senators in the other body and was defeated on a vote of 96 to 0, in that budget the President proposed $2.2 billion in education spending cuts.

I have not heard the news media report on that fact as recently as yesterday, when the President went across the Potomac River to a public school in Arlington, in northern Virginia. So I think we ought to start out this special order by just pointing out some facts about the President's plan.

The minority whip is on the floor. Perhaps he would like to engage in a gentlemanly conversation or colloquy, because I would love to hear some short of explanation given regarding the President's plan. Because when you look at his proposed budget, he recommended terminating 16 education programs in the 1995 rescissions bill, which has become law, another 21 programs in his 1996 budget request, and 4 more programs which would begin phaseout in 1996. These 41 program terminations requested by the President total approximately $803 million in savings.

Now if we were doing that, that would be $803 million in cuts, not savings, that could be applied to deficit reduction or some other important purpose of the Federal Government. The President has actually embraced our idea of consolidating those programs that can be consolidated with education programs at the State and local level. He has embraced our idea of terminating those programs which are redundant or for that matter which have never been funded by the Congress, and streamlining the delivery of Federal taxpayer services for public education. In total, he has recommended terminating and consolidating 68 programs for a total savings of $757 million.

Those recommendations were incorporated into the 1995 rescissions bill and the 1996 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill which has already passed this body, the House, and is now pending action in the other body.

This proves, I submit to you, Mr. Chairman and colleagues, that the White House agrees with Republicans on the concept of reducing the number of unneeded and outdated education programs, that they agree that it is time to stop throwing money at the problem of poor educational results in American, and to start getting parents and local communities involved again in real solutions to the problem with learning and public education, the bootstrap improvement of public education in this country at the grassroots level.

Those are all concepts that we very much believe in and, as the chairman has pointed out, we are proposing in our different concepts. This works on both the macro level as well as the micro level.

I hope we will talk a little bit about the current what I regard as a crisis in the District of Columbia public schools before we complete our special order tonight, where I think we do have a very real oversight responsibility to the District of Columbia public schools. Perhaps we can talk a little bit about some of the reforms that we have put forward to improve this crisis situation that prevails in the District of Columbia public schools today, but that is sort of a micro application of education reform.

But whether we are talking macro or micro educational reform, we are, as you have already said, Mr. Chairman, demanding results from Federal programs for the Federal taxpayer dollar rather than simply throwing more money at programs that are not working. We want less Washington interference, we want to respect the longstanding American tradition of decentralized decisionmaking and decentralized management in public education which the chairman knows so well from his distinguished career in public education as a school administrator. And we want to demand tangible results from Federal programs. We want proof that those programs are actually helping and serving students and not Federal bureaucrats.

I just want to make two other quick comments before yielding back to the chairman so we can go on to our other colleagues. But I want to reemphasize the chairman's point because I think this is terribly important.

We have gotten a new term in Washington jargon about school lunching, as part of the official rhetoric and sometimes the demagoguery that comes out of Washington. We do not want to be ''school lunched'' by the minority party when we are talking about some of the other reforms contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

This is so misleading and patently unfair, because what we proposed to do was take, as the chairman well knows, 6 separate school-based nutrition programs and consolidate them into one

block grant for State and local education agencies. We have a requirement in the block grant that limits the amount that State education agencies can take off the top for administration of the program, and we effectively force almost all of the money down to the local community level where it can be used to meet the nutritional needs of our kids in local schools.

That was our proposal. Why have six separate programs, the before school, after school, hot lunch, school milk program?

Mr. GOODLING. Summer feedings.

Mr. RIGGS. Why have all these programs, each with their own set of rules and regulations, each requiring a separate application from local education agencies to Washington? Why not, instead of that very bureaucratic process, full of red tape and regulatory hurdles, why not put them all in a block grant?

That is what we did. In putting them in a block grant, we proposed to increase spending for the school-based nutrition block grant 4.5 percent each and every year for the next 5 years, a total increase in spending of $1 billion in school nutrition programs.

Mr. GOODLING. Here is a good example, because in the red is what the President proposed in 1995 and what the President proposed in 1996. This is what we proposed, the 4.5-percent increase in each one of those years.

Mr. RIGGS. The other criticism that we heard from the other side and their allies across the country was that we eliminated mandatory Federal nutritional standards for this block grant program. Well, what we did instead, of course, as the chairman well knows, is suggest voluntary nutritional standards.

We know full well that, because this goes back to the canard that in the absence of mandatory nutritional standards, somehow, some way, local school districts are going to start feeding our kids ketchup, when we know that is just a bald falsehood. But I also know from my own experience as a local school board member, which I am sure the chairman as a former school principal and educational administrator would attest to, we know from our personal firsthand experiences that if any local school district in this country attempted to feed their kids ketchup, they would hear about it loud and clear at the very next school board meeting.

I appreciate the chairman giving me the opportunity to join the special order to make that point, and also reemphasize his point that we are proposing to increase funding for school loans, by $12 billion, from $24 billion today in 1995 to $36 billion in the year 2002. That proposal is incorporated into our plan, our 7-year plan for balancing the Federal budget known as the B Balanced Budget Act of 1995, a $12 billion increase in spending for student financial aid, student loans, and as the chairman has already pointed out, next year we will witness the highest level of Pell grants in our country's history.

So so much for these claims as we have heard. I actually gathered some of the more descriptive adjectives that I have seen in my local media back home in the First Congressional District, in and around the First Congressional District of California. We have heard descriptions used such as drastic, catastrophic, devastating, used to describe our proposals.

I hope that our constituents and fellow Americans listening to us tonight realize that a $12 billion spending increase for student loans, a $1 billion spending increase for school nutrition programs is hardly drastic, catastrophic or devastating. And I hope they will be able to see, with the help of this special order and other efforts such as this special order, through all this deliberate distortion and misleading rhetoric. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODLING. You mentioned consolidating programs, that the President was interested in consolidating and eliminating some and we are interested in doing that.

It is interesting, I think, for the public to understand that there are 500 education programs on the Federal level. Only one-third of those are in the Department of Education, and the Department of Education cannot tell us where the others are, nor can they tell us whether they are effective, nor can they tell us how much they are costing, which means we are probably wasting about $100 billion on these phantom programs somewhere that apparently are not very effective because nobody seems to know anything about them.

I yield to another colleague from our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA].

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank the chairman for yielding. I would like to just reference some of the comments from my colleague from California.

Not only is going from 298 and increasing by $12 billion, not only is that not catastrophic, not only is that not devastating, I believe that—and my principal can correct me, perhaps—I believe that in 99 percent of the country, every place but Washington, when you go from 298 and you go up by $12 billion, I believe every place else in the country that is not a cut. I believe that that is an increase. It is the same thing for a number of other programs.

If I could just then talk a little bit about the bigger picture because also, in addition to serving on the Education and Economic Opportunity Committee, I also serve on the Budget Committee, and just frame it a little bit because I think as the chairman has laid out so effectively, we are increasing spending on a number of different programs.

People ask, ''Well, now can that be? You guys are cutting the budget in Washington.'' In reality we are just slowing the growth.

We are slowing the growth for a very, very important reason. I think that is why last week, Friday, so many of us were disappointed, because in the middle of November we thought we had reached an agreement with the President.

We thought that we had reached an agreement that said he was going to submit to us a plan to balance the budget, a plan to balance the budget within 7 years, and that he would use Congressional Budget Office numbers. So that we then could take our plan to balance the budget, compare it to his plan to balance the budget, and we could get off of this debate about whether balancing the budget was important or not, but that we would all agree and then we could actually get into the policy differences.

That did not happen. Last week, Friday, the President, we were expecting his plan. He did present a plan. The disappointing thing with the plan is that that plan never got to zero. I think the best estimate said that in year 7 there would still be a $75 billion deficit, and the number could be higher than that. It just did not reach zero.

Actually, when I was back in my district a couple of weeks ago and talking to some of my constituents, they said, ''PETE, we are really disappointed. Ever since you got to Washington, you forgot the word surplus.''

When you were in the private sector, working for a publicly held corporation, a Fortune 500 company, the expectation from your shareholders, from your employees, was that you would deliver a profit.

□ 2015

Now that the gentleman has gotten to Washington, he thinks that getting to zero is good enough. It is kind of like, yes, you are right, we ought to be talking about a surplus because what we are really trying to do here in this bigger picture, in a positive and constructive way, is we are trying to, I think, preserve the future for our kids, provide them with the educational opportunities, the educational reforms, the education spending that can create a positive educational environment for our kids but from an economic standpoint can do the right things, that says we are going to gradually move to balancing the budget and hopefully after that getting to a surplus so that we can start paying back the debt because what we are doing today is we are saddling onto our kids $4.9 trillion, close to $5 trillion worth of debt.

A kid born in my district today, in the gentleman's district, anywhere in this country is going to pay in their lifetime $187,000 of interest on the debt if we do not change the way that we do our spending programs. They will face effective tax rates of 82 percent.

Most of these are discretionary programs, correct, the discretionary part of the budget. What happens to these programs in the year 2012 when the only money that we have coming in for tax revenues, it is only available for entitlement programs? What happens to a lot of these programs?

Mr. GOODLING. They are going to fall with their weight.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. They are going to be gone.

Mr. GOODLING. They will not be able to be funded.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. There will not be any money for education if we do not, and I do not consider these tough decisions, I consider these reasonable decisions to reform and slow the growth of Federal spending.

Remember, in 1995 we spent, what, the numbers are big, $1.5 trillion. The year 2002, we are not going to be spending $1.4 trillion, it is not going down. We are going to be spending $1.85 trillion. We are going to add $350 billion more per year to spend. What we are trying to do is allocate those dollars toward the priorities that we think are important for this country.

So we are not cutting spending. We are trying to more effectively target the programs. The chairman has done an excellent job of identifying reforms in a number of programs so that these dollars will go back to the States, will go back to the kids in more effective ways.

We had the vote today on the President's budget which does not get us to zero. I applaud the vote that we had today; 412 Members of this Congress, of this House, stood up and said, a $75 billion deficit in year 7 is not good enough. We need to do better than that. We need to do better than that for our kids, for the next generation. We are going to have, and I think the House is going to have, to take the lead. We have worked hard all year. We have developed a lot of innovative new programs, a lot of reforms.

The House has led the way. I think we are going to have to lead, we are going to have to lead the President now because this is an historic debate. Are we finally going to take the lead in actually having a realistic plan to balance the budget? Or what a lot of my constituents are afraid of, they are afraid that there was a plan to balance the budget in the mid-1980s, there was one to balance it in the late 1980s. There was a Bush plan in 1990. There was President Clinton's plan in 1993, all of which have two things in common. They all promised to balance the budget, and they have all failed miserably.

We still have a $160 billion deficit. We are going to make sure that this Congress comes down and that we do not join that pattern. We are not the fifth in a series of failures. This Congress is actually going to go though the process and say, we are going to have a real plan. We are going to come back next year. We are going to monitor the programs and the changes and the reforms that we have made. We are going to fix them where they do not work, and we are going to build on them where they do. But we are also going to come back and make sure that we hit year 1 of the 7-year plan. Then I think we will do it the Republican way.

We are not going to meet the targets of year 2. We are going to exceed, not exceed in spending, we are going to beat the deficit targets, and we are going to improve on these plans, because I still think there is room for improvement. We just have to get better at monitoring, reforming and transferring power out.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I had recently a letter that was devastating to me, because it came from someone who I admire greatly and someone with whom I am very close. He bought the rhetoric that he has heard and the things that he has read that somehow or other we are cutting education and we are cutting nutrition. Therefore, he decided that I was not doing what he and I had talked about to improve education and training in this country.

He equated, I suppose, additional funds with the improvement, and what I was trying to do was just the opposite. I was trying to do what he and I talked about, and that was to move us from access only, access to mediocrity, to access to quality. And so I tried to point out to the American public that we have spent $90 billion on title I, $90 billion since its inception.

Then I read what the department says. The department says, under program effectiveness, comparisons of similar cohorts by grade and poverty show that program participation does not reduce the test score gap for disadvantaged students. Indeed, they went on, chapter 1 students scores in all poverty cohorts declined between the third and fourth grades.

What I am trying to say is that it does not matter whether we spend $180 billion. If it is not directed toward quality, if we are not demanding more from these students, then, of course, we are spending the money to develop mediocrity. We cannot survive if we do that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I had much the same dialogue with a very good friend of mine back in Michigan. We were talking about head Start and said, you are taking money away from some of the neediest kids. I thought, well, I will come back, and I talked with the staff and said, give me the numbers on Head Start.

We have gone through this earlier this year. We felt good about what we did. But some people have heard some things. Let me revisit the Head Start Program. Got the numbers and, kind of like 1989, we were spending $1.2 billion, $1.2 billion is a lot of money. I worked for a Fortune 500 company for 15 years. We tried to get to be a billion dollar company. They finally hit it this last year, and 5000 families depend on this company. It is a lot of money.

But in 1989, $1.2 billion. Now 1995, we are spending $3.5 billion. So this program had tripled, almost tripled in the amount of dollars that were being spent. I think the chairman is an expert on this, but one of the things that has happened is, you would think that the number of kids being served by the program might have at least doubled or tripled just like the dollars, but the number of kids served has only gone up by 40 percent.

Some of the studies that we have gotten back have said parts of this program are working. Some of it is not working, perhaps, or is not working quite as well as what we need.

I think we did a very good thing. We basically stabilized the growth. We cut it by, what, by about 3 percent this year. So we are still spending 3.4 billion, and we said, this program has grown very, very quickly over the last number of years. We are getting mixed kinds of feedback. Let us step back and assess the program, see what is working, see what is not. Let us make sure that we do not just dump a lot of money on it.

I think people too often, they have pealed the onion back. Just throwing dollars at these programs does not mean that they are accomplishing the goals that we have set out. I think that is the same thing that the gentleman was bringing out in his point.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, as I tried to point out this afternoon, and the gentleman just pointed out, this program, Head Start, has grown 186 percent in 5 years as far as dollars are concerned. But, again, there was less than 40 percent in increased student participation. But it was the health and human service inspector general who said, the reason for the problems is that we increased the money so dramatically that we have sloppy program management. They also then go on to say that only 50 percent of the programs they would rate as good programs.

So again we are talking about getting quality programs so that these children have an opportunity to be successful and get a part of the American dream. And just throwing money at mediocrity will not improve their chances of making a success of life. I think that is why we have to talk about reforms.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, sloppy program management, what does that mean when we have sloppy program management on $3.5 billion? Sloppy program management, private sector, my boss came to me and said, you have got sloppy program management. We were not talking anywhere on these kinds of numbers, but it means dollars going down the drain that are not being used for the goals and the objectives that we have set.

It is maybe time to step back and take a look and not throw more money at it but say, let us take a look at the money that is going there, that $3.5 billion. Let us tighten up our program assessment, our criteria so that we can get more effectiveness out of $3.4 billion or $3.5 billion rather than just throwing another $2- or $300 billion at it, because that $2- or $300 billion is going to be administered how? Sloppy program management means a portion of it is gone before we ever educate one more child.

Mr. GOODLING. Every administration, not just this administration, but

every administration and every Congress, each administration would say, give us more money for these two programs. All the Congress would say, more money for the program. No one paid very much attention until the last couple years as to the possibility that maybe it is mediocrity rather than quality that is being produced out there.

So, all we are saying is, sit up and take notice. These children deserve more than mediocrity. They deserve excellence. We need to demand more from them so that they have an opportunity to get a part of the American dream.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one thing that we have not mentioned tonight is the three of us and our other colleagues in the majority on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities are in the process of developing a very ambitious legislative agenda to address educational reform and improvement in America for next year, 1996.

I want to salute the gentleman from Michigan in particular because he is the chairman of our newly created Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee. He has helped us attend to one of our fundamental responsibilities as Members of Congress, and that is performing legislative oversight of these different programs.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned just a moment ago the chapter 1 program, the basic skills education program, which was originally intended, going back to the congressional intent in the authorizing legislation, to help the most disadvantaged and to provide some assistance from the Federal taxpayer to low income school districts.

This program has grown in leaps and bounds as well. I am just looking down here at the latest information. Again recent studies demonstrate that the program has the long-term impact of improving educational achievement. That, after all, ought to be the bottom line.

I fully agree with the premise that equating money with educational progress or educational achievement is really a false equation. Education funding has risen steadily and dramatically in America in recent years. Yet test scores, probably the best barometer for gauging pupil achievement and educational performance, have shown little or no improvement. But this particular program, this chapter 1 program, is no longer targeted to the most disadvantaged. Ninety percent of the school districts in America receive this funding, including, as the chairman knows, the 100 most affluent school districts that received $490 million, almost half a billion dollars, in fiscal year 1994.

So it has become an operational subsidy that local school districts are now relying on, more largesse from the Federal taxpayer. There is no connection or nexus necessarily between this Federal taxpayer funding and results. As I mentioned at the outset, in my remarks, we are interested in results. That is why performing the oversight function, the oversight responsibility, of the legislative branch of Government is so important so that we really can take a hard look and determine which programs are working well, which programs are producing results and the proper bang for the taxpayer dollar.

Mr. GOODLING. And I think it is important to point out that together the administration, the majority, the minority, brought about a careers bill that took all of those, again, programs, 163, 153, how many ever may be out there again, who knows how many Federal programs that are there for job training, and together we said we got to get some quality programs out there. All we are doing is spending money so thinly all over everything that we do not know if we are accomplishing anything to help people to be better trained, and in this day and age they have to get trained and retrained constantly, and so we work together to do it, and I would call on the minority and the administration to do the same thing now for every other program. Do not keep accepting the idea that we cannot admit that they have not done well. Let us admit that we failed and then say from what we have learned we can build quality programs.

That is, I think, the message that we should get out to everybody.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned the, and so did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOEKSTRA] the concept of transferring responsibility and authority out of Washington back down to State and local communities, and I tried to make the point that again the centralized decision making is fundamental to America education, but I want to—you mentioned the career legislation that I, all three of us, worked on in this House, and it uses the concept of block grants, as does the school-based nutrition program as potentially further legislative initiatives will in the future. Yet our political opponents and their allies have managed to kind of give this concept of block grants a bad name. It is sort of a nasty term now when people talk about block grants, and I think we ought to point out that what we are attempting to do is consolidate programs first of all, which gives us the opportunity to identify those that can be eliminated because they are either redundant with State or local programs or they are better performed at the State or local level, and you pointed out that with the careers work force development job training consolidation legislation—that is quite a mouthful, but you pointed out that there is something like 160 separate Federal job-training programs, what we call categorical programs, and they are spread across virtually the entire Federal bureaucracy, administered by 14 different departments and agencies. So we thought it would make sense to take those programs, consolidate them down into a few block grants; in the case of the careers legislation, ultimately three block grants, and then use those block grants to transfer the authority and the revenue down to the State and local level with proper oversight from the Federal Government and the Congress as the legislative branch of Government so that these programs would be closer to the people they are intended to serve. In the process of doing that consolidation and streamlining, Mr. Speaker, we assumed that there would be an administrative cost savings that we could then use to our long-term plans to balance the Federal budget and ultimately generate a budget surplus which is so critically important, as the gentleman from Michigan has already point out, in order to pay down and pay off that $5 trillion national debt, $1.5 trillion of which are funds borrowed from the trust funds of the Federal Government including Social Security. So we are moving on two paths here. We want to improve programs by emphasizing results, not just money, and we want to do the very best things that we can possibly do for the future of our children even before improving the quality of American education, bootstrapping the performance of our schools, and that is balancing the Federal budget and getting our Nation's fiscal house in order.

Mr. GOODLING. And I think it is very important to point out to the American people what I have pointed out in committee time and time again, and what I pointed out here on the floor, and what I pointed out to the Governors. We are not talking about revenue sharing. We do not have any revenue to share. We are talking about this is what we expect you to accomplish, these are the goals you must reach, you use your creativity, you use what you know on the local level to bring about the changes that have to be brought about, if we are going to move from mediocrity to excellence.

So we are not talking about revenue sharing, and I think it is important that the American public understands that, and I yield again to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Well, the gentleman may be disappointed he yielded. We have had our discussions and our debates about revenue sharing, but I think we are pretty close together.

As long as the money—it is kind of interesting. Revenue sharing is kind of like the impression is we are sharing with the rest of the country. It is kind of like they are sharing with us. The money comes from there in the first place, but, as long as the money is coming from the local communities and it is coming to Washington, then we are sending it back to them, I think it is important that we send it back with some broader goals, and some criteria and some measurements so they can drive toward successful programs. I think what my colleague from California was pointing out so correctly, we

are not taking away the criteria, and the goals and the objective measurements, but what we are doing with block granting is we are putting in place a lot more flexibility for the people in Holland, MI; Muskegan, MI; or Ludington, communities in my district, versus communities in your district, versus communities in California, to take these dollars, take a look at the broad objectives and goals that we think they should be striving for and put the programs together to go after meeting those objectives. What we want to eliminate, and you know we had the hearings a couple of weeks ago talking about values, schools, and parents, and Bill Bennett came and testified, and he seemed to imply, and I think we going to do some followup work on this with our staff and research with the people in the Education Department that the 6 percent of dollars, the education dollars that are coming from Washington at the elementary-secondary level, that when those dollars go back to the community, the belief is that maybe they go back with too many strings attached, too many rules and regulations, so that what happens at the local level is administrators and teachers are looking to Washington for their direction in what they should be doing when really, as Mr. Bennett said, great schools, effective schools, are those that are forming a partnership with the parents in the community in talking together with about here collectively our goals and our objectives for your kids, and we are going to work together on reaching those, and what you have here is when the dollars start coming from Washington with rules and regulations, all of a sudden the administrators are looking somewhere else about what they should be doing, and what rules and regulations they should be following, and we are detracting away from their primary focus. Their primary focus should not be filling out paperwork for bureaucrats in Washington. Their primary focus should be dealing with parents in the community, in dealing with the kids in the classroom and meeting their needs, and not trying to meet the needs of detailed rules and regulations from people that cannot even find our districts on a map.

Mr. GOODLING. And what they are looking at most and what detracts them most is that they are worried about the audit because, if they commingle one penny, they are in trouble, yet they know that here are 10 small categorical programs and they are accomplishing nothing. They could put some of those together, and commingle that money and produce good programs that are effective for that particular area, but they cannot do it because the auditor will be there.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Block grants are a positive thing because they will get rid of rules and regulations, they will be broad objectives, and it will return the primary focus back to the kids and getting them educated, and the administrators will spend more time worrying about what is happening in the classroom and less time about what is, or less time worrying about what is going to happen when the people in Washington review our documents.

It is a constructive change, it is a positive change, it is moving control back to where it should be.

Mr. GOODLING. I would like to very quickly review one other area that does not deal with education, but, you know, every time we come here we hear somebody get up and say, ''Oh, you're taking from the poor and you're giving to the rich with your tax program,'' and I will come down every time, I will challenge them, tell them exactly what is in the tax bill. They will never get up and rebut it, but the next day they will come and say the same thing over and over again.

And so I come down, and I say, ''Is a $500 tax credit for long-term-care insurance, is that something for the rich?'' Every senior citizen is worried out there about what happens if I have a lengthy illness.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is not every senior citizen, it is every one of us is worried about.

Mr. GOODLING. But this is one where the $500 credit for long-term care cannot be for the rich. A thousand dollars for home care where every senior citizen wants to stay and where it is so much cheaper for everyone to have them, and is that for the rich? Of course not.

Is a correction of the marriage penalty for the rich? Of course not.

Is a $2,000 IRA for the parent that stays home with their children for the rich? Of course not.

Up to $5,000 credit for adoption? Is that for the rich?

A $500 credit; now here they like to play with this one, for each child under 18, but 35 percent of all of those dollars go to a family of four with an income of $30,000 or less. The next 35 percent goes to $50,000 or less. Again, something for the rich?

Capital gains. Sixty-five percent of all capital gains transactions are brought about by senior citizens, and, therefore, if some senior citizen wants to take care of themselves in their golden years, and they have to sell their property, sell their farm, between State and Federal government will take 60 percent of everything, and then we will create programs down here to send money out to try to take care of the very people whose money we took from them and brought it down here.

So again the whole package was built around how do you keep the family, the struggling young family, together, and what can you do to get small business to create more jobs, because if our welfare program works, we need those jobs, and we need them to create them.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. And I believe that it is not like our tax revenues are going to go down—I mean and let us see. We have got $175 billion deficit or a $160 billion deficit, and this year we spent $1.5 trillion, so our tax revenues must have been about $1.325 trillion, a lot. But $1.3 trillion rounding. In 7 years, we are going to have a balanced budget, we are going to do the positive kinds of tax reforms that you are talking about, and what is our revenue going to be? It will be $1.85 trillion. Tax revenues are going to go up, and they are going to go up significantly over the next 7 years even though we have made these tax reforms, so it is not like we are sitting here on a diet saying, ''Oh, boy, we're not going to be getting as much money in.'' We are going to be getting a lot more money and we are going to be getting almost $500 billion more per year into Washington in taxes in 7 years than what we are collecting this year.

Some tax cut.

Mr. GOODLING. Yes.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIGGS. I just want to make a couple of other quick points, Mr. Speaker, because I came across some information that I think answers some of the rhetorical questions we were raising earlier. I want to point out to our colleagues, our constituents, our listeners that a lot of the Federal funding on education in recent years has gone to fuel a large bureaucracy back here known as the U.S. Department of Education, and I am going to introduce a couple of articles for the RECORD, but I want to point out according to a couple of articles from Investors Business Daily. Since its creation in 1979 the Education Department has doubled in size from $14.2 to $32.9 billion today, 1995. That is three times the growth rate of all other discretionary nondefense programs in the Federal budget. In the past 5 years, the Education Department has grown from 4,596 bureaucrats and 155 programs to 5,100 bureaucrats and more than 240 programs, and that is, as you pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker, that is just the U.S. Department of Education. That does not include the 30 other Federal agencies which spend more than $27 billion on 308 education programs that the General Accounting Office deemed often duplicative and overlapping.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman would yield, we are working on this project to define or redefine the role of the Education Department in the future, and I think, as the staff, the committee has gone through that number you quoted, $27 billion in spending on education outside of the Education Department. I believe that the staff has come up with a number that says that number is closer to $80 to $100 billion. But that is the problem. We do not know where all of this money is which may be job security for me, but I think there is a role for oversight, significant oversight, and you know we have had some—we have had some very good hearings in trying to track down that

kind of money, having the kind of expertise that my colleague from California and the enthusiasm that he brings for this issue I think means that we are going to have a good opportunity to manage our growth and significantly increase our effectiveness as we go through what is a more difficult process than I believe it has to be of trying to balance the budget.

□ 2045

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will yield again, and I thank the gentleman for his comments, I want to introduce for the RECORD a commentary published in the American Legion magazine entitled ''The Wrong Answer: Washington's movement toward centrally run, politically correct, 'no-fault' education proves the government is out of touch with what America wants from its schools,'' by Bruno V. Manno, the former U.S. assistant secretary of education for policy and planning, now a senior fellow at the Washington, DC, office of the Hudson Institute, and also an associate director of the Hudson's Modern Red Schoolhouse project, which I think attests to what the gentleman from Michigan was saying. In fact, I would change that subhead to say ''This idea of federalizing education in this country proves that the government is out of touch with what American parents and guardians want from its schools.''

I wanted to make one other point, though, because it is crucial to the debate we are going to have here over the next couple of days on the House floor. That is the District of Columbia public schools. I think it is a real concern for all of us. One of my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOLF], who represents a northern Virginia suburban district, has called the situation in D.C. public schools a disgrace and a tragedy. He has suggested that no Member of Congress would willingly send their children to attend District of Columbia public schools. I would point out that the President and the Vice President, who can obviously afford to send their children to private schools, so those children do not have to attend the District of Columbia public schools, do so.

I want to point out that Washington students consistently score the worst in the Nation, lower than any other inner-city group on the national education assessment progress test. And here is truly a shocking figure: Only 56 percent of city students even graduate high school. In recent weeks, we have seen newspaper articles appearing in the local media. Here is one from the Washington Post. I believe I have it here, if I can find it.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, while the gentleman is looking for it, I might point out that the per pupil expenditure is one of the highest in the country.

Mr. RIGGS. In the range of $8,000 to $9,000 per pupil annually. Here is an article in the December 9 Washington Post, and the headline says, ''Third Graders Mark Time During Parade of Teachers; D.C. Class Settles Down With Fourth Substitute.'' And we hear these stories of kids who do not have permanent teachers, who lack just basic education equipment, they lack proper textbooks, we hear horror stories, literally, of rundown facilities, facilities that do not have working plumbing, working, operating bathrooms. It is just really a crime and disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, we have passed, as an amendment to the District of Columbia annual appropriations bill, the D.C. School Reform Act. That originated, of course, with the efforts of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING], the efforts of our colleague on the Committee on Educational and Economic Opportunities, Mr. GUNDERSON; the D.C. School Reform Act will establish a challenging economic core curriculum in the District of Columbia public schools and provide scholarships for low-income families so they have the same right of choice across all competing educational institutions, public and private, as more affluent families.

It establishes independent public charter schools, expanded parent literacy schools, a work force preparation initiative, and it spends money to improve the District of Columbia school facilities. That particular amendment, which again was attached to the District of Columbia annual appropriations bill, has caused a great deal of controversy in this House. It has actually held up final passage of the District of Columbia appropriations.

I hope that we can make good on our commitment to the young people, the students of the District of Columbia public schools, because this is one case where a school district is, in fact, under our direct oversight by virtue of our being Members of Congress, and I appreciate the chairman of the committee not only taking the initiative tonight on this special order, but for all the work he has done to demonstrate his concern for the District of Columbia and to try to improve the caliber of District of Columbia schools.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles referred to earlier:

[From Investor's Business Daily, Nov. 21, 1995]

THE FEDERALIZATION OF EDUCATION?

CLINTON WANTS WASHINGTON IN CHARGE OF SCHOOLING

(By Matthew Robinson)

President Clinton's latest line in the sand in the budget battle is education spending.

Clinton considers his education policies one of his greatest achievements. He cites Goals 2000 and expansion of the federal student loan program as too important to trim.

But Clinton is facing a GOP just as steeled to reform the education status quo as he is bent to defend it.

The budget battle represents two different views of the federal government's role in education. Clinton wants to preserve his education policies which broaden federal power. The GOP wants to send education back to the states.

A look at the numbers shows that Clinton's favorite education programs not only have failed to deliver better-educated kids, they have undermined traditional state authority.

To address this, the GOP is seeking changes in federal education programs, which have been the fastest-growing items in the federal budget.

In total, Washington spends about $70 billion a year on education programs, according to the General Accounting Office.

Since its creation, the Education Department's budget has more than doubled from $14.2 billion in 1980 to $32.9 billion in 1995.

In the past five years, the Education Department has grown from 4,596 bureaucrats and 155 programs to 5,100 bureaucrats and more than 240 programs.

The House wants to cut $3.6 billion from the Education Department, and the Senate want $2.9 billion in cuts.

Despite his line in the sand, Clinton also called for a drop of $2.2 billion in education outlays in his 1996 budget.

Federal education spending also has risen dramatically relative to other discretionary spending since 1979, according to John Berthoud, vice president of the Alexis de Tocqueville Institution, a think tank in Arlington, Va.

In the '70s, inflation-adjusted federal education spending grew only about half as fast as other non-defense discretionary spending items (35% vs. 65.4%).

But with the creation of the Education Department, federal education spending surged—rising three-and-a-half times as fast as the non-defense discretionary budget (29.5% vs. 7.9%).

And it's not just the department. Some 30 other federal agencies spend more than $27 billion on 308 education programs that the GAO deemed often ''duplicative and overlapping.''

Despite the surge in federal spending, educational achievement barely roes. Average SAT scores rose just 1.1% during the '80s. And in more than a third of the states, scores fell.

''We have been throwing an endless stream of dollars at education with ever diminishing results,'' Berthoud said.

Still, the president has staked a lot on Goals 2000: The Educate America Act. The legislation builds on ideas begun in the Bush administration. It provides aid to states to develop education reform plans and implement ''voluntary federal standards.''

The president asked for $750 million—an increase of more than 87% over fiscal year '95—to finance the program. By 2002, total funding for Goals 2000 would reach $896 million.

But House Republicans have chosen to zero out Goals 2000. The Senate has opted to keep some of Goals 2000, cutting only $62 million—a drop of 16.6% from the 1994 budget.

When compared to a federal budget of more than $1.5 trillion dollars, Goals 2000—even if fully funded—is hardly a drop in the bucket.

PHILOSOPHICAL DIRECTION

And the federal share of education pales next to state and local shares. The U.S. spends about $484 billion a year on education at all levels—7.6% of the GDP. The federal share comes to about 6%.

It isn't just the funding that bothers Republicans, it's the philosophical direction of Goals 2000.

The House, driven by the New Federalists, a group of about 50 Republican freshmen, chose to eliminate it.

Goals 2000, critics note, aims at raising national standards and performance. But it

does so by expanding the federal presence in education, even though supporters claim the federal standards are voluntary.

Some of the controversial elements include:

Goals 2000 uses the command ''will'' more than 45 times when describing what states must do to receive federal money. The word ''should'' is only used three times.

States must submit plans to federal education officials showing how they will accomplish the national education goals.

Once a state accepts Goals 2000 money, it must implement the program's requirements or be subject to federal action. Thus, a local charter school free from state regulations would have to answer directly to the federal government.

Tests used to evaluate students are based on criteria such as self-esteem and thinking ability, not factual knowledge. A typical question on such tests is: ''What are your feelings after reading this?'' The answers may include ''symbols, images and drawings'' in place of words.

Curricula and textbooks must fulfill federal specifications including ''gender equitable and multicultural materials.''

Controversial history standards that critics say are politically biased also are an outgrowth of the Goals 2000 reforms.

But the federal guidelines don't stop there, critics say. So intrusive are these measures, said Edward Kealy, director of Federal Programs for the National School Boards Association, that ''I do not think any (corrective action) is left off the list short of a nuclear attack on school districts.''

It boils down to one issue, others say. ''Ultimately, it is an issue of local control,'' said Natalie Williams, an education specialist with the Claremont Institute, a California-based think tank. ''Goals 2000 purports to be a wonderful reform measure. However, the GOP is looking to reform schools by freeing up schools with charters and restoring local control.

''It is tempting to look at Goals 2000 money and not see the implications. It's stifling creative reform efforts,'' Williams added.

The education establishment is up in arms at the GOP efforts to stop Goals 2000 before it gets started. The National Education Association, a union representing 2.1 million of the nation's teachers, has started a campaign to block the Republican budget plans.

HYPERBOLIC RHETORIC

Declares one NEA press release: ''(T)he sound of the school bell is being drowned out by the growing roar of a chainsaw as Congress hacks billions of dollars from education to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy and giveaways to big business. As the school year begins, vital education programs are on the chopping block as never before.''

Dale Lestina, senior lobbyist for the NEA is just as blunt. ''Both the House and Senate proposals are poison to education. One just kills it a little faster. The Senate version is a little slower, but it'll still kill the program.''

The GOP also wants to reverse Clinton's changes in student aid. Such aid is still a mainstay of the Education Department, with some 40% of its spending devoted to it.

The department spends about $12 billion a year to make more than $32 billion in grants, loans and work-study programs available to 6.5 million students—nearly half of the nation's college and university population.

Clinton has pointed to this program as an example of ''investing in the next generation.'' To do so, he pushed through a change in student aid, from federally backed private lending to direct government lending.

Yet his direct lending program has not produced the savings he promised.

By eliminating the free-market lenders and administering the loans directly, the government hoped to save $5 billion.

But according to the Congressional Budget Office, the White House plan has cost $1.5 billion to administer.

Republicans plan on shifting the burdens back onto the private lenders who benefit from the loans. They predict a savings of $10 billion.

The GOP desire for local control has even led to the first voucher-like initiative in the District of Columbia.

The House's D.C. appropriations bill approves $3,000 scholarships for parents to choose the schools their children attend, whether public or private.

Washington students consistently score the worst in the nation—lower than any other inner-city group on the National Education Assessment Progress tests. Only 56% of city students even graduate high school.

But these arguments may soon become moot. In many states, there is a growing resolve to reject Washington money. States want to proceed with their own reforms free of federal red tape.

Montana, Virginia, New Hampshire and Alabama have all declined Goals 2000 money. And in California Gov. Pete Wilson's office, a debate rages about whether to accept $42 million of Goals 2000 funding.

Not all Republicans want to trim the federal role in education.

Senator Arlen Specter of Pennsylvania helped save Goals 2000 in the Senate, fighting to keep $300 million in funding. His office also has been urging states to take the money and promising changes when state officials balked.

Even with the budget impasse, education reform is coming.

IN THE CROSSHAIRS

Ever since President Reagan promised to abolish the Education Department, conservative Republicans have had their sights set on the department.

The Back to Basics Education Reform Act, a measure introduced by Ohio Republican Steve Chabot, a former school teacher, would abolish the department.

It also would send $9 billion in block grants to the states for elementary and secondary education and provide $2 billion for higher education.

Student loans, Pell Grants and the Individuals with Disabilities Act programs would be moved to the Department of Health and Human Services.

The bill has 120 cosponsors and is expected to reach the House floor for a vote next year.

[From Investor's Business Daily, Nov. 27, 1995]

EDUCATION BAIT AND SWITCH

The program encourages states to adopt ''voluntary federal standards'' to qualify for new federal grants. Clinton wants to boost funding to $700 million—almost double last year's $370 million. The Senate wants to spend 16.6% less than last year. The House wants to zero out the program.

Its backers call Goals 2000 the most important education reform in three decades. But four states have already said ''No,'' and California may join them. Virginia, Montana, New Hampshire and Alabama have rejected more than $11 million of Goals 2000 funds.

Yes, it's a drop in the bucket. Virginia spends more than $6 billion a year on education. Montana spends more than $700 million, New Hampshire $980 million and Alabama $2.8 billion.

The states, which all have Republican governors, say they're rejecting the federal intrusion and ''potential interference'' in state authority. Alabama Gov. Fob James complained that Goals 2000 doesn't move in the ''direction of decreasing the role of the federal government and returning power to the states.''

California Gov. Pete Wilson, who said last month that he would ''probably not'' accept $42.1 million in Goals 2000 money, has the same beef. Goals 2000 is an intrusive measure filled with a ''myriad of federal dictates'' that may lead to the ''federal micromanagement of California's education policy.''

Goals 2000 backers say it has some of the ''most flexible requirements'' of any education act ever handed down from Washington. And it began at the initiative of the nation's governors, back in 1989. Why are they turning down what they asked for?

In fact, it's the same old Washington bait-and-switch. The standards are only voluntary if you turn down the money. Take it, and you're under the thumb of a half-dozen new bureaucracies and research institutions. You have to submit plans to the federal government to show how you'll reach Goals 2000 standards.

The passages on what states that take the funds must do uses the command ''will'' 45 times, and ''should'' just thrice.

Most important, Goals 2000 isn't really what the governors asked for. It doesn't boost education standards. It boosts education bureaucrats who will just add ''standards'' to their jargon, and go on as before.

This establishment is run by union bosses, administrators, and education professors who never master any other subject. Classroom teachers have next to no voice.

Since its creation in 1979, the Education Department has doubled in size, from $14.2 billion to $32.9 billion in 1995. That's three times the growth rate of all other discretionary, non-defense programs. Nationally, inflation-adjusted per pupil spending grew 35% from 1979 to 1992.

And all that bought us is a 1.1% increase in SAT scores.

Paul Gagnon, a former director of the Education Department's Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching, considers the problem in the December issue of The Atlantic Monthly. He looks at the debacle of another Education Department attempt to fulfill the governors' mandate—the effort to write national content standards.

Education hired scholars and teachers to write the humanities standards. They failed miserably. The English project was suspended after spending more than $900,000. One subcommittee voted that the phrase ''standard English'' be replaced by ''privileged dialect.''

The history standards won headlines for their relentless pursuit of political correctness. At 314 pages, the experts' ''outline'' of world history is longer than many textbooks. And it emphasizes everything but the foundations of Western culture and thought.

The problem, writes Gagnon, is that the education establishment has opposed real standards for over a century. As a result, we write off 80% to 90% of all kids as unable to learn the basics of citizenship and success.

The nation does need education reform, and it would be worth higher spending. There's even room for a healthy federal role.

But Goals 2000, like most other current federal ''reform'' efforts, only buys more red tape, bureaucracy and double-talk. It's an investment in failure.

[From the American Legion, Dec. 1995]

THE WRONG ANSWER

(By Bruno V. Manno)

She is a 10-year-old blank slate sitting with hands clasped in a classroom in Anytown, USA. Her brown eyes are large and

luminous, her long dark hair is tied behind her in a satin bow. Perhaps she is your daughter, or granddaughter, or niece.

What she learns here will determine how she sees the world and her place in it. Naturally you are concerned. You want to know that her schooling will equip her to compete. You want to know what she is being told about life and living.

About all, you want to know who is making the decisions that determine what she thinks about life.

Although there have been myriad debates about the ''meaning'' of the election of November 1994, this much is known: The American people used the ballot to express discomfort—if not outright disgust—with the government's paternalistic role in their daily lives. At a time when Washington's role in education has been steadily growing, this raises a number of serious questions about U.S. education policy.

Can Washington do right by the nation's nearly 50 million school kids?

Are the aims of Washington out of tune with the aims of America-at-large?

What should be done to resolve this disparity?

The answers are ''perhaps,'' ''quite probably,'' and ''listen to the people.''

The Clinton administration's elementary and secondary educational policies are packaged in a comprehensive two-part education overhaul known as Goals 2000 (the Educate American Act) and HR 6 (the Improving America's School Act). Together, these two pieces of 1994 legislation represent a vigorous and misguided attempt to centralize and standardize what this country does in education.

Most of the administration's agenda is a throwback to the mid-60's ''Uncle Sam knows best'' policies of the Great Society. It imposes nationwide a single education game plan, so-called ''systemic reform.'' It maximizes Uncle Sam's role in the classroom and minimizes the role of communities and parents by tying federal education funds to the states' willingness to embrace Goals 2000 and the HR 6 agenda.

This Washington-knows-best education policy has several serious flaws. First, it downplays the academic results students achieve—''outputs''—in favor of such ''inputs'' as school spending, class size, and other resources or money issues. It thus shifts the focus of national education reform from what children learn, to what bureaucrats spend (once more assuming that the way to fix a problem is to throw money at it). This approach, of course, has almost nothing to do with the content of what is taught, or how it is taught, to that little dark-haired girl and her millions of classmates nationally.

This leads us to flaw number two. The Clinton approach gives far greater clout to education ''experts'' at the national level, while slighting civilian consumers such as parents and elected officials. For starters, Goals 2000 establishes a National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC). This new bureaucracy, comprising powerful interest groups, is akin to a national school board. NESIC, could, for example, set national standards for what kind of technology classrooms should have, what teaching methods are best for students, what training programs are best for teachers, or other controversial issues.

The danger here is amply demonstrated by the firestorm ignited by the debut of the new national history standards. In a now-famous essay for the The Wall Street Journal, former National Endowment for the Humanities chairman Lynne V. Cheney attacked them as ''politicized history; [they] tend to save their unqualified admiration for people, places and events that are politically correct.'' To a lesser degree, the political correctness of Goals 2000 even seeped into its science curricula.

Meanwhile , HR 6's ''Gender Equity Act'' mandates ''gender sensitivity [and] gender-equitable practices.'' This approach is a supposed remedy for an alleged ''academic gender gap'' that is based on discredited research. It may earn political capital for its authors, but will do little to promote quality education.

Finally, the Clinton plan bans the use of federal money to develop or administer the sorts of ''high stakes'' tests that should be used by states and districts in making major decisions about student promotion, graduation and employment. This reinforces and accelerates the slide toward no-fault education which began a few decades ago with the advent of ''gradeless'' classes. It also undermines those few aspects of Goals 2000 that are worth supporting. For example, it advocates establishing voluntary standards in such core academic areas as math, science, English, history and geography.

We are left with a system of education that neither penalizes failure nor rewards success—this, in the name of protecting kids' feelings or ''safeguarding the civil rights'' of low-achievers.

In sum, the new laws are little more than a Washington power-grab in which Uncle Sam appears on the doorstep of local communities and states bearing gifts. But gifts from Washington seldom come without strings, and this is no exception. The inevitable result will be more federal red tape imposing rules and regulations on parents, teachers and communities that ''can't be trusted'' to decide what is best for their own children.

What makes all this more than mildly ironic is that the American people apparently feel it's Uncle Sam himself who can't be trusted.

Today, public confidence in Washington is at the lowest it has been in 36 years of survey research. That's the sober verdict of the most comprehensive examination ever undertaken of the ''American dream,'' done for the Hudson Institute's Project on the New Promise of American Life.

The Hudson survey reveals that only 2 percent of Americans trust Washington to do what's right ''all the time,'' and just 14 percent ''most of the time.'' Incredibly, more than one in five trust our federal government to do the right thing ''almost none of the time.''

Also revealing was the survey's examination of which government branch or level has, or should have, the most power. While 55 percent believe Congress has the most power, only 29 percent believe that's the way things ought to be. Conversely, while 41 percent believe that states and localities should have the most power, fewer than 10 percent think that situation actually exists. These basic findings hold across all demographic lines.

Put simply, the vast majority of us believe that things are precisely ass-backwards when it comes to the distribution of power and influence. Washington is on a collision course with what most Americans want.

These facts take on added meaning as we examine more specifically what Americans expect of their public schools: According to a poll released by the Phi Delta Kappa education publication and the Gallup Organization:

Americans rank educaiton at or near the top among national priorities.

Almost 90 percent say that developing the world's best education system is essential to America's future. Indeed, support for education as a No. 1 priority exceeds support for industrial development (60 percent) or the military (40 percent).

Americans want meaningful, measurable standards.

Eighty-one percent think schools should conform to national achievement standards and goals, with 70 percent supporting the standardized ''high stakes'' national tests eliminated under the Clinton plan.

Americans want key decisions about education made locally.

Some 77 percent of us want federal agencies to give local authorities more, not less, say in spending tax money from Uncle Sam, and 62 percent advocate families choosing which public schools their kids attend. Minorities—the people the new Clinton plan is trying to be ''sensitive'' to—are among the staunchest backers of school choice, and respective figures of 70 percent for blacks, 66 percent for Hispanics.

Another poll by the prestigious Public Agenda foundation showed:

Americans want no-nonsense schools where kids must show what they've learned before they can move on.

Fully 81 percent support student promotion only when a child has demonstrated mastery of what he's already been taught. Indeed—far from the Clinton notion of making school easier—more than three-quarters of Americans want teachers to toughen grading and be more willing to fail high-school students. Further, 76 percent say high-school diplomas should never be given to students who can't write and speak English well. (That this should even be a topic for discussion is a sad commentary on the state of education and society in general.)

The bottom line? The American public wants safe, orderly schools where discipline is enforced and students master ''the basics'' before promotion. As the Public Agenda poll itself puts it, Americans ''seem to want a new and improved version of the little red schoolhouse.''

The stark contrast between this report, and the beliefs espoused by the ''experts'' who are shaping national education policy, shows just how out of sync Washington is.

What does all this mean for Congress as it looks anew at education?

Elected officials should begin with the premise that local education can't be fixed in Washington. Accordingly, the 104th Congress should:

Undo the worst damage. That is, repeal the most damaging provisions of both the Goals 2000 and HR 6 federal power grabs.

Abolishing NESIC is a start. This would remove the ''experts'' from the driver's seat of a centralized national education policy. In fact, Congress should bar the federal bureaucracy from doing almost anything that interferes with local control of standards, curricula, testing and teaching.

Eliminate, too, all criteria that value money over marks. Don't judge progress by the amount of money a school district spends on education, but by the kinds of grades students are getting. This, of course, means overturning the provisions that frown upon the use of tests. In the final analysis, how do you really determine how well students are doing without them?

Congress also should take a clear position that true civil-rights enforcement means protecting the rights of all individuals as individuals. Enforcement should not be based on contrived gender-equity research, so-called ''race norming'' that ''adjusts'' test scores for characteristics such as race and poverty, or any other form of civil-rights activism that benefits specific groups.

Send programs home. About $10 billion in federal programs should be re-routed to the states, which can use the money to purchase needed services. Congress should consult with the nation's governors to fine-tune the details. The final package should eliminate

one-size-fits-all thinking and allow states and communities to decide what they want to do.

Eliminate the Department of Education. It sounds drastic—but with so many programs sent back to the states, there's no need for a cabinet-level agency. What remains could be housed in an independent agency with a White House adviser reporting to the President.

Washington, however, should continue support for some research and statistics activities, especially state, national and international comparisons of what students are learning so that information is available to report on the nation's progress in achieving its education goals.

The time has come for an arrogant and meddlesome Washington to divest itself and send education back to families, schools, communities and states. It's the will of the people. And our children will benefit immensely.

Mr. GOODLING. When I went with the Speaker to the town meeting downtown at one of the schools, my closing remarks to the audience were something like this: ''We have a golden opportunity to help the children get a part of the American dream in the District of Columbia, but my fear is that adults will act like children and nothing will happen.'' I hope I am not prophetic. I hope we can get beyond that, but unfortunately, that is the way it looks at this particular hour on this particular day.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I think it is all of our vision. I am glad my colleague, the gentleman from California, brought up the District of Columbia. I think it is our vision that when educators from around the country come to Washington, they stop coming here trying to get their piece of the pie, their piece of the dollars, and they come here so they can learn about the District that we have some oversight on and say, ''Here is a district that we can learn from.''

Our vision is to have a school district that is turning out well-trained, well-educated kids, that is the envy of other school districts around the country, so they come here not for money but they come to learn from the school district we have in Washington here. We do not know whether those reforms are going to work, but we recognize that we have to do something, and we think these are constructive approaches that we can experiment with, that hopefully will make things better, and again, we will do the normal thing. We will build off of those things that work and eliminate those things that do not, but we are going to keep plugging at this.

I thank the chairman for having this special order. I think we have been able to dispel some myths tonight and hopefully educate and share some knowledge with people.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me close by saying that there are two major responsibilities as far as the Federal Government is concerned in relationship to public education, because, as we all know, that is guarded very jealously by local communities and by States. There are two major responsibilities. That is equal access to all for a good education, and the research that must be done.

I would appeal to the American public, please, encourage us, help us make the kind of reforms that have to be made if, as a matter of fact, quality is going to be the name of the game, rather than mediocrity. I appeal to all Americans, do not encourage us to continue the status quo, encourage us, as a matter of fact, as a body to bring about the necessary reforms so that quality in education, quality in job training, will be the goal that we reach and the goal that we attain.

I thank both of you very much for participating in this discussion.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN DINGELL ON HIS 40TH ANNIVERSARY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure this evening to come to the floor to honor one of the truly great leaders that has served in this institution over the course of our noble history in this country.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I am proud this evening to join with my colleagues to pay tribute to my good friend and mentor, the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL. All of us have favorite JOHN DINGELL stories, and let me just tell you quickly a story that I think just about says it all.

A few months ago when we were in the heat of the Medicare debate, I turned the TV on one morning on C-SPAN, and there was JOHN sitting in a committee meeting. He was reading our colleagues on this side of the aisle the riot act. A few hours later I looked again on C-SPAN and there was JOHN, standing up in front of a group of senior citizens at a press conference talking about Medicare. A few minutes later the House went into session and he was sitting here, in one of the front rows, and came up and gave a 1-minute speech on the Medicare plan. Later that day, during the debate, I looked up and there he was, giving a stirring speech in opposition to the nursing home cuts that were being proposed. At the end of the day I walked out of the House and there was the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, in front of the Capitol. He was talking to a group of constituents about this very same issue. This all happened in a period of one day.

The next morning we were in Michigan and we had this bus tour, and it was a Medicare bus tour. We went to all these different cities in southeastern Michigan, my district and his district, SANDY LEVIN'S district, DALE KILDEE'S district, we went into the city of Detroit, JOHN CONYERS' district, to talk about Medicare.

I remember the first stop was in Pontiac. I thought, ''Well, maybe I had better get there very early to make sure everything is going right.'' I got there, and I do not recall what time it was, but it was quite early in the morning. He was there before I was, and he was talking to some of the constituents in Pontiac about this issue. Not only did he speak at all six stops as we went throughout southeastern Michigan that day, he was the last one talking to the reporters when the day was over. I swear I expected to half see him driving the bus home at the end of the day.

I think that story says it all about JOHN DINGELL. After 40 years, my friend from the Dawn River area in Michigan is just as committed, he is just as passionate and just as dedicated to the working people that he represents as the day that he got here. I do not think I have seen a more energized and compassionate defense of working people from a Member of our party when we went into the minority this year, especially a senior Member, than I saw in JOHN DINGELL in the first 12 months of this new year. Minority status has not bothered him at all. He has been out there, he has been fighting, and I think that says a lot about his person, who he is, what he is about, and what he cares about.

For over 40 years, he has made a difference in more lives than I think virtually any other Member who has served in this great institution. I stand in awe of the legacy that he has for this great institution. If you look at what he has done, he was there for Medicare, he was there when Medicaid was established, he was there for the nursing home protection that we have in the institutions that house the elderly all over the country.

In the environmental area I had the good fortune to serve with JOHN on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when I first came to the Congress. We worked on many, many pieces of legislation back there to help clean up our environment. He has been there on the forefront of, of course, the Clean Air Act, the Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, the Alaskan lands bill, and in the environmental area he stands out as a giant in this country.

For those who have disabilities, he was there in championing, in leading the fight in his committee on the Americans with Disabilities Act; in his efforts to remove asbestos from our children's classrooms, to improve lab testing, to increase railroad safety, and to ensure that tax dollars are used

wisely. As the chairman of the subcommittee for so many years on the committee which he chaired that dealt with oversight, he has been vigilant to the abuses that have gone on in this government, and the abuses, frankly, that have gone on in the market as well, the free market as well. He has been there to crack down on waste, fraud and abuse, and so many others, other issues that he has championed over the years that this constituents in this country are indebted to him for.

People will give you a lot of reasons why JOHN DINGELL has been so successful, but those of us who are from Michigan know the real secret. He has been here for 40 years, but the truth is that JOHN DINGELL has never left his community, the people who work there, the people who work in the factories and the offices, the people he grew up with. He have never left his roots. That has been demonstrated to me personally so eloquently and so well in his fight this year when we, as a party, have needed a champion, and someone with savvy and experience. He has been here doing it, and it has meant a tremendous amount, JOHN, not only to me but to a lot of Members who noted it, who appreciated it, who respect your knowledge and your wisdom, and your tenacity for those people who have sent you here and who you have never forgotten. It has always been a source of strength and commitment to many of us, and we will always remember it.

When you come right down to it, nobody has done more for the people of the State of Michigan, nobody has done more for this institution, and nobody has done more for the working people of this country than my dear friend, JOHN DINGELL. JOHN, I am really proud to call you a mentor, I really mean that, a friend, and an inspiration for nearly 30 years. I am proud to have been able to have served at your side and to have learned from you, sometimes painfully, but to have learned from you lo these many years.

JOHN is part of a great team with his wife, Debbie, who has done tremendous work in this town, but especially back in Michigan with the charity work that she does, the work she does with our party, and the boost that she gives us to make this institution and the work JOHN, and I know and others do, so very, very important. We are delighted and honored that she is a part of one of the most dynamic and great teams in terms of helping people in this country.

□ 2100

I just want to conclude by saying that I look forward to working with the gentleman from Michigan in the months ahead to fight for the issues that we believe in.

I guess I also should say before I conclude that JOHN has one of the greatest staffs that you could ever want, not only in Government, but in the private sector. He hires the best. He has the best seek him out because he is the best. He has a fantastic staff; and if you talk to any of them, they will tell you that. Good people.

JOHN, I look forward to working with you. We have a lot of work to do yet over the next few years. The health care issue that your father championed and you have championed all of these years, we have a ways to go to get there yet, but we are going to get there. I never give up on the fact that that is such an important issue to the people of this country. We are going to get it done.

So I thank you for your outstanding service and your dedication, and we look forward to your continued service.

I yield to may friend from Pennsylvania, who has patiently waited, and I thank him for participating with us.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding. If Dad were still living today, he would have been most upset if I had walked off the floor when they were having a special order for Congressman DINGELL. Even though on some issues, they were probably 100 percent opposites, on many issues they worked very, very closely together and had a great relationship, which again was carried over with JOHN and myself when I arrive here. So from both Dad and myself, we say, thank you for outstanding service.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to my friend from the great State of Tennessee, Mr. BART GORDON.

Mr. GORDON. Thank you, DAVE BONIOR, for yielding, but more importantly I want to thank you for taking the initiative to have this well-deserved tribute tonight.

As you mentioned earlier in your remarks, everyone could tell a JOHN DINGELL story, but I think it would all come down to sort of the same theme that you pointed out earlier, and that is that, and I see it every day on the Committee on Energy, it is not just that JOHN DINGELL is the most senior Member that walks in the room, but he is also the most prepared Member that walks in the room, and he is the hardest working Member that walks in the room.

Most folks after 40 years in any career try to coast on their experience and their reputation, but not JOHN DINGELL, and I am amazed at how he continues to work, work, work and prepare so that us young whippersnappers never have a change to get a leg up on him, because he is always up a little later, working a little harder. So I am glad to share in this.

I guess the remembrance that I have of this is I was at a meeting with him one time and someone asked me to give a good reason why we should have Medicare and Social Security, and so I gave them that reason, and it was my mother. If someone were to ask me who my mother should thank for her Medicare and Social Security, I would answer, thank the DINGELLS.

Like your father, JOHN, before you, you have been more responsible for providing health care and income support to senior Americans like my mother than any other individual who has ever served in this Government. If your work on health care issues had been the total of your first 40 years, you would have a legacy of which every Member would be envious.

However, the truth is that your contribution has been far greater. When any of us see a bald eagle flying we can credit your work on the Endangered Species Act. When any of us breathe air that does not poison our lungs, we can credit your work on the Clean Air Act. When we are thankful that our children will be able to go into the oceans to see dolphin and whale populations growing, we can credit your work on the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

When we see disabled Americans show up for work and become full members in helping America grow, we can credit your work on the Americans With Disabilities Act. When any of us feel relieved that we live in a home that has been checked for radon and lead-based paint, we can credit your work on those important bills.

I think we are limited just to an hour, so I cannot go through all of the other bills that every day when we wake up, we know how thankful we are.

So now, I know that my mother has a lot to be thankful for to you, and so do other Americans, and I guess we should also be thankful for you bringing Debbie Dingell into our midst and being a part of what we do. We are all grateful for the contribution that she has made to all of us, and you and Debbie are a team that make our lives better, that make America better.

I want to thank you for your work, for your dedication. It has been an honor to serve with you, and I look forward to continuing to serve with you.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his eloquent remarks.

I now would recognize my colleague and neighbor from the State of Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank my colleague from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR]. To me, it is an honor, and it is very appropriate that I be here to join my colleagues in congratulating JOHN DINGELL on his 40th anniversary, 40 years, 4 decades. In fact, it spans in effect five decades from the 1950's through the 1990's.

I think of that, and I go back to the year that JOHN DINGELL came to this Congress after his father had been here for over 20 years, and I think about Elvis Presley who had not even come into being. I think about Sputnik, which was just around the corner, but still had not happened. Those were the Eisenhower years; and before John Kennedy became President, JOHN DINGELL was a veteran in this House.

I must tell you also that, coming from the opposite side of the aisle, JOHN DINGELL and I agree to disagree on a number of issues, but we agree on a great many issues too. I have a great deal of respect and admiration for the

accomplishments that he has made in this body. I have more respect and admiration for the man.

There is no doubt that JOHN DINGELL has left his mark on this body, and he will continue. His kindness, his courtesy is something that perhaps does not shine through, but as a junior Member of this body and having been here a short time, I have had the experience, or I have had the, call it delightful experience of gaining some of the courtesy, sharing some of the courtesy he has extended to me.

Many of the issues that he and I have agreed to agree upon are issues that obviously involve Michigan, but they also deal with matters that go beyond his district and my district and the State of Michigan to involve the country at large; and most notably, I know we have worked very hard, and with other Members of this body to provide access to foreign markets for the domestic auto manufacturers in our area. Again, this is a matter that we found common ground on, that has done remarkable things for our State, our locality, and our country.

JOHN DINGELL is an ardent defender of the governing philosophy of the Democratic Party, and he has worked with Republicans for years and years and years to find that common ground on many important bills. This year, more recently, his input on the House Committee on Commerce was instrumental in moving forward a telecommunications reform bill that would create millions of new jobs and provide better telecommunications services at lower prices to the American people.

So again, I just want to emphasize the common ground, and I think that is the mark of a true legislator, someone who may disagree philosophically on a matter here or there, but can find reasons to get together, to embark on the same course and come to a conclusion that benefits all of us.

I would never question JOHN DINGELL's patriotism. He never questions mine either. He might question my thinking and I might on occasion question his, but he is a gentleman, he is a man who believes very strongly that you have a right to your philosophy, but still, in fact, he has a right to disagree with you. I do not think there is any more that you can ask of any individual.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, JOHN DINGELL's character and integrity are his strongest attributes. One thing that I have learned in the short time that I have known him is that when he gives you his word, you know that you can count on him to keep it. That is a quality that many people search all of their lives for and can never accomplish. I can tell you that JOHN DINGELL accomplished that years ago. I see signs of that every time I talk to him.

An interesting comment: Just a short time ago I happened to be talking to JOHN, and I cannot even tell you what we were talking about, but it had to do with—we were paying, I guess, some mutual respect, praising each other in one of those moments, and I said something to him along the line of, I appreciate all of his advice, and he said, I do not recall ever giving you any advice, I said, well, maybe you have not by words, but you have by actions.

I would say also, JOHN, it has been words as well, but certainly by your actions, and I think those actions speak much, much louder than words. I respect what you have done and the character you have shown me.

In closing, I just want to again congratulate my colleague from Trenton, from down river, on this 40th anniversary in the House. JOHN DINGELL is the dean of the House. He is called Mr. Chairman, but I also want to go beyond JOHN and salute the lady who has already been called the best asset he has, and I believe that she is, his wife, Debbie. Debbie is his greatest asset.

I wish you both the very best, and I again salute you, JOHN DIGELL, in obtaining this milestone. Thank you.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend from Oakland County for his very kind remarks.

Let me just give you a little biographical sketch of JOHN. I will just do that very briefly and then I will yield to my friend from Michigan, JIM BARCIA. JOHN was born July 8, 1926, in Colorado Springs, CO; beautiful country. He was educated at Georgetown where he received his bachelor of science degree and then a law degree in 1952. He served in the U.S. Army from 1944 to 1946.

He is, indeed, a lawyer and was a Wayne County assistant prosecutor from 1953 to 1955, and Wayne County is the largest county in the State of Michigan.

As my friend, JOE KNOLLENBERG, has indicated, he is, indeed, the dean of the House and has served continuously the longest of any member of the House of Representatives.

I now yield to my friend from the Bay City area, JIM BARCIA.

Mr. BARCIA. Thank you very much, Congressman BONIOR. It is indeed a pleasure and a privilege to also rise and join my colleagues in paying tribute to the outstanding service that JOHN DINGELL has given this institution and the Nation.

Of course, I cannot go through the long list, just a few of them have been mentioned this evening, the long list of accomplishments of Congressman DINGELL spanning some 40 years of service, distinguished service in the House. But I know that sportsmen across this country, the men and women who love to fish or hunt, ought to certainly appreciate the efforts of Congressman DINGELL and the numerous public acts which he has shepherded through this body and seen signed into law during his distinguished career, that preserve and protect the bountiful natural resources that our country has.

I know that reference has been made this evening to clean air and clean water, but especially I would like to say, as also a fellow avid hunter, how much the sportsmen of this country have to appreciate the contributions that JOHN has made on behalf of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, few people have had the ability that JOHN DINGELL has had to make a lasting mark on the policies of our National Government. Perhaps some Presidents have left their mark and some Members of our leadership have succeeded over the years. But not many could ever hope to have had the record of achievement that has been proudly and deservedly earned by JOHN DINGELL.

He has worked long and hard on behalf of his constituents, and that is apparent if you look at the margins of victory by which he has been returned to this body through the election cycle over these past 20 elections. He has worked long and hard on behalf of our Democratic Party in this body. More importantly, he has worked long and hard on the matters to which he has a personal commitment which are too numerous to mention in the few moments that I have to share in this tribute toward our colleague.

No one here can talk about health care policy without recognizing the contributions and wisdom of JOHN DINGELL. No one can expect to have a responsible discussion about trade policy without understanding that a key player in trade policy since the 1970's has been JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington in 1993, JOHN DINGELL was among the first to come to me and offer his help and advice. I had other colleagues who offered some very important advice: Accept help from someone who remembers when he has been refused. This tenacity has been the hallmark of his success. JOHN DINGELL does not give up.

□ 2115

It is a lesson soon learned by those who are prepared enough to challenge him, either in committee or on the floor.

While some of my colleagues who have spoken already alluded to the tremendous carrier JOHN'S father had in this body, and also the dedication and the contributions of Mrs. John Dingell, our friend Debbie, I have also had the honor and privilege, as some of my other colleagues who are about to speak, of serving with yet another Dingell. Christopher Dingell, JOHN'S son, who I want to say, Congressman DINGELL, you can be very, very proud of, who is succeeding in the great and fine tradition of being a tremendous public servant back in the State Senate in Lansing, Michigan. I miss seeing Christopher, but I know that he will carry on in this next generation the fine tradition of public service that your father and you have provided.

JOHN DINGELL is now the senior member of the House in terms of seniority. He has spent his time here wisely, with

distinction and honor. I am sure that he will continue to conduct himself in a similar fashion for so long as his constituents exercise their good judgement to retain him as their very effective and capable Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege to know JOHN DINGELL and to serve with him both as a Member of this House of Representatives and as the dean of the Michigan delegation. I join all of our colleagues in thanking him for his years of devoted service, and in wishing him the very best for whatever the future may hold for someone who has even been talked about as a future Speaker of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Thank you very much, JIM, for your very kind remarks.

If I could just go to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER]. Then I will be happy to yield to my colleague SANDY LEVIN.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my fellow colleagues in paying tribute to Congressman JOHN DINGELL for the 40 years of public service to this Nation.

As a fellow native of the state of Michigan, I have seen the impact that JOHN has had both back home and nationally. JOHN has been a central figure in both Michigan and national politics for decades and will leave a lasting legacy as one who has dedicated his life to his fellow citizens.

Whether it be from his service in World War II, as a county prosecutor in Michigan, or his extensive legislative record here in Congress—JOHN has exemplified the qualities of leadership that have helped shape this Nation and helped educate our future leaders. And it is a great honor for me to now serve in this body with him.

I had known JOHN for many years before being elected to Congress. We have for years shared many common interests back home, most notably the auto industry. I have had the benefit of accompanying JOHN and his lovely wife Debbie at the Detroit Auto shows over the years.

And although I am new to the House of Representatives, and from the other side of the aisle of my good friend, I feel his years of service, his tenacity and persistence, and the conviction with which he has guided himself throughout the years are unparalleled.

JOHN, I, the people of Michigan, and the Nation salute you and thank you for all your dedicated service.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank you, DICK, for your kind remarks.

Let me just give you a little background about the Dingell family. We have heard references this evening about JOHN's father and son. They have represented the Congress since 1932. For 23 years JOHN's father was a New Deal champion in the health care area. Of course JOHN has specialized in that area as well as so many others.

One of the great things you can say about JOHN DINGELL is that his expertise is not necessarily narrow, it is broad. It is trade policy, it is health policy, it is transportation policy, it is regulatory concerns, environmental concerns. He has a deep and broad understanding of the workings of this country.

Of course, as JIM BARCIA mentioned, his son Christopher has served with distinction in the State Senate in Michigan. So the family has been an incredible attribute to the citizens of our State.

I now yield to another gentleman whose family has been a great attribute and who has championed some of these very same issues, SANDY LEVIN from the State of Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Thank you, Congressman BONIOR, our distinguished minority whip. I applaud you for, in your very busy schedule, taking time at this late hour to do something that you care about so personally, and that is paying tribute to a friend. We do not do that enough around here, and surely it is warranted on this occasion.

If we were going to have a vote on the resolution tonight, I might have to vote ''present.'' I have a conflict of interest, in a sense. Our two families have been intertwined for a long time. I am not objective.

Indeed, my first recollection of direct involvement in politics relates to the Dingell family. It is a pretty vague memory, but I do remember it. In knickers—that dates me—carrying pamphlets for JOHN DINGELL's father in our precinct. It was my first direct involvement and it was not a very major one. I do not think JOHN's dad needed my help.

Mr. BONIOR. I am still trying to picture you in knickers.

Mr. LEVIN. I wore them. You maybe are not old enough to remember what knickers are.

Mr. BONIOR. No, I remember them.

Mr. LEVIN. I confess that I am.

We went door-to-door distributing these leaflets, and I do not quite remember the district number. But that was just part of our two families' interwovenness.

Some of my uncles knew JOHN's dad very well. My Uncle Bayre and my Aunt Lydia and my Uncle Theodore and my Aunt Rhoda, JOHN's dad was close to my uncle and with his help was elevated to the Federal bench. JOHN clerked for my uncle.

So our two families have had a long history together. And our family is so proud of our relationship with the Dingell family.

We might ask ourselves, what is the key to JOHN's success? We can point, and he would, to his own family. I think we would point to his intellect, his integrity, his perseverance, his guts, many other qualities. We also would mention as we have Debbie Dingell, a tower of strength. They have been a couple that have blessed Michigan and this city. But if I might, I just want to comment on one other aspect.

I had a chance to campaign throughout Michigan in the 1970's and see JOHN in action in his district. Then when I was elected to the Congress in the 1980's, the district I represented bordered JOHN's district.

One of JOHN's towering strengths is what I think is often overlooked. That is, no matter how powerful he became in Washington, he was still very much rooted back home.

Mr. BONIOR. Exactly.

Mr. LEVIN. No matter how much he rubbed elbows with the mighty here in Washington, he remembered those who were plying elbow grease back home to their own work.

No matter how much he was part of the famous here, JOHN remembered the humble families back home. That is where he came from, and he has never left them.

I think that has been such a source of strength and if I might say accomplishment. DAVID, you and I feel this so much. Industry, it is in JOHN's blood. Jobs. Good jobs. JOHN has been a leader in the fight to remind America that if the middle class does not grow and does not prosper, America sinks.

The auto industry and the steel industry have been such a critical part of that and JOHN has been identified: Jobs, health. Health. Even a good job is not meaningful without good health.

This goes back to JOHN's did and he has carried on this tradition, this fight, this tenacious battle to make sure that every American has an opportunity of good health.

Good environment. A job. Health. People also want to live in an environment and in a hospitable environment. JOHN has been a tenacious battler.

Safety. There is no use having a good job if you are likely to be injured there. JOHN has had a difficult balancing act representing a State with a strong auto industry and Representative BONIOR and I know. Everybody always is not a sync. I see Representative EHLERS here. There are conflicts, too. Representative CHRYSLER, who has been part of that.

You have to do some balancing. JOHN has been such a battler in terms of oversight.

Then lastly let me just mention, we all hope to grow old. JOHN DINGELL has remembered his roots.

I had a chance to travel through his district in the 1970's and, as I said, represent areas right next to him. JOHN has remembered the importance of the dignity that needs to come with old age.

In talking about age, I want to finish with this, and I think our distinguished minority whip will agree: JOHN DINGELL has made us feel young, and I say this to my colleagues in the majority, and it has been commented on. I do not think for anyone here the transition would have seemed more difficult from majority to minority status than JOHN DINGELL.

Just think of it. All of his years here. The position, the powerful position. We in Ways and Means sometimes thought his position was too powerful.

And all of a sudden, and it was a bit sudden. Maybe some of you knew it was coming.

Mr. BONIOR. It was too sudden.

Mr. LEVIN. All of a sudden he is in the minority.

Now I think some people thought JOHN DINGELL might disappear. But I think all of you admit, he has been very much on your radar screen. As the distinguished minority whip mentioned, he has been on the television screen, he has been on every screen. He has been working his heart out. He has made us feel young. He has shown that what he believes in, he fights for as hard in the minority as when he is in the majority. There is no better test of the real mettle of a human being than that he fights regardless of the circumstances.

So to JOHN DINGELL, I just say, with a completely subjective feeling, but I think there is some objectivity to it, too, that your 40th anniversary here is an important event for us to note. We are deeply proud, JOHN, of being your friend and of serving with JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend from Michigan. Well-said and beautifully said.

You reminded me in your remarks of another attribute that we have not mentioned this evening, one which I appreciate especially, and that is the great parliamentary skills of JOHN DINGELL. There are not very many people in this institution that understand the rules and can debate the rules and he is one of the best, and I think we have seen that as he has had time to do that in this the first year of our minority status.

I yield to my friend from Pennsylvania CURT WELDON.

□ 2130

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding, and I want to join with my friends on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to an outstanding American leader, JOHN DINGELL, although I hate to say, JOHN, when you first started out in this body, I was in grade school, but, like many of us here, we knew you by reputation long before we got here, and, growing up in a State that has many similar problems to the State of Michigan, the State of Pennsylvania, a State that has had the problems associated with what we refer to as the Rust Belt, we in our State saw you fighting for jobs, and economic growth and development years ago. As a former mayor of a small town, an industrial town, and the county commissioner of that county, your reputation for being a fighter on behalf of working people was known throughout our Commonwealth as it has been known throughout the Nation.

There also was another reputation that you instilled in many of us on this side, but also on your side, and that is the word ''fear'' because before coming to Congress, as a local official and then getting here as a freshman and sophomore, I know many a bureaucrat who feared having JOHN DINGELL, and his committee, and his investigators come in to basically get the facts on a given issue or a given set of circumstances, especially where you had evidence that things perhaps were not operating as they should, and perhaps the taxpayers and the citizens were not being as well served as they should be served by this Government, and so that fear really was out of respect for you and the job that you have established a reputation in doing for the entire time you have been here, as someone who is willing to take on any fight, any battle that you believe in and which warrants the attention of this body.

But in the last 3 years I have come to know you in a different capacity, and it has been a very enjoyable one for me. I have had the pleasure of serving as the Republican along with our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], on the Migratory Bird Commission, a rather obscure commission that only has seven members, two Members of the Senate from each party, two Members of the House, one from each party, and the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and the head of the Environmental Protection Agency. The seven of us meet throughout the year three or four times and basically decide how to spend the moneys that are raised from the sale of duck stamps for hunting licenses and conservation practices and to implement the programs established under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act as well as those administered by the Migratory Bird Commission.

Mr. Speaker, it was the legacy of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] following his father to establish that whole effort in this country, and we talk about Federal programs that some would say have been boondoggles. Let me tell you one that is a shining example of something that both parties can point to, and conservatives and liberals can point to, that works amazingly well, the program that JOHN DINGELL has kind of like, I guess, been the grandfather of, if you will, because we honored him for 25 years of service in that capacity just this past year. He has protected millions of acres of wetlands in this country for ducks, and for hunting and for wetlands protection, not with a strong arm of Government, not with mandated actions, not with condemning properties, but with the voluntary acquisition of property that our Government has been able to enter into agreements with, all across America, to protect our vital wilderness area and our wetlands, and no one has done more in that regard than JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, for years he was associated with the late Silvio Conte, and the two of them were a dynamic team because they were the two that represented the House in fighting for the support for this very valuable, but oftentimes unheralded, program.

But, JOHN, you know people all over this country know that you have been there day in and day out fighting for not just the continuation of this very successful effort, but fighting to make sure, working with conservation groups, working with the Defenders of Wildlife and the Nature Conservancy, to not just espouse conservation concerns, but also to take a very aggressive—yet in some cases you can argue a very conservative approach to protecting the land of this country through these two commissions, and you have just been a hero in that regard.

And I can remember when I first joined the Commission and had the honor of sitting next to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] at the first meeting and said, you know, I am here to learn. He said, ''No, my friend, you are here as my partner,'' and that is a typical attitude of a JOHN DINGELL, to have someone who, still wet behind the ears, who is at that point in time a fourth-term Member of congress, sit down next to a veteran who has been through so many battles that I could never begin to name and to consider me an equal partner in the struggle to make sure we continue the fine work established with the tradition of excellence that the Migratory Bird Commission, the North American Wetlands Conservation Program represent.

So I join with my colleagues today in saying congratulations and thank you. You are a role model for me. We may not always agree on the issues, but you are always a role model, the way you handle yourself, the way you do your homework, the way you present your facts, the way you fight for your causes, the way that you work with every ounce of energy and body until you accomplish what you set out to achieve. Those are all the traits that all of us can and do admire and respect in you, and I am a better person for having known you and worked with you and look forward to many more years of being a colleague and associate of the Honorable JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for having yielded to me.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his lovely remarks, and I yield now to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH].

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, join my colleagues in an honor today to really talk a little bit about JOHN DINGELL. As was pointed out, the times that we entered this Congress or first heard of JOHN DINGELL, JOHN DINGELL entered this Congress before I was born. I was elected in 1992, but obviously I had heard of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] before then. As somewhat considering myself a student of history and history of this Congress, in many ways JOHN DINGELL is the Babe Ruth of this Congress and really a legendary person, a person that, when you look back on 40 years of American history, had a role, had a piece, had a touch, on 40 years on American history, and, when we look back on 40 years of American history

in terms of the good things that happened, that same hand, that same touch, that same action was there, and for those of us who studied the legislative process over the last 40 years, there is no one who has probably attained the status of master of this process of being able to use public policy to positively influence people's lives, and really that is what this process is about, using this process, using Government, to make a difference in people's lives, to make a positive force, to use Government as a positive force, in people's lives.

And that really, I guess, is the legacy of JOHN DINGELL, really having done that over a 40-year period because none of our words here tonight can possibly do justice to what he has done in the last 40 years, but tens of millions, really hundreds of millions, of Americans whose lives are different because of his work are that legacy.

And we can go through, and some of the issues have been talked about tonight, but his integrity and his commitment—but his attitude about this process I think is an example that all of us really use as a paradigm of unbought and unbossed, whose only interests really have been that goal of representing his constituents and people of this country. Whether it is health care, whether it is the environment, those differences have occurred, and I can think of no greater tribute than I can say for myself that I can look to no one in this Congress whose career that I would seek to emulate, and I think many, if not most, of the younger Members of this Chamber who have had a chance to serve with him would say the same thing, than to have a career, after any number of years, of trying to influence this process and being successful as JOHN DINGELL has during the first 40 years of his career.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank you, the gentleman from Florida, for the lovely remarks.

I now yield to the Speaker of the House.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank my colleague for yielding. I must say that there are not many things that the Democratic whip and I agree on, but I think one of them is the extraordinary historic role that our mutual friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], has played in this institution and the leadership he has given over the years.

I have known the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] as a tough partisan, and he has been as good as they get. I have seen him as a great bipartisan legislative craftsman, and he is as good as they get. He did more to build the then Energy and Commerce Committee into a powerhouse than any chairman in its history except, I guess, Sam Rayburn. He brings to the floor a level of knowledge, a level of enthusiasm, and at the same time a level of decency and concern for others that is remarkable. When you disagree, he will run over you, but he will do so in a gentlemanly way, and courteous, and on the other hand, when he was in the minority, I found that he was equally courteous and a gentleman, does not like it any more than I did when he ran over me. But on things like the Clean Air Act and clean water and a whole range of issues where Congressman DINGELL had a deep interest in the envrionment, an interest in the economy, we worked together on a number of issues that, I think, I think, have helped make America a better country.

And I think any student who wants to understand this House in the last generation has to look carefully at the role of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], has to understand the tremendous tradition that he embodied going back to his father, the commitment they both had to helping people, to making this a more humane country, and to doing what they could to make Government a more useful instrument of social purpose, and I think that there is an enormous investment in creating a better America and in extending democracy that is the personification of the career of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]. Marianne and I regard JOHN and Debbie as close friends, and it is just a wonderful thing in this historic period, setting a record, to be able to be with him, and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for hosting this, and I thank you very much for taking this kind of time.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the Speaker for his comments and for honoring the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] this evening.

I yield now to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any prepared comments but would rather speak from the heart because I find I can do that much better without a prepared statement.

I have not known the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] for very many years. I am probably the least senior of the Members from Michigan in that regard. But I have known him long enought to know what an outstanding person he is.

My first acquaintance with him was serving with his son, Christopher, in the Michigan Senate for several years, and Chris and I came to be good friends partly because we shared a technical background, partly because we have common interests, even though we are from opposite parties, and we worked on a number of issues together and got a considerable amount accomplished. But I decided, if JOHN DINGELL was anything like his son, Christopher, he was a fine person, and it was a pleasure when I arrived here to discover indeed that that impression was correct. I must confees I was always puzzled as an outsider at the power that JOHN DINGELL was reuputed to have. I recall an article in the Michigan newspapers when Mr. Foley was elected Speaker of the House. The article stated that JOHN DINGELL could have had the job, but did not want it, and the reason was that he had more power as chairman of the Committee on Commerce than he would have had as Speaker of the House.

When I arrived here I realized why everyone considered him such a powerful member of the House. He was not only the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, but he had also defined the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce to include virtually everything that came before the House of Representatives.

That reminds me of the comment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] a few moments ago about the exceedingly good knowledge of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] about the rules of the House, and that surprised me, because I assumed during his 40 years here he had probably managed to rewrite most of the rules of the House so that they would make more sense and could be used properly.

But what particularly impressed me when I arrived in the Congress was the kindness and courteous attitude displayed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] as the dean of our delegation. He introduced me to the House. He was extremely helpful to me, and I thought that was exceedingly gracious that the dean of the delegation, one of the wisest Members of the House of Representatives, certainly the most experienced, took the time to be considerate and thoughtful toward me as I made my maiden voyage, which is always a different thing when entering as a result of a special election, because you are thrown into the maelstrom. It is similar to sitting in a tree above the river waiting for a canoe to go by and trying to jump into the canoe without tipping it over.

☐ 2045

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was very gracious and helpful in getting me established in the House, helping me learn its myriad ways. I certainly appreciated that.

Mr. Speaker, I am here not only to give tribute to Mr. DINGELL, but also to his wife Debbie, who I had the pleasure of meeting shortly after I arrived. What I have said of him is true, in many ways, of Mrs. DINGELL as well; being very thoughtful, very kind, very helpful to me in getting settled here, and also to my wife. I appreciate her thoughtfulness as well, and particularly the way she organized events for the Michigan delegation. I found that also to be a real asset.

Mr. DINGELL is a gentleman, a sportsman, a man of courage, a man of honesty, a man of integrity, all extremely valuable attributes in the House of Representatives. I wish that there were more Members of the House who had these characteristics, and we are here tonight to honor Mr. DINGELL, Congressman from Michigan for 40 years, for what he has taught us and for what he has shown us about being

not only a good representative, but a civil human being who is kind and helpful to all those around him. I thank you very much for your service to our State and our Nation, Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. BONIOR. Thank you, Vern, for your very lovely remarks.

I yield to the gentleman from the upper Peninsula and parts of the lower Peninsula of Michigan, BART STUPAK.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. BONIOR] but I am also honored tonight to be able to rise and pay tribute to my good friend, JOHN DINGELL, and celebrate his 40 years here and all the accomplishments and achievements he has accomplished over these last 40 years.

I came in when the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WELDON] was talking. I could not help but overhear the comment that there is always a degree of fear associated with Mr. DINGELL, but it is a very respectful fear. This morning I was at a meeting and there were Democrats there and Republicans and Independents and business leaders from around town. We got to talking about the degree of animosity or the tensions that are on the floor as we are here during the holiday season, and how tempers grow short at times.

The people and the Members who have been here the longest said, ''You know,'' because I had the honor of serving with Mr. DINGELL on the Committee on Commerce, ''that there are one or two committees in this whole House where there is not the friction between the Democrats and the Republicans on the committee because of the way, when Mr. DINGELL was chairman, he treated the Republicans, and the gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. BLILEY].''

They said the Committee on Commerce has set the example, and that example is truly, JOHN DINGELL, you always treat people in a professional, respectful, civilized manner, whether you are Democrat or Republican. We wish the other committees would take up from JOHN's leadership and copy his style, because I think things would run much smoother, especially right now when time is short and tempers are getting a little frayed right now. So, JOHN, you bring a degree of civility which is recognized not only within this body but also outside this body.

I had the pleasure of serving in the Michigan legislature with JOHN's son Christopher. Tonight we have touched upon John Dingell, Senior, JOHN DINGELL here present with us, his son Christopher, his wife Debbie. I think the DINGELL family has given so much to this country and to Michigan that it is only right that we honor the whole family, because without the whole family, JOHN DINGELL could not be the individual he is that we have come to love and respect in this body.

I appreciated it when I came here 3 years ago, the outward hand, and a big hand, I may add, was given to me by JOHN DINGELL. His wife, Debbie, befriended my wife, Laurie, and they have made our times out here when Laurie comes out so much more personable, so much more enjoyable to have them with us, to be our personal friends.

Professionally, he has helped me immensely, being a young Member, learning the ropes, helping me to get on the Committee on Commerce, where I learned underneath JOHN. He has become my mentor. I learn every time I have an opportunity to talk with him. He has helped me immensely. He has helped Michigan, he has helped northern Michigan, and he certainly has helped this country.

I hope those who are listening tonight take a special note to those who would advocate term limits, how term limits is really the wrong thing for this country when you have someone like JOHN DINGELL. I hope they stop and understand that we speak here very affectionately of JOHN DINGELL as the individual, but also very affectionately of JOHN DINGELL and his expertise, and the knowledge that he brings to this institution; that once he leaves this institution, for whatever reason, that knowledge is lost, that expertise is lost. We cannot bring it back. The advice, the leadership, the moral compass he has set for this House, that is something that would be lost. So those who advocate term limits, we rely upon JOHN DINGELL and others who have been here more than three terms or four terms for advice on the complex issues of the day.

Tonight I would like to say thank you. I consider it a high honor to know you, JOHN DINGELL, to have worked with you, to be a friend with you, to be a friend of yours, and I always appreciate it when that big paw of JOHN DINGELL gives me a slap on the shoulder or on the back. To a young Member like me, it means so much that Members who we respect and admire acknowledge us, give us some guidance, and always have a willing ear to help us in difficult times, and even when we are having some fun around this place.

We look forward to many more years of working with you, JOHN, and you have a fine family. Christopher and Debbie are great folks, and we really do appreciate your 40 years here. I have only been here for 3, but I have 37 more in me. I hope you do, too. I thank you very much.

Mr. BONIOR. Our time is just about up, so I want to close by saying to JOHN how much we admire, respect, and love you for your service to your district, your State, and the people of this great Nation. We look forward to working with you and Debbie and Christopher and your family in the years to come. We thank you so very much.

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

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my dear friend, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. BONIOR] for his kind words, and tell him how much I cherish his friendship and how much I love him, and how grateful I am to him for having done this. It has been a singular honor, a somewhat uncomfortable moment, but nothing has been said tonight that I feel there is a strong need for me to deny.

I want to thank all of my colleagues who have stayed up so late to participate in this event and tell them how much I appreciate the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. KNOLLENBERG] the gentleman from Tennessee, [Mr. GORDON] the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. LEVIN] the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. GOODLING] with whose dad I served, and who was a great friend of mine in times past and with whom we wrote great legislation; my good friend, Mr. BARCIA, the gentlemen from Michigan, [Mr. CHRYSLER] Mr. SMITH, and Mr. EHLERS, who has provided some remarkable leadership in the area of the environment, and for which I am grateful, and my partner and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WELDON] who worked with me on the Migratory Bird Commission. We have done great work in a small area which is so little known that it is able to be uniquely effective, and we are very proud. Also my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. STUPAK]. I am grateful to you and to Speaker GINGRICH, the gentleman from Georgia. I want to express my appreciation to him for his friendship and for his being here tonight. It means a great deal to me.

I am honored that you have mentioned my wife, Deborah, who is very dear to me and who is an extremely important part of this family and of whatever success I have had. Her wisdom and goodness and loyalty have been a shining light and a source of enormous strength to me. I am singularly blessed in having had a wonderful family, a great mother who lent strength and dignity to the family, and a dad who left a great tradition, of which I am very proud, and wonderful children.

We come from, as does my good friend, Mr. BONIOR a family of Polish immigrants, and that tradition is something of which I am enormously proud. I have served and represented a great district, the Sixteenth District. It is called the Down Rivers, and the people who live there are great people who work hard, raise great families, take pride in their communities, and are great Americans. They were the arsenal of democracy in time of war. They are people who are proud of and work hard on behalf of their communities.

I owe an enormous debt to a great staff, which has served me and this body, the committees and the people of the Sixteenth District for many years with great dedication and decency, and I have had the privilege of serving, as mentioned, on the wonderful Committee on Energy and Commerce, which is a great institution and was made so

under the leadership of Sam Rayburn, who I admired. I had the benefit of his wisdom and guidance and teaching, as I did of some other great speakers, like John McCormack, to whom I hope God will be very, very kind, and I know he will, and our great friend, Tip O'Neill, who was a wonderful and unique man.

I would just like to say that it has been a singular honor to serve here for 40 years. This is a great institution, a great body. Great human beings are here, wonderful people. Great friendships are generated across the aisles. In spite of the sometimes terrifying partisanship that exists in this institution, really strong and wonderful friendships exist here. They are the thing of which service in this place is really made to be meaningful, good, and it is something which contributes to the goodness and the strength of the country. I am proud that I have been here.

I seriously doubt if I will be able to ever express my full gratitude to my colleagues for the things they have said about me tonight. I note that I will not be denying them, and that, I will enjoy them always. I will say it may, perhaps, have gone a bit to my head, and perhaps some of my colleagues and I think the lovely Deborah will have to inform me that I perhaps should not take the events of the evening too seriously. I want to also mention the fact that she was sitting up there with her very special friend, Mary Anne Gingrich, who is a wonderful and a fine woman.

I want to just conclude by saying that it is always a privilege to serve as part of this institution. It is a great body, it is a wonderful place. It is the people's House, and in good times and bad, in differences and in friendship, we serve the public interest, and remarkably well. We may all take pride in that. We may all take pride in the fact that we have had the privilege of serving in perhaps the greatest and most democratic institution in the entirety of not only the free world but the rest of the world.

I thank my colleagues for what they have said about me. I am grateful to each of you, both for what you have said, and your friendship. Thank you very much.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and admiration that I rise today to pay tribute to my very good friend and mentor, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL on the occasion of his 40 years in Congress.

When I came to the Congress as a freshman in 1985, one of my primary goals was to become a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, and to serve under the leadership of the legendary ''Chairman DINGELL.'' It took me a few years, but with JOHN's help and strong support, in 1989, I became one of only two new members of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

It was truly an honor and a privilege to watch Chairman DINGELL shepherd legislation through his Committee. In those days, almost forty percent of the legislation considered on the House Floor was reported by the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

During the 101st Congress, the Energy and Commerce Committee tackled one the most controversial and comprehensive measures ever considered, the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

As the author of our nation's most important and lasting environmental statutes, including the Clean Water Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, JOHN DINGELL's environmental record was then, and remains today, second to none. But his skills as a legislator and a deal maker would be put to the test like never before in the effort to reauthorize the Clean Air Act. It would clearly take a herculean effort to strike a balance between competing economic interests and the need to cleanup our nation's air. Yet that is exactly what JOHN DINGELL achieved. He pulled together disparate interests and presided over the passage of a landmark and historic measure to dramatically improve the quality of our air while preserving economic growth and job opportunities in every region of the nation. It is truly a legislative achievement that has touched the life of every American.

I served on the conference committee that developed the final version of this comprehensive legislation, and I was deeply honored that Chairman DINGELL chose a new member of his committee to play a role in this historic event. I will be forever grateful.

Of course, the Clean Air Act is just one of the many achievements of his storied 40 year career. He passed legislation to improve our energy efficiency, remove asbestos from our public schools, improve clinical laboratory standards, and establish strong federal nursing home care standards.

And during the 1980's when everyone was railing against waste, fraud and abuse in government, JOHN DINGELL was doing something about it. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Chairman DINGELL uncovered corrupt billing practices by defense contractors and major violations at nuclear weapons facilities. He also led the effort to revamp the Red Cross' blood collection system and exposed corruption in the generic drug industry. Chairman DINGELL found waste and he cleaned it up.

JOHN DINGELL has enjoyed four decades of unparalleled success as one of the greatest leaders and legislators who has ever graced this august body. The people of Michigan and this nation owe him a great debt of gratitude.

I am proud to call JOHN DINGELL my colleague, and more importantly, my friend.

Congratulations to you and Debbie on your 40 years of service. And I know, there is much, much more to come.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join my colleagues tonight in honoring a friend and colleague, Representative JOHN DINGELL, on the occasion of his 40th anniversary serving in the U.S. House of Representatives. His 40 years of dedicated service in this House on behalf of the people of the 16th District of Michigan is unmatched by any of us here today and by few in the long history of this institution.

JOHN DINGELL, Mr. Chairman, as I still like to call him, is a true crusader in a form and fashion that we do not see too much of lately. Grounded in principle and integrity and skilled in legislative negotiating he is an undaunted leader who will always persevere.

There are few people who have made their mark on such a wide variety of policy issues ranging from clean air and clean water, to protection of our blood supply, removal of asbestos from our schools, protection from securities and telemarketing fraud, increased railroad safety, and promoting energy efficiency.

In tackling these often controversial issues he has a real knack for achieving that delicate balance between progress and productivity, and protection for the consumer and the environment. Through it all he has never compromised his principles working equally for improved job opportunities and worker protections for industrial workers, fighting for the preservation of our environment, and protecting our nation's consumers.

His achievements which have improved the lives of the residents of Michigan's 16th district and indeed the entire nation are too numerous to mention. But one that stands out for me is Medicare. As a new Member of Congress in 1965, I remember JOHN DINGELL and his role in shepherding the Medicare bill through the House. It was a difficult task for anyone and JOHN took on the challenge with the tenacity of a pit bull. It is because of JOHN DINGELL that we have a Medicare program today.

For a young, new Member of Congress watching JOHN DINGELL at work, fighting for health care for our seniors was inspiring and most of all educational. Today, 30 years later, I still learn from JOHN DINGELL and look highly upon his guidance and counsel.

Not serving on the same committees I don't often get the chance to socialize or spend time with JOHN, but this summer we both had a chance to attend the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II in Honolulu Hawaii, before his service in this House JOHN served as a soldier in World War II. And I think it appropriate that tonight we recognize not only his 40 years of service to this institution but his 50 plus years of public service.

From his military service to his tenure in the U.S. House, JOHN DINGELL exemplifies the true meaning of a public servant. Thank you JOHN for your dedication to making this world better for us and for future generations. It is an honor to call you my colleague and my friend.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to House minority whip, DAVID BONIOR, for reserving this special order. I am pleased to join my colleague and Members of the Michigan congressional delegation in saluting the dean of the delegation, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

Forty years ago, JOHN DINGELL was elected to this legislative body. At the beginning of the 104th Congress, he marked 40 years of uninterrupted House service. This represents the longest record of continuous service in the House of Representatives. As he celebrates this important milestone in his legislative career, it is fitting that we pause to salute Congressman DINGELL.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN DINGELL was elected to the United States Congress in 1955. He came to Washington armed with an insider's view of Capitol Hill. For 23 years JOHN's father, John D. Dingell, Sr., had represented the people of Michigan in the Congress. Thus, JOHN DINGELL arrived on Capitol Hill well versed in the

legislative process and parliamentary procedure.

Like his father, JOHN also brought to the Congress the highest level of commitment to public service. During his 40 year tenure in Congress, the residents of Michigan's 16th Congressional District, and indeed the Nation, has benefitted from his tireless efforts and unselfish dedication.

Mr. Speaker, as we review his legislative record, I note that Congressman DINGELL has compiled a distinguished record of legislative accomplishments that reflect highly upon this institution and the Nation. He has taken the lead on important issues which impact the lives of all Americans.

JOHN DINGELL led the fight on health care reform, greater environmental protections and the reshaping of the Nation's telecommunications industry. Congressman DINGELL has been instrumental in writing every major law to improve air quality standards, including the Clean Air Act of 1990. His efforts were also instrumental in the passage of the first ever Americans With Disabilities Act. Other legislative accomplishments include authoring the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act, just to name a few.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the U.S. Congress as a freshman lawmaker in 1969, Congressman DINGELL was one of the individuals to whom I turned for leadership and guidance. His knowledge of the legislative process is unsurpassed. More importantly, JOHN DINGELL was willing to give freely of his time and counsel. This is something that I will always remember about this great statesman.

Mr. Speaker, I take special pride in joining members of the Michigan congressional delegation in saluting Congressman JOHN DINGELL. His service in the Congress has been exemplary. He represents the best that this institution stands for, and he is held in high esteem throughout the Nation. I extend my best wishes and salute our distinguished colleague and friend, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a longtime friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL of Michigan. Last Wednesday marked the 40th anniversary of his election to the House of Representatives. JOHN DINGELL is the longest serving House Member of the 104th Congress, and I think we all should take a minute to reflect on the distinguished record of this distinguished gentleman.

JOHN DINGELL has spent his career fighting for the betterment of our country on a broad range of issues. As chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, a post he held for 14 years, JOHN DINGELL was able to make a real difference for improving the lives of all Americans. He was instrumental in writing every major law to improve air quality standards, radon testing and lead paint removal and was the author of the Clean Air Act of 1990. He is the author of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and has been effective in protecting millions of acres of wetland and controlling pollution in the Great Lakes.

In 1987, JOHN DINGELL wrote strong Federal nursing home care standards in response to widespread abuse in our nation's nursing homes. He ushered through the Americans with Disabilities Act, the law which affords disabled Americans with the same rights and privileges other Americans enjoy.

JOHN DINGELL served as chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee, where he was able to reveal dozens of instance of waste and abuse. His subcommittee directed an investigation of the safety of our Nation's blood supply that prompted the Red Cross to completely revamp its blood collection system. He exposed corruption in the generic drug industry and uncovered corrupt billing practices by defense contractors. JOHN DINGELL investigated waste and abuse in public and private institutions with such tenaciousness that correspondence from the Dingell Committee was one of the most feared letters in Washington.

I have had the privilege to know JOHN DINGELL more than 30 years; he hired me to work on his staff in Detroit prior to may election to Congress in 1964, and we have worked closely together ever since. He is one of the most dignified, honest and hard-working members this body has ever witnessed—and today those are qualities that are becoming harder to find in the House of Representatives. Congratulations, JOHN DINGELL, for 40 years of distinguished service.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to Rep. JOHN DINGELL as we celebrate the 40th anniversary of this election to Congress. It has been an honor for me to serve on the House Energy and Commerce Committee under his effective leadership. Throughout his years of distinguished service, John always has been a fierce advocate and tough negotiator, and his legislative accomplishments are impressive.

John's efforts led to passage of milestone legislation to protect the environment. He was instrumental in passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and passed strong Federal nursing home care standards. He helped write legislation that protected the consumer from unsafe products and unfair practices. He led efforts to expose and end corruption and waste in the public and private sectors and wrote legislation that promoted competition in the telecommunications industry. Although John and I sometimes disagreed philosophically about the nature and scope of specific legislation, we developed a good working relationship and a special friendship over the years.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN DINGELL continues with great distinction his family's legacy of public service, following in the footsteps of his father, JOHN DINGELL, Sr., who preceded him in the House of Representatives. His son, Christopher, carries on the family tradition through his service as a Michigan State Senator—and perhaps he also will join this body one day. Such dedication to public service, Mr. Speaker, is part of our rich American heritage. Such commitment to public service, Mr. Speaker, deserves our respect and our gratitude. My friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL, has served our country well and no doubt will continue to fight the good fight as long as he is a Member of the House of Representatives. I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to this great warrior.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Representative from the 16th District of Michigan JOHN DINGELL, for his 40 years of service in this body. This length of service, I am told, represents the longest continuous run of any Member who has ever served in the House of Representatives.

These days, as we witness a rash of voluntary retirements from this body, it is refreshing to reflect upon JOHN DINGELL'S career and his continued, and still very much intense, service to his constituents in this body. Leafing through just about any write-up on Members of Congress such as ''Politics In America'' it is impossible not to find the words ''powerful'' and ''influential'' as descriptions of JOHN DINGELL, especially in terms of his tenure as chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Indeed, during his chairmanship, JOHN'S legislative savvy and tenacious oversight activities grew to almost mythical proportions.

It is true that JOHN ruled the Committee on Energy and Commerce between 1981 and 1995, and that few dared to cross him. But in my dealings with him, I knew of a kinder and gentler JOHN DINGELL. A Member of this body who would listen to your concerns, and who if he could, would seek to accommodate them into his legislative strategy. I personally found this to be true during our consideration of the Clean Air Act reauthorization in 1990, and when we devised the Energy Policy Act of 1992.

JOHN DINGELL represents the type of Member many of us view as the ideal. So to the dean of the House of Representatives, I salute you. Congratulations on your years of service, and I look forward to seeing the distinguished gentleman from Michigan serving in this body for many more years. You are a dear and true friend, ''Big John,'' to me and many in my family. Thank you.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Representative JOHN DINGELL, the dean of the House of Representatives, on the 40th anniversary of his election to Congress.

As all of us recognize, JOHN DINGELL possesses a strong commitment to public service and a stellar record of legislative accomplishment. John has worked to enact meaningful legislation to protect the environment, improve health care, and defend the consumer from unsafe products and unfair practices. In fact, John has authored several of the most important environmental protection measures, including the Endangered Species Act of 1973, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990.

In addition, as chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, JOHN has written legislation to lower cable television rates, to stop securities and telemarketing fraud, and to improve energy efficiency.

It has been an honor and a privilege to serve in the House with Representative DINGELL. Clearly, JOHN's hard work and dedication to public service have improved the lives of all Americans.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to pay the highest tribute to my long-time colleague, Commerce Committee ranking member, and great friend, the Honorable JOHN DINGELL of Michigan. On this day, marking his 40 years of distinguished and unparalleled service to this institution, it is only proper that we take this time to reflect upon the momentous impact Representative DINGELL's dedicated work has had on the lives of all Americans.

The list of Congressman DINGELL's accomplishments is long and impressive. For four decades, he has been a leader in the fight for expanded access to quality health care for all of our citizens. From the battle to create Medicare to the current attempts by the majority to

destroy it, JOHN DINGELL has stood firmly on the side of the people, upholding the rights and needs of seniors across the Nation. He was instrumental in establishing standards governing nursing home care in response to abuses throughout the system and shepherded the Individuals with Disabilities Act through this body, giving a voice in Congress to those with special needs.

On the environmental front, Representative DINGELL has been a strong protector of our country's vast and valuable public lands and wildlife, authoring the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act. In addition, the Congressman has staunchly championed the public health and safety of our children and families through his efforts to improve the quality of the air we breath and the water we drink.

Both the Clean Air Act Amendments and the Clean Water Act are the products of JOHN DINGELL's commitment to our future generations. When he could easily have backed down from pressure by major business interests such as the auto industry on these and other major fights over the years, Congressman DINGELL held his ground.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, I constantly marveled at the fairness that JOHN DINGELL, as chairman, exercised in moving legislation through that committee. I recall working closely with him on numerous occasions as we tackled such weighty issues as the divestiture of AT&T and the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992. Each and every time I approached Congressman DINGELL with the concerns of my constituents on a particular matter before the committee, JOHN treated me and my constituents with the utmost respect and consideration, always welcoming our input.

In his long-standing role as chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee, Representative DINGELL has been singlehandedly responsible for uncovering some of the most profligate cases of waste, fraud, and abuse at several government departments—saving American taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars. His investigations of U.S. defense contractors turned up the infamous $600 toilet seat while his probes of EPA contract mismanagement and lack of enforcement practices in the 1980's fundamentally improved the functioning of that Agency.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on for hours. The contributions Congressman DINGELL has made to our Nation and its citizens cannot be overstated. JOHN DINGELL is truly a Representative of the people. I am proud to serve with him, and congratulate him on this historic day.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to pay tribute to one of the most remarkable individuals the Congress has ever known, Congressman JOHN DINGELL of Michigan.

As a Member of Congress, JOHN DINGELL has helped write landmark legislation to protect the environment, promote American competitiveness, and defend consumers form unsafe and unfair practices. He has written legislation to improve energy efficiency, stop securities and telemarketing fraud, and lower cable television rates by promoting competition in the industry.

Under his guidance, the Energy and Commerce Committee passed measures to remove asbestos from public schools, improve clinical laboratory standards increase railroad safety, and promote the development of alternative fuels.

Throughout Michigan, JOHN DINGELL is known as a defender of the people; an advocate for issues that are often unpopular but always critical. In this body, he has come to represent an ideal that is in short supply: the willingness to take a stand for what is right, and what is good for this country, regardless of political implications.

JOHN DINGELL is legendary for his tenacity, especially when it comes to fighting for causes in which he believes. He has been a mentor and a friend, and it has been a great honor knowing him over the years. His outspoken leadership in the area of environmental protection was inspirational in my own legislation to fight environmental injustice in poor and minority communities.

His legislative accomplishments are far too numerous to list, but let me simply say that without the presence of JOHN DINGELL this body—and this nation—would have missed one of the few great men of our time.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr.Speaker, it is indeed my pleasure to join my House colleagues in saluting a man whose 40-year contributions to our Nation are only exceed by his commitment to public service and his unswerving sense of personal, political and professional integrity, Congressman JOHN DINGELL.

For 40 years JOHN DINGELL has been a champion in the fight to protect consumers from fraud, waste, corruption and environmental pollution. The 16th District of Michigan and all Americans can be confident that their welfare has been well served by the former seven term Commerce Committee chairman.

As a member of the Commerce Committee, I have fond memories of my initial introduction to the former chairman, whose vast reputation was only matched by his gigantic physical stature and expansive intellect. During my tenure as a committee member I have marveled at his mastery of legislative procedure and his gift for building political coalitions. Without equivocation, JOHN DINGELL has created an indelible impression upon anyone with whom he has come in contact. When the political annals are written about legendary members of Congress, without question, JOHN DINGELL's name will appear at the top of that list.

America owes a tremendous debt of gratitude to Congressman DINGELL for his discovery of corrupt billing practices by government contractors, and major safety violations at nuclear weapons facilities. And it was JOHN DINGELL who was directly responsible for prompting the American Red Cross to revamp its blood collection system. Americans with disabilities can now function much more effectively and comfortably given the input of Congressman DINGELL and his contributions to the Americans with Disabilities Act. And every American who cherishes breathing clean air, owes a tremendous debt to Congressman DINGELL for his efforts in promoting the Clean Air Act of 1990.

I consider JOHN DINGELL a personal friend and mentor. His 40 years of selfless service merit recognition and commendation. The institution of Congress, and the taxpaying public, has gotten the best that JOHN DINGELL has had to offer. I salute him for his years of service to, and love for the United States Congress

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, for the past 40 years, the people of Michigan's 16th district have benefited from the representation of JOHN DINGELL. JOHN is a gentleman whose example challenges us in the House of Representatives, and will continue to do so.

Michigan is consistently recognized each year as one of the most influentional delegations in the House. Through experience and leadership, both sides of the aisle have made their legislative mark for both their State and the entire Nation. JOHN demonstrates both tenacity for his personal interests and causes, as well as a spirit of cooperation within the legislative process.

His record reflects a dedication of addressing needs of his district while balancing those with the needs of the Nation. His hard work, legislative ability and conscientious votings have earned him the admiration of his constituents and fellow Members of Congress.

I join my fellow colleagues in paying tribute to JOHN, his accomplishments and his continued service to our Nation.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my long-time friend and colleague, JOHN DINGELL, as he marks his anniversary of serving four decades in the U.S. Congress.

JOHN is certainly a landmark around here, one of the true legends to ever serve in the Congress. He is the House's longest serving Member and no one has worked harder on so many important and complicated issues over the years.

He was one of the most outstanding chairmen we've ever had and he certainly made his mark on Energy and Commerce matters. JOHN DINGELL has always been respected for his leadership and legislative capabilities.

He remains one of most able and capable leaders in the Congress. I hope JOHN will serve many more years here. We need people of his caliber and intellect as our public servants. His fine record of accomplishment will always be remembered and appreciated.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DINGELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the 60 minutes, but I will be happy to start off, and I am going to talk about the defense bill, I will be happy to start off by yielding to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. I am a Republican, and the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, is a Democrat. I

have been here 3 years, and what I have discovered is he is just a good person. He cares about people. His knowledge is extraordinary. I served with his son, Chris Dingell, in the Michigan Senate for 10 years. I asked Christ about 3 years ago if he was going to follow the family tradition and run for the U.S. Congress. Chris said, ''Nick, you wouldn't believe how hard dad works.'' I did not believe it then, I believe it now.

JOHN, I think, you know, this is not a eulogy, it does not mean you can relax or let down. We need your experience, we need your help, we need your camaraderie to make some of the tough decisions ahead of us. It is a shame, you know more about many subjects and many areas and probably you have more knowledge than anybody else in the world in some of the aspects of your experience over the last 40 years. I personally think you should work harder and write a book. Debbie, encourage him to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be from Michigan and a colleague of a gentleman that has helped Michigan a great deal and helped America a great deal. Thank you.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to state that I am not from the State of Michigan, but I have had the opportunity to serve with JOHN DINGELL for the past 3 years I have been here in the House of Representatives, and I just wanted to take a moment, just a few minutes, a few seconds, actually, and just stop by and say JOHN, I want to thank you for your years of service, 40 years.

I am only 33, but I tell you, you have been serving the people of this country as long as I have been living, and it was an extraordinary opportunity for me to meet you, not only meet you, but also to develop a friendship with you, and I want to thank you for the time that you have given me in your office and talked to me about the oil and gas industries and issues relative to my State. As a young Member of this Congress, I want to thank you for taking out the time with me.

I want to also thank you for giving me the opportunity to be in your district. It was encouraging to see a Member like the gentleman from Michigan, JOHN DINGELL, at a rally at the University of Michigan, to see young students rally around a Member of this institution.

□ 2200

Martin Luther King once said, ''The measure of a great man is not where he stands in moments of confidence; it is where he stands in moments of challenge and controversy.''

Through your 40 years of service, I am sure you have been through a lot. I just want to say, thank you so much; on behalf of not only the college students in Michigan, but across the country, thank you for your years of service.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank our colleague for those very eloquent comments, and I yield to our friend from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I have been patiently waiting here just in case there was no one here to take the Republican hour, and I am happy to make additional comments about JOHN DINGELL, the icon of this institution.

I came here in 1983 with a very large freshman class, I think it was something like 57 Democrats and a total of 80, and about two-thirds of the members of my freshman class all wanted to serve on the Committee on Commerce. I had a mindset for education and labor, so I was not a part of that group.

I can speak objectively, because I am not a member of the Committee on Commerce, I am not from Michigan, but I would like to add my voice to those who paid tribute to JOHN DINGELL tonight.

I could go on and on and talk about the Individuals with Disabilities Act, a piece of legislation which a number of enemies swore would never get past the Committee on Energy, but it of course got past the Committee on Energy, and in the end, all of the Members of Congress, Republicans and Democrats, joined in making that act pass as a result of the kind of leadership shown by JOHN DINGELL.

On term limitations, somebody has already spoken. I think JOHN DINGELL's 40 years in the Congress certainly answer the assertion made that we have people here too long. I have always argued that term limitations are a bit silly. Nobody goes out to look for a lawyer fresh out of law school to take a case that is important; you do not go to surgery expecting a doctor fresh out of medical school to put your life in their hands; and certainly it should not be done in a complex job like this.

The legislative process is just as complex, and those who insist that you do not need to stay here long to understand it are misunderstanding the process. I think JOHN DINGELL shows that in order to succeed in the legislative process here in America you have to have the wisdom and skill of Socrates, Plato and Aristotle, combined with the skills of Machiavelli and Jesus Christ all together. It is a very complex process and it takes a great deal; and just as nobody would say that Einstein, because he had a head of white hair and looked very old, should step down because of term limitations, I think JOHN DINGELL will never be asked to step down, in deference to some kind of theory of term limitations.

JOHN DINGELL is the Einstein of the Federal legislative process, and it is a pleasure for me to and an honor for me to raise my voice with others to pay tribute to JOHN DINGELL, Mr. Chairman, from the State of Michigan.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank our colleague for joining us and I thank all of our colleagues who have joined with Congressman JOHN BONIOR, in his Special Order and the beginning of my Special Order this evening; and I again wanted to thank Mr. DINGELL for his tireless efforts in this institution.

Mr. Speaker, I will take approximately 20 or so minutes to discuss a piece of legislation that has finally made its way through this body and the other body and is now headed down to the White House for consideration by the President, and that is the 1996 defense authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening the Senate passed this piece of legislation, which is the major authorization bill for our entire military, by a vote of 51 to 43. Last week the House went on record and supported the exact same conference report for this bill with a total amount of almost 270 votes. I think the final vote was 267.

The bill, when it originally passed the House, Mr. Speaker, gathered 300 signatures, the largest number of Members in a bipartisan way to support a defense bill, certainly in the 9 years that I have been here, and it is certainly showing a strong bipartisan backing of our defense authorization process.

In fact, when the bill left the Committee on National Security of the House, it passed by a vote of 48 to 3, the largest vote we have ever had, at least in my time here, in support of a bill coming out of committee.

So this is in fact a good bill, Mr. Speaker. Despite intense lobbying by the White House and by the Secretary asking Members not to support final passage of the conference report, getting almost 270 Members of this body to support a national defense authorization is a major accomplishment.

In fact, there are several major items in this legislation that really merit the President to fully consider supporting this; not to do as has been rumored, and that is to veto this legislation.

The bill is consistent with the appropriated defense dollars for the next fiscal year. We worked very closely with the appropriators to make sure that our dollar amounts were consistent, that there in fact was not a large disagreement between the dollar amounts for the various items within the budgets, both authorization and appropriation.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the conference report for the defense authorization for the 1996 fiscal year contains major legislation dealing with acquisition reform. This administration and Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle have repeatedly stated that we need to reform the way that we spend our DOD dollars, that we can save significant amounts of money, that we can buy better equipment and materials for our military and in the end save the taxpayers their tax dollars. That acquisition reform is in this legislation.

If President Clinton vetoes this bill, we lose the acquisition reform which is so critical in this year of declining defense dollars. In addition, we have the pay raise authorization.

Last week, we had the debate on whether or not to support the troops. The President asked us to support the troops; we supported the troops. Members on both sides of the aisle, depending upon which version of legislation that they supported, were unanimous in one argument on the House floor, and that was to support the troops as they are being deployed to Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, there is no better way to support our troops than to vote for the authorization to give them a pay raise. Contrary to what is being stated here in this body, the military personnel will not receive their full pay increase if we do not have the authorization bill approved by the President and become law. The appropriation bill will not do it alone.

Those are major reasons why this President needs to consider supporting this legislation and express the urgency of putting this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard some comments that perhaps the reason why the President might want to veto this bill is because of what we have done in the area of missile defense. Mr. Speaker, that is an area that I have worked on this entire year as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development and have worked to try to turn around the whole debate on protecting the American people from the threat of a missile attack, either an accident or deliberate, by any Nation, not just Russia. In fact, I would agree with my colleagues that what we did in the missile defense area is perhaps one of the single biggest policy changes that we made from the President's stated policy objectives when he came out with his defense request for 1996.

It is a tough issue, but Mr. Speaker, we have tried very carefully and very exactly to make sure that what we came out with is a bill that this President can sign into law.

We were very careful this year, Mr. Speaker, during the authorization process in the committee and on the House floor; we were careful that in plussing up the funding for theater missile defense, for national missile defense, and for cruise missile defense that we do it in a way that was consistent with what the administration and the Pentagon thought should be our priorities.

Mr. Speaker, as I have sat on this floor, many times over the past several months, each of the areas in which we plussed up funding in missile defense were given to us by the administration's point person for missile defense policy. We asked Gen. Mal O'Neill, who heads the BMD office, the missile defense operation for the Pentagon, to tell us where he would put additional dollars if the Congress were to provide those dollars to him.

So we followed his advice in plussed-up money for theater missile protection, for a robust national missile program that had been devastated by the President's request, and by a plus-up in the cruise missile area, because of the threat that cruise missile proliferation poses not just to the American people, but to our troops wherever they are deployed, and we did those plus-ups, Mr. Speaker.

We fully funded programs in theater missile defense like those that are being tested right now for use in those theaters where our troops are in fact going to be committed in the future. We plussed up national missile defense to give us the ability over a period of 3, 4, or 5 years, to have a system in place much like one the Russians already have.

Most American people when you ask them whether or not they believe that we have a system like the Russians have to protect themselves against an accidental launch, they would tell you, oh, sure we have a system like that, obvious. They cannot believe that we today do not have a national missile defense system to protect the American people against a rogue nation launch.

Mr. Speaker, we also saw the threat in our hearings of cruise missile proliferation. We saw that 77 nations in the world today have cruise missiles that they are capable of using right now, today. We heard testimony from experts, including the administration, that over 20 nations are today building cruise missiles, some of them very sophisticated, well beyond what we saw with the Scuds, even beyond what we saw with our own capabilities in terms of cruise missiles. We have to put more of our resources in protecting our people and our troops from the threat of a cruise missile situation.

Mr. Speaker, we did all of these things and we did them finally in a way that this administration could not stand up and say was in violation of the ABM Treaty. That is a very important point, Mr. Speaker, because some in our Congress and in this institution wanted us to take the treaty head on on the bill.

While I have serious reservations about the ABM Treaty, I think in the end the treaty has outlived its usefulness, I think we are dealing in a different world today; I was in agreement that that should be a debate left and a fight left for a different day.

This bill, when it left the House last week and when it left the Senate today, by a vote of 51 to 43, in no way violates the ABM Treaty. In fact, it is totally consistent with the ABM Treaty. We in fact now have on the record both the Army and the Air Force telling us that we can deploy a single-sight system which is compliant with the ABM Treaty, as the Russians already have and have upgraded at least two times since they have had that system, that can protect the entire 48 States and Alaska and Hawaii.

The Air Force says they can do it using the existing Minuteman system with upgrades costing about $2.5 billion over 4 years. The Army says they can do it using THAAD for a cost of $4 billion to $5 billion over the same time period.

Well, we say in our bill that we want a system deployed by the year 2000. We want a system that is not pie-in-the-sky. We want a system where we know that technology is available today that we can afford that will give us no more than what the Russians have. My colleagues on the other side during the debate on the conference bill last week said, well, the Russians' system does not protect the entire nation of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the ABM system that Russia deploys today protects 80 percent of the population of Russia because it was designed when it used to be the Soviet Union. So they already have a system, so that if we were to fire a missile at Russia, they could protect their citizens. If a rogue nation like Iraq or Iran or Libya were to fire a missile, they could, in effect, shoot up their missiles to protect their people.

We have no such system today, even though it is totally and completely allowable under the terms of the ABM Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we send to President Clinton tonight, approved by both bodies of this institution, does not violate any treaty, and if the President says that to the American people tomorrow, he is just not being truthful.

Mr. Speaker, that is really an outrage, because we have been extremely careful. In fact, in the negotiations that we were involved in with the Senate, with Senator THURMAN and Senator NUNN and with Senator LOTT, we were very careful in bringing in the administration's point person on missile defense, Bob Bell. He raised eight specific concerns in the bill with us, issues involving missile defense. We were able to resolve each of those items, and finally it came down to Bob Bell realizing that we were not going to give in on the issue of a date certain for deployment.

He found out also, and I know he has called various officials in the administration that would be able to respond to this question, that what we have done in this bill in no way violates the ABM Treaty.

So what is really going to come down to the actual decision of the President and whether to veto this bill or not if he does veto it and uses the issue of missile defense, is very simple: It is that this President does not want to provide a system to provide any defensive protection for the American people.

□ 2215

Mr. Speaker, that is outrageous because we are not talking about building more offensive weapons. We are beyond that now. We are talking about defending the American people. We are

talking about a defensive system that would be able to shoot an incoming missile if it were fired not just from Russia but from China, who we know is developing a CSS–2 system that has tremendous capabilities. We know the North Koreans are about ready to deploy a new system that could eventually reach Hawaii and parts of Alaska. We know that Iraq and Iran want to buy these systems.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I am going to include an article that appeared in the Washington Post on December 15 where the United Nations came out and said they have found documentation of missile parts and state-of-the-art technology to be used for long-range missiles that were bound for Iraq, that were made in Russia.

This is not something that came out years ago. This is from the December 15 issue of the Washington Post. I am putting the entire article in the RECORD, because in the article the United Nations verifies that missile components that can be used by Iraq to develop a long-range missile that we cannot defend ourselves against have now been captured, and even though Russia is denying where they came from, they have no idea, the best guess is that someone within the former Soviet Union has made these parts available in the black market.

Mr. Speaker, let me also say that our efforts here are not about sticking a twig in the eye of the Russian nation. This is not about calling the Russian nation an evil empire.

As most of my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, I have been a student of the Russian government and people since I graduated from college with my undergraduate degree in Russian studies. I have spoken the language, I have traveled there, I have lived in homes.

In the past year alone, I have hosted 120 members of the Russian Duma in my office and here on the Hill. I lead the bipartisan effort in the area of energy cooperation with my colleagues GREG LAUGHLIN and STENY HOYER and GLENN POSHARD. For the last 3 years, we have worked with our energy companies to encourage and follow through on joint energy deals.

Just today we learned that the Sakhalin one and two deal had been grandfathered by legislation passed by the Russian Duma. These two projects, when completed, will see the largest western investment of dollars in energy development in the history of Russia and the former Soviet republics.

In the area of the environment, working with Nikolay Vorontsov in the Russian Duma, I lead American efforts to work with the Russians on cleaning up their nuclear waste. In January, I will be in St. Petersburg representing America in a major conference on ocean protection.

Last week, in the first ever subcommittee of our committee on ocean protection, I brought over Aleksey Yablokov, the leading environmental advocate in Russia, a member of Yeltsin's National Security Council, who testified for an hour before my subcommittee in terms of ways that we can work together to deal with the problem of ocean dumping that he helped expose in his homeland of Russian.

We are not about a radical agenda. Mr. Speaker, these efforts are designed to say yes, we want to build a strong relationship with Russian. We want to work with its leadership and its people and its Duma, but we do not want to do it with blinders on and we do not want to walk into a situation where we have some of the former military leaders still thinking that it is the cold war. Some will say, well, that is not true.

Mr. Speaker, let me include some other articles in my special order this evening. The first is an article that appeared in Krymskaya Pravda, and I monitor the FBIS reports, the Foreign Information Broadcast Service, every day. Every article that appears in the Russian media that is highlighted there, I go through.

This one caught my eye from November 28 of this year. It is an article written by Admiral Baltin, who was commander of the Black Sea fleet, hero of the Soviet Union.

Remember, the Russian Navy and the Soviet Navy has had a reputation of being among the best in the world, in many cases able to go toe-to-toe with our Navy. Here we have the commander, the current commander of the Baltic fleet, Admiral Baltin, doing an article in the Russian media about his state of concern for what is happening in his country.

I would encourage all of our colleagues to read this article in depth, Mr. Speaker, because in this article Admiral Baltin makes the case that we are in the midst of World War II. He says this is not a war like we have fought in the past. He refers to it, and I will use his direct quote, as a velvet war, a velvet war because the United States has sucked Russia into a process of not being able to defend itself.

And what does he advocate? He advocates, and I will quote him directly here, ''World War III is not over.'' The last of the elements that are inaccessible to the West is Russia with its nuclear might. He goes on to say that Russia must not do away with its nuclear arsenal but must reinforce it, that it is the only way to deal with the West.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not some radical person in the Russian media. This is the commanding officer, a decorated admiral in charge of the Baltic fleet, just recently, Mr. Speaker, on November 28 of this year.

Now, I am not saying he speaks for Boris Yeltsin, I am not even saying he speaks for Pavel Grachev, but this is the mindset of some of the military leaders inside Russia that we have to be aware of, that we cannot ignore it.

Or, Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps we ought to look at some of the comments made by the fellow I had in America last week before my subcommittee, Aleksey Yablokov. Three articles, again appearing in FBIS, this time on November 21, 1995, a week before he came over here to testify before my subcommittee.

The first article quotes Mr. Yablokov in his criticism of the Russian military. He has done this repeatedly in the Russian press. This article appeared in Itar Tass in Moscow. It was an article that ran on their national TV network.

Yablokov criticizes the Russian General Staff Chief Kolesnikov in his report that Russia only has 40,000 tons of chemical weapons in its arsenal. Yablokov in this article says that is not true. We know Russia has 100,000 tons of chemical weapons.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Member of Congress saying this. This is not some radical journalist saying this. This is a member of Boris Yeltsin's Security Council in the Russian media telling the Russian people that the military is not being honest, that it is not 40,000 tons of chemical weapons, there are 100,000 tons. In this article he says to the military, ''Tell us what you have done with the other 60,000 tons of chemical weapons. Are they hidden someplace? Have you buried them? Where are they?''

The second article, also quoting Mr. Yablokov, deals with miniature nuclear weapons. Again Mr. Yablokov questions the small nuclear weapons that are portable that Russia has, which they admit they have, that can be used in a battlefield environment.

Mr. Yablokov in this case disagrees with the Russian military leadership as to the extent and the potential impact these nuclear weapons could have in a theater of operation, let alone the damage they could cause accidentally. That article appeared, by the way, in Itar Tass, as I mentioned.

The third article appeared in English in Interface in Moscow. It deals with decontaminated nuclear submarines. Mr. Yablokov again is quoted. This time he says that as the Russian military is decommissioning its nuclear submarines, 50 of them still contain nuclear fuel that they do not know how to deal with, and that 7 to 10 of these submarines have nuclear fuel that cannot be extracted for technical reasons.

He goes on to say, and I quote, ''These submarines are the source of super high danger.''

Mr. Speaker, may point is simple: All of us, and certainly me, want to have a stable relationship with Russia. When I go to Russia in January, besides attending a conference on the oceans in St. Petersburg, I will be in Moscow, and I will be following up on establishing a process, a formal process, with members of the Russian Duma National Security Council for an ongoing dialogue with members of our congressional Committee on National Security.

This is an outgrowth of discussions that my good friend and colleague who

I am going to yield to in a moment, DUNCAN HUNTER from California, Chairman FLOYD SPENCE and I, along with Congressman and Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations BOB LIVINGSTON, had with members of the Russian Duma defense committees for 3 hours behind closed doors last spring.

Mr. Speaker, we want stable relations with Russia. Mr. Speaker, I want Russia to succeed economically, and my actions prove that. Mr. Speaker, I want us to help the Russians solve their environmental problems, and my actions prove that.

Mr. Speaker, I am reaching out to Duma members every day. If this President, Mr. Speaker, stands up and says that we are somehow radical people who want to distort the balance between our Nation and Russia, then, Mr. Speaker, I have a problem, and I will deal with that problem very vocally and verbally because the President, or whoever would say that, would in fact not be honest with the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask that the President seriously consider supporting the bill. The elections that occurred this past weekend in Russia showed a small, not a really significant gain, but a gain by the Communist party. They garnered 22 percent of the vote. If you couple that with Zhirinovsky's party which pulled 11 percent of the vote or 12 percent of the vote, you have seen some reactionary movements in Russia, but that should not scare us.

Mr. Speaker, we want to work with people like Yablokov, we want to work with people like Yeltsin, but we do not want to do it in a vacuum or with blinders on our eyes. We want to protect the American people, and we want to make sure that in the end the people of Russia have the same protection that we have.

What is ironic about this whole thing, Mr. Speaker, if President Clinton were to veto this defense bill because we in fact are wanting to establish a national missile defense capability, the irony is that this President wants to give one of our key allies, Israel, a national missile defense largely paid for by the American people, to protect the people of Israel, but does not want that same protection for the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, that to me is the ultimate irony. Let me say in closing, before I yield to my friends here, I am a supporter of the ARROW program. It was my friend and colleague DUNCAN HUNTER, who is here tonight, who 7, 8, 9 years ago wrote a letter to the administration and to the Israelis suggesting as their strong friends and allies that instead of pursuing a Leve technology for a Leve fighter plane that they shift to missile defense. The outgrowth that that effort is the ARROW system being developed today with Israel paying a portion of the cost and America paying a portion of the cost. Is it ironic that this President and some people that are recommending bad advice to him in threatening a veto for this bill would want to fund a defensive system for Israel but not one for the United States? It just does not make sense.

So I hope the President is listening, and I hope he heeds our warning that this is a good bill and certainly one worthy of his consideration. I will be happy to yield to my friend and colleague from California the chairman of the Procurement and Acquisition Committee who did such a great job in the process of this bill and I am sure he is going to talk about the positive aspects of the bill as they were developed by his subcommittee, DUNCAN HUNTER from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend for yielding. First let me talk about a positive aspect of his leadership. CURT WELDON has been a person who has driven this bill with respect to missile defense and you are absolutely right that in many cases you asked and solicited as much information as you could get on the problems that the administration had with this bill. Each time they developed a problem, you sat down and tried to work it out. I think you did everything you possibly could do to meet their concerns. It is going to be tragic if the President vetoes this bill, which provides by a date certain some modicum of defense, of missile defense, for the American people which, as you further pointed out, most Americans think we already have.

So I want to salute you for your leadership because you had to work with both Members of the other body and folks from this body and some of us that wanted to do more in this bill, and the President's people, and you made a number of agreements and put a number of pieces of language to accommodate them, and for the President to veto this thing simply on the basis that he does not want to protect the American people make no sense at all. I agree with you, if he did the same thing, if he was a leader of Israel and made the same decision with respect to Israel, he would not get 10 percent of the vote in the next election. Let us hope this President does the right thing and to my friend, let me just say briefly, because I know our friend from Michigan has something to add to this discussion, also, that we have done a lot for the troops in this bill. You have mentioned the 2.4 percent pay raise, the increase in the housing allowance that we have in this bill.

□ 2230

If the troops are going to get their pay raise January 1, this is the way to do it, but, secondly, we give them some good equipment, and we have increased the number of trucks, armored personnel carriers, tanks, small arms. We have given them new weapon systems. We added a lot of ammo, all the way from basic M–16 ammunition right through to these precision guided munitions like the ones we saw operating in Desert Storm that allow you to stand off, and make strategic hits, and protect people, and keep us from having to put soft bodies into a very violent contact zone with the enemy.

So we do a lot of things to equip our soldiers, to give them a quality of life, and, you know, I served a brief, served a tour in Vietnam, did not do anything special, but I served with a lot of special people. I never read a congressional resolution, we passed a number of them now, but I always read my pay raises. If the President really wants to support the troops, the way to support the troops is to sign this bill that will give the families of all those military people who are over there in snow that is even deeper than it is in Washington, DC a little bit of value and a little bit of buying power over the next several months by giving them that 2.4-percent pay raise. Let us see President Clinton really support the troops by sending a few more bucks to their families.

So I want to thank the gentleman for everything that he has done because I think you put together an excellent missile package, one that the President can work with over the next 8 or 9 months, we can get together, we can work out some of our more detailed problems in hearings working with the other body.

We have the same concern that the Soviets have about the ABM treaty, we understand that they are still wary of the United States, but one thing that you brought out when the members of the Duma met with us was that they, too, are worried about missiles coming from Third World nations, and the real tragedy in this is going to be, if we are so—if the President is so insistent on vetoing a bill that does anything at all toward moving us to defense against missiles on the basis that he thinks in some point in the future this will violate the ABM treaty, here we have an ABM treaty that was signed by two parties, us and the Soviet Union, and yet there are many countries now like North Korea, like Libya, like Iraq which are developing missiles. So because of an agreement that we made with the Russians, we are going to allow a Third World nation to have a vulnerable target either in the United States, on the mainland or against our troops in theater, because we do not want to violate this deal we made with the Russians. The North Koreans did not sign the ABM treaty. They do not care about the ABM treaty. The Libyans did not sign it, Iraqis did not sign the ABM treaty, and when you were discussing this with your fellows and your colleagues in the Duma when they were visiting the United States Congress, I noticed you asked a question of one of them, and that was were they not also concerned with missiles coming in not from the United States, but from third nations, and they answered, yes, they were, and because of that I think—I think if the President will sign this bill, they will understand

that, they will understand our problems, and they will move forward accordingly to accommodate not only the United States and the Soviet Union or the Russians in our arms negotiations, but also to accommodate the safety requirements of their own citizens against incoming missiles from other countries.

So this is a good defense bill, and lastly I just say to my friend for those who say that might tell the President we are spending too much, this bill is roughly $100 billion less in real dollars than Ronald Reagan's 1986 defense bill, and the reason it is less is because we held the line in those days, and we stood strong, we stayed strong, we funded adequate ammunition, and equipment, and readiness for our troops, and because of that we were able to bring about a peace with the Soviet Union. We achieved in the 1980's peace through strength.

This budget is about a hundred billion dollars less than those budgets, and yet I think we have done the right thing in many places in this budget, and we can maintain this peace with this defense bill, and I hope the President signs it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank my colleague for his excellent comments, and, before he leaves, I just want to enter into a brief dialog with him about the—you know we hear on the floor all the time about the state of our economy and how some of the decisions that this Congress is making are putting people out of work. And you are the chairman of the acquisition committee which oversees all the items we procure. Is it not true that, what I read in the Fortune magazine and on the pages of the Wall Street Journal, that we have lost over 600,000 manufacturing jobs in the defense industrial base because of the downsizing, and while you and I both agree, I think, that our priority is not to be a job producer, that is a secondary benefit, that our ultimate goal is to protect the American people and give our troops the best.

But you wonder why you never hear these same Members of Congress talking about the only area where we are making such draconian cuts, putting real people out of work, and what is interesting is and which still boggles my mind, most of these people that have lost their jobs are members of the UAW, the machinists' union, the electrical workers. They are all AFL–CIO workers, and where are they? They are out there looking for jobs in southern California, in Pennsylvania, because they have—and Michigan. They have no place to go, people who have lost their jobs paying $40,000 and $50,000 a year where this Government has just said, ''Oh, well,'' and is it not true that those cuts in jobs have been caused directly by our lack of support for procurement?

And you might want to comment on how much we have procured in the way of new aircraft compared to some of our allies like some of the—even the Scandinavian countries in Europe for instance.

Mr. HUNTER. Well, the gentleman is right. Last year we purchased fewer combat aircraft than that warmaking nation in Switzerland. We had—I think we did something like 29 aircraft, and they did about 31 or 32. But the facts are that every billion dollars in economic activity expenditures on defense in manufacturing means about 25,000 to 30,000 jobs. So we have lost well over 600,000 jobs in the radical cut in defense spending that this administration has embarked upon. They have gone down roughly $129 billion under the levels that George Bush, and Colin Powell, and Dick Cheney got together and agreed upon as what they considered to be a prudent number, and now we are learning in Bosnia, and the gentleman has been a leader there, we are learning that the world may be a different world now, now that the Berlin Wall has come down. But it is still a very dangerous world.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Is it not also true, to my colleague who chairs the acquisition subcommittee as I chair the R&D subcommittee, that you were lobbied, as I was lobbied, by the heads of each of the services who told us privately that they desperately needed additional dollars to meet the needs of their troops so that when this President, if he does, and he said this repeatedly, says and makes the claim that we are spending too much on defense, that the Pentagon did not ask for this; the only one in the Pentagon who did not ask for this is his appointee who happens to be his Secretary, but that each of those service chiefs, who are career people who are responsible and whose necks are on the line if our kids are killed and not able to respond, each of them have come to us personally, as I know I have, and I would ask you if you have had the same meetings in your office saying these cuts are way out of line, you know we are not going to be able to meet our needs.

Is that true with your role as chairman?

Mr. HUNTER. The gentleman is absolutely true, my friend is stating the fact.

Once the President makes his decision on the defense number, and in this case I think it was totally arbitrary, much less than we should spend to be prudent, and you ask the leadership, military leadership, in the series of hearings that we held, you ask them at the table what do you think about this in terms of funding, their answer is we support the President's budget. It has to be like that, and it is. But there are also good, honest, candid Americans, and later on you get to have a conversation about ammunition, about modernization, and they have every single piece of equipment that we put in this bill, the gentleman has put in and I put in this bill, and other members of our committee, because we have a very bipartisan committee, Democrats and Republicans. Everything we have put in has been put in after discussion and thorough discussion with military leadership, and you know that has all come out now in the last few days. They had an article in the Washington Post to the effect that the military leadership had gone to the Joint Chiefs and said we needed to increase spending on modernization by 50 percent. Now we spent a little over $40 billion, so that is saying here they were telling their leadership in the Clinton administration we need to spend an extra $20 billion on modernization, and yet the President's aides say that the 5, or 6, or 7 billion extra that we have spent this year is just too much, and nobody wanted it, nobody asked for it.

Well, everything we put in the bill has been asked for, and you know something? I think, as the President gets into this very serious situation in Bosnia and other situations that will come down the line in the next year, he is going to say thank God for those increases in defense.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I yield to my friend from Michigan. I would ask him the question:

He sat through the State of the Union speech, as we did. Does he recall the President standing at this very podium, and pounding his fist on the table, and saying we will not cut defense spending any further, and in fact, if the gentleman would respond, my recollection is he said he was going to add $25 billion to defense spending.

Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. CHRYSLER. Yes, I absolutely do.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. And what he said though unfortunately is that he is not going do that until after the next Presidential election, which it is convenient for him to make that statement after he runs for reelection.

With that I will yield to our good friend from Michigan for whatever comments he would like to make.

Mr. CHRYSLER. I would just like to rise in support of this bill and certainly encourage President Clinton to sign this bill, and I commend my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for their efforts in giving us a procurement bill, a business-type procurement bill, that can save us on the $400 billion of goods and services that this Government buys up to 20 percent, which is some $400 million, and it means no more $600 toilet seats, it means no more $200 hammers, and it helps cut down the 300,000 people that we have in this Government that work at acquiring goods and services for this Government, and one of the things, and I know I went against my chairman and my subcommittee chairman on this legislation to get it passed and to get at part of this bill, and that is why I am so interested in seeing this sign, is because one of the things that we find is that this Government is the single largest purchaser of vacuum tubes.

Now some of you might be too young to remember what vacuum tubes were, but we buy more vacuum tubes than anyone else. We do not make them in this country, but because of our procurement system we have to buy them.

Now you can get a computer chip about the size of your little fingernail that equals 3,150,000 vacuum tubes, and of course nobody that is listening wants to know what we use vacuum tubes for in this Government because we use them to keep the air traffic controller system running in this country, and we need to modernize that system. This bill will allow us to do that for the first time, and that is why I rise in such strong support of it.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman because he played a major role as one of our newer Members of this institution, hit the ground running and played a major role in pushing the agenda of acquisition reform that is going to help us save the dwindling defense dollars that we are currently spending. We appreciate your leadership. It is not often that a Member comes in here and makes that kind of a difference, and we on the defense committee—I know the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] shares my feelings—appreciate the leadership of you on the Government Ops Committee who played a key role in getting this added to our defense bill.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is especially valuable to us because he comes with a business background, and he understands acquisition in the real marketplace; that is, in the private marketplace, and we are going to save a lot of money because of what you did.

We still have a long way to go. We still have those 300,000 Government shoppers in the Department of Defense which is roughly 2 United States Marine Corps. We call them fighting shoppers from the sky, and we are going to be trying to build a more efficient system in terms of personnel in the next couple of years, but your work has been extraordinary, and we are going to save the taxpayers some money because of it. I thank you.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank both of my colleagues for their cooperation here and for joining me here in this special order to reiterate to the President and to our colleagues the importance of this bill becoming law. It would be a real tragedy for the American troops and for the American people if this President ignored the authorization process, ignored the acquisition reform, ignored the pay raise, the benefits in terms of housing that were outlined by my friend from California, and the advances we have made in areas like missile defense consistent with his own people in the Pentagon if we would choose to veto this legislation.

□ 2245

I would say to my friends and colleagues that we will be there to respond to whatever case this President attempts to make as to why this bill should be vetoed. If it is based on the missile defense, we are going to have an out-and-out war on our hands, because it will have to be filled with untruths, because of the efforts we went to to meet the administration more than halfway in getting a bill finished that he can sign into law.

With that, I thank both of the gentleman, I thank our staff and our distinguished Speaker, the scholarly gentleman from the deep South, from Arkansas, Mr. DICKEY, for bearing with us this time.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the articles mentioned:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1995]

U.N. IS SAID TO FIND RUSSIAN MARKINGS ON IRAQ-BOUND MILITARY EQUIPMENT

(By R. Jeffrey Smith)

United Nations investigators have determined that an Iraq-bound shipment of sophisticated military equipment seized by Jordanian authorities last month was built in Russia and may have been designed for use in long-range, intercontinental missiles, according to informed diplomatic sources.

The shipment, which has been valued by the United Nations at more than $25 million, was seized on a western government's tip just days before it was to be shipped to Iraq, the sources said. They said it consisted of about 100 sets of advanced guidance equipment, such as accelerometers and gyroscopes, which Iraq may have wanted to use in banned missiles capable of carrying chemical or biological warheads.

The equipment was shipped in 30 or so boxes to Jordan's capital Amman in August on flights that originated in Moscow, according to three diplomatic sources. But Washington is uncertain whether the export was secretly sanctioned by part of the Russian government or was the work of criminals who obtained the parts in Russia on the black market, officials said.

If the United Nations confirms that the equipment was meant for use in long-range missiles, it would mark the first occasion that such advanced missile technology has been exported from Russia to a country considered hostile to U.S. interests.

If the export was approved by Moscow it would be a violation of Russia's pledge to abide by the terms of the Missile Technology Control Regime, a global accord aimed at stopping the spread of missiles capable of carrying nuclear, chemical or biological warheads. It would also violate Russian promises to adhere to the global trade embargo imposed on Iraq by the U.N. Security Council after the 1991 Persian Gulf War.

If the Russian export was instead illicit, it suggests that long-standing U.S. fears that such advanced arms technology would eventually leak from Russia are finally being borne out, a U.S. official said on condition he not be named. ''There is a very real . . . possibility that this was provided by black marketeers'' who obtained it directly from the Russian military's stockpile of long-range missile equipment, he said.

Although the Clinton administration has not yet raised the matter directly with the Russian government, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow issued a statement last week denying any knowledge of the shipment. ''It does not belong to Russia,'' said a spokesman for the Russian Embassy in Washington, U.S. and U.N. officials said the denial was not credible, however, because the parts were clearly marked and recognizable.

''These are Russian-made components, definitely,'' one official said. The parts were designed for use in Russian long-range missiles but could be adapted for use in shorter-range missiles.

Documents obtained by the United Nations indicate that the missile parts had been ordered by the Karama research center near Baghdad, where Iraq continues to work on missiles with a range of less than 150 kilometers (about 90 miles). Such short-range missiles are allowed by the cease-fire resolutions approved by the United Nations, which sought only to prohibit arms capable of directly threatening Iraq's neighbors.

But Iraq has not claimed it was trying to buy the parts to use with such short-range missiles; it instead has sought to pin the blame for the attempted export on any overly enthusiastic Jordanian businessman who it claims tried to sell the banned parts on at least two occasions this year without ever receiving an Iraqi tender offer or negotiating contract.

''The Iraqi industrial facility refused this offer categorically, in compliance with United Nations resolutions,'' the Iraqi News Agency said in a written statement issued in Baghdad last week.

Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister Tariq Aziz, who is visiting the United Nations this week to seek an early lifting of the punitive trade embargo, told U.N. officials on Tuesday that the seller had been arrested by the government pending a full investigation. He also alleged that the incident had resulted from a conspiracy meant to undermine Iraqi cooperation with the United Nations.

A knowledgeable diplomatic source identified the businessman as a Palestinian from Gaza and Wiyam Abu Gharbieh, and said his company's name was listed on the shipping manifests for the equipment. ''We have reason to believe the Iraqi account [of official disinterest in the parts] is inaccurate,'' a U.N. official said.

U.S. officials said that Iraq may have wanted to use the guidance equipment on banned medium-range missiles, which they suspect remain hidden in Iraq. Alternatively, Iraq may have wanted to stockpile the equipment until it could produce other vital long-range missile components, an effort that would require many years to complete.

U.S. intelligence officials said they are confident that any Iraqi attempt to develop, assemble and test such a missile would be detected long in advance.

''We now have tangible proof of our statement'' in October that Iraq was still trying to buy sensitive missile parts from foreign suppliers, said Swedish envoy Rolf Ekeus, who chairs the U.N. Special Commission on Iraq. He added that ''we don't think this [revelation] is the end of the road,'' because Iraq has made other such purchases or attempted purchases.

[From Krymskaya Pravda, Nov. 28, 1995]

THE THIRD WORLD [WAR]? . . .

(By Adm. E. Baltin)

MILITARY DANGER FOR RUSSIA IS A REALITY

The geopolitical consequences of the collapse of the Soviet Union have not yet been completely studied. However, their negative manifestations are already visible to everyone who has made even the briefest observations on the development of events throughout the world.

A very important peculiarity of the present international situation that has an extremely unfavorable effect on Russia's situation is the existence and reinforcement of NATO, as well as the West European Union, which, essentially speaking, represent the power ''fists'' of the consolidated West. We might recall the discussions that were held

in Brussels after the self-disbanding of the Warsaw Pact. The topic of discussion was not only the need to transform NATO from a military-political association into a political one, but even the possibility of disbanding it has having fulfilled the goals that had been set. But the words remained words. Today NATO not only preserves the structure that used to exist, but even is intensifying and consolidating it by attracting new members into its orbit. Cover for activities of this kind is provided by programs such as the notorious ''Partnership For the Sake of Peace.''

Meanwhile it is absolutely clear that in its present form NATO is nothing else but a military-political anachronism that not only failed to serve the reinforcement of security in Europe, but kept undermining it. The military-power course in resolving acute international questions, the arbitrary, uncontrolled expansion of the zone of its responsibility, and the policy of ''movement toward the East'' are links in a single chain and they are aimed primarily against Russia.

Operation Desert Storm and the recent demonstrative punishment of the Serbs, despite the lack of similarity of their causes, nevertheless had much in common. The first and most important thing is: under United Nations cover (after the divulging of the existence of a secret treaty between NATO and the United Nations that pertains to former Yugoslavia, the essence of the interaction between these organizations does not evoke any illusions), the NATO bloc personally assumed the duties of ''world policeman,'' maintaining order in his fiefdom, and that order is established by the ''policeman'' himself.

Second, The armed forces of the NATO allies obtained unprecedented experience in waging aggressive combat actions on foreign territory, with the modern methods of armed combat being applied with respect to an opponent with a Soviet organization and using what is basically our tactics and weapons.

Third. Psychologically, the armies and public opinion in the countries participating in NATO have become adapted, to a considerable degree, to the waging of aggressive combat actions on foreign territory—by means of the broad-scale propaganda campaigns concerning the ''extremely precise,'' ''intelligent,'' and ''human'' weapons, the ''carpet bombings,'' ''surgical strikes,'' and the ''clean,'' ''local'' warfare. For professionals, the absurdity of these propaganda efforts is obvious. In the Persian Gulf, NATO pilots were definitely not fighting against Khussein's army, which had lost its combat potential, but against peaceful citizens.

And there is one more thing. The undeclared NATO war against the Serbs is already the obtaining of practical experience, the conditioning of world public opinion, and the psychological preparation of NATO soldiers for unpunished combat actions against Slavs.

Let us now examine the foreign-policy situation that Russia has found itself in today and the problems in this area that are awaiting their immediate resolution. With the collapse of the USSR, Russia, which had been occupied exclusively by its domestic problems, actually lost its previous allies and failed to acquire any new ones. As a result, its situation in the world, as well as in Europe, is extremely indefinite and shaky.

The process of crowding Russia out of its age-old geopolitical positions is continuing. All we have to recall is Ukraine, which is being drawn increasingly into NATO's embrace, and the successful activity of Turkey in the trans-Caucasus, not to mention the processes in the Baltic region. The extensive crowding out of the country from Western and Central Europe has already led to the loss of basic ports in the Baltic and Black seas, as well as communication hunger with Europe. In the south of Russia is the well blackened ''arc of instability''—across the Black Sea, Chechnya, Georgia, and even across Central Asia to the border of the KNR [People's Republic of China], as well as the gradual shifting of that ''arc'' to the north under the flag of Islamic fundamentalism. The situation is no better in the Far East or the Asia-Pacific Region. In those areas there has been the continuing weakening of Russia's positions against the background of the unresolved nature of a number of international problems, with the growing economic and military power of China, Japan, and other close neighbors of ours.

And there are also comparisons that already are not in our favor: Europe is integrating and is consolidating its positions more and closely—in our country, with the aid of certain conceited neighbors, even such an unsteady boat as the CIS is being rocked until it is listing dangerously; the United States and other NATO members have a permanent presence in practically all the regions of the world, and we are abandoning the forward-base lines that our army and navy have had for many years in the countries not only of the far abroad, but also of the near abroad; NATO submarines, the carriers of nuclear and conventional weapons, carry out constant combat duty and patrols in the immediate proximity of our borders. By virtue of our extremely meager financing, we are not only failing to build new technology, but cannot even use that which exists. By means of the holding of ''joint'' maneuvers and exercises, the armed forces of the NATO countries are becoming acquainted with newer and newer theaters of military actions. In Russia, even the conducting of conventional intelligence has been left practically to drift along on its own momentum, and the intelligence services that have been reorganized and renamed many times are taking on an attributive nature...

There arises the completely reasonable question of the goals pursued by the United States and NATO, which expend—for the purpose of arming their armies and conducting exercises and, finally, combat operations—amounts of money that would be more than enough to provide fundamental assistance to starving Africa and to carry out the technical re-equipping of the entire post-Communist Eastern Europe. The goal of these miliary preparations is obvious: to prevent the Russia that is being reborn and its allies, assuming that such should arise sooner or later, from reconstituting a serious competition to the West that has been experiencing increasingly serious problems, despite its former prosperity.

What has been stated may seem to be improbable. Since the time of open confrontation between West and East, the world has truly changed very much. But the crux of the matter is that, despite the external illusion that has been skillfully created by Western specialist in psychological operations, the world has not become more stable or more just, but, on the contrary, has become even more dangerous and unpredictable—as a consequence of the disruption of the balance among the forces that used to constitute it and the predominance in that world of interest that are extremely remote from humanitarian ones. ''We won the war, but we did not win the peace,'' Boris Yeltsin has said. And that is the truth.

For that category of our citizens who look at the world through the prism of a forced system of values, it seems impossible that the West can find a reason for armed interference in Russian affairs—not necessarily in Russia itself.

Now the West is deciding how much democracy is sufficient for us, and how much is not. The West is dictating the principles of the construction of the Russian economy. The West determines whether human rights are being observed in our country. So long as Russia was a strong country, ''comments'' such as this were called interference in internal affairs, and that was perceived completely adequately by our opponents and by the world community as a whole.

The system of double standards that has been used for so long by specialists in the area of the struggle of ideas is not new. So it is strange that we have once again been hooked by it. The world remains silent about the fact that unarmed Kurds are being killed by shells fired from tanks of governmental troops in Turkey. The passions have not yet subsided in the Ireland that is thirsting for independence, but people also are generally not being reminded of that either. For yet another year the United States is incapable of coping with the periodically arising unrest among the Negro population (of whom there are approximately 30 million in the States), a population that is demanding autonomy. And is anyone actually speaking seriously about the crudest violations of human rights in Serbian Kraina? Who has counted the number of defenseless Serbs who perished under NATO bombs, or the number of their homes that have been destroyed? Those are areas that could use the numerous commissions on human rights from the CSCE and the European parliament! But they prefer to come to our country, in order to discuss the situation in Chechnya. The West has certain criteria for judging human rights in our country, and completely different ones for itself.

Let us imagine now what might become a reality in the situation of a collision between Russian and Western interests that is completely possible in the future. An invented reason (Panama, Somali, the Balkans), the United Nations ''blessing,'' and...

The only thing that is currently restraining the appetites of our new ''friends'' is the nuclear weapons that Russia continues to have. Although the West attempts constantly to put under its control the production, testing, deployment, and reduction of those weapons. With the aid of the government of the former USSR, the West partially managed to do that, and continues to this day to make such attempts.

REPARTITIONING

Everything that was formulated above is occurring during a unique period of world history. I have in mind World War III, which broke out and almost ceased rumbling before our eyes. It was not a classic ''world war,'' but, rather, a ''velvet'' world war that became such by virtue of the factors that caused it and the conditions in which it occurred. For all the mootness of this kind of assertion, no one will deny that mankind has entered a new phase in its development, a phase that has exceeded all its expectations. For the third time in the present century there has been a repartitioning of the spheres of influence among the leading world powers. And the most extensive one of all those known to us.

What became physically the beginning of World War III was the destruction of the Berlin Wall. But a new classic world war—judged on the basis of its form, content, and methods of waging combat actions—did not break out simply because, first of all, the public awareness of the twentieth century was saturated by the two preceding ones, which had been the bloodiest wars that had been its misfortune to endure, and, secondly, because there was absolutely no need for the classic continuation of a policy specifically

by military means. There had been an offensive, but there was no proper defense, since the opponent was so demoralized by internal upheavals that he could scarcely have been called an opponent in the usual understanding of that word.

The third world war, the ''velvet'' one, is being waged in other forms and by other methods. Its essence lies in the strategic-informational offensive, in which the basic role is played by the well-organized means of psychological operations. But all the unconventional, nonclassic methods of waging that war combine closely with the numerous military conflicts of small and average intensity. All of which, in their turn, are frequently engendered by the same psychological effect.

Yet another peculiarity of World War III consists in the fact that it is being waged on the territory of the Old World, chiefly Europe. At one time Iosif Stalin stated that he would be able to prevent a war on the territory of the Soviet Union. His conviction has been implemented by the pragmatic Yankees.

The results of World War III have exceeded all the expectations and everything that mankind has known up until now. In none of the classic world wars were such astonishing successes achieved with practically no bloodshed. The first such success was the achievement of NATO's political goals: the system of socialism, with what had been at one time its powerful economy and military potential, was destroyed.

But World War III is not over. The last of the elements that are inaccessible to the West is Russia, with its nuclear might. In order to eliminate that factor, our state, by means of all kinds of subterfuges, is being drawn into numerous international programs under the aegis of the United Nations, NATO OSCE, CSCE, WMF, and Council of Europe (at times one cannot get rid of the impression that those programs were invented only with this purpose in mind). Within the framework of these joint programs, Russia is being pressured into participating in international agreements that are of a political, economic, and only partially a military nature (limitation, control of limitations of weapons production and testing, etc.). Participation in such missions, which are being conducted under the noble slogans of peacekeeping activity, most-favored economic conditions, arms reduction, human-rights protection, etc., leads to a situation in which the elements that are desirable for the West are forced into Russia's domestic- and foreign-policy strategy, that is, leads to the programmed formation of our policy. Factually speaking, this is the end of the process of the destruction of the Russian state system.

Hence Russia's complete political, economic, and military dependence upon the West.

But Russia is definitely not the first country to suffer as a result of World War II. Its deplorable consequences for the Old World, for Europe, will require more time to evaluate. As a result of the geopolitical reforms that have occurred, Europe lost its face by allowing the processes occurring on its territory to get almost completely out from under its control. Europe had a direct influence on those processes before and after World War II, but currently Europe has become only a test range for the concepts of world structure that have been developed in the United States, thus having transformed its peoples into hostages of the transoceanic national interests.

At one time Adolf Hitler used to dream about ruling the world. However, for him that goal proved to be unattainable. The embodiment of the wildest of all ideas that ever existed—true, with the existence of the objective prerequisites and by means of other instruments—apparently proved to be possible several decades later by the United States. The scheme ''Center of power (United States)—NATO—United Nations—. . .'' still lives and, as we may be convinced, is winning. The main thing now is for the world that has been deprived on equilibrium must not slip of its fulcrum. . .

A STRONG ARMY IS A STRONG RUSSIA

The current period in the history of the Russian state is a critical one. Here has been an understanding of the changes that have occurred in the world and in the country, and the first, albeit shy, attempts are being undertaken to correct the miscalculations that have been made. This segment of time has coincided with the latest parliamentary election in Russia. It appears to be indisputable that Russia's population, which has obtained a definite amount of political experience, will make the most correct choice if one compares it with the previous ones.

I would call the broad participation of the military in the current election campaign completely natural. The military, more than anyone else, are capable of subordinating themselves to the state's interests, and of differentiating among all its misfortunes and problems. Because, unlike a large number of other politicians, serving the state is their profession. Being completely aware of the importance of the Armed Forces in the modern world and, on a daily basis when resolving exceptionally practical tasks, coming up against the objective impossibility of constructing the activities of military units according to canons that correspond to the vital needs of the state, the military are forced to go into politics. Because, essentially speaking, the struggle for the Armed Forces today is becoming a struggle for the Homeland. From what has been stated above, this must be absolutely clear.

What, then, is the Russian army and Navy today? That which we have been accustomed to calling them are only fragments—and not even the largest or the best ones—remaining from the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. Almost everything that is the best has remained on the former forward base lines, in what are now the countries of the near abroad. The only thing that remains now is to rebuild the Russian Armed Forces.

Throughout the world the building of the armed forces is carried out by proceeding from the national interests of the state. It is necessary on that basis to create the concept of the county's national security and the military doctrine the evolves from it; the structure of the Armed Forces, the concept and long-range arms program, and the state production order for them have been determined. This is the classic scheme, and that is precisely the scheme that should be followed today when we create the Russian Armed Forces for the twenty-first century. It is also necessary to save that we inherited from the former USSR: today's shield, the guarantee of the unique, independent path of Russia's development, if such is chosen. But with the attitude of society and many state figures to the Ministry of Defense that we observe today, it is a miracle that the Armed Forces are still functioning. It must be admitted that this is thanks only to the colossal stamina of the Russian enlisted man.

Let us analyze to a certain extent how the Russian power structures and de-facto functioning today. It is a paradox when only one-third of the people who are ''under arms'' are subordinate to the minister of defense, and the remaining two-thirds are subordinate to other power departments. Moreover, the emphasis is made on the MVD troops, the border troops, and the creation of numerous special subdivisions. The power structure are being inflated to unprecedented proportions, but this results, first of all, in the dissipation of manpower and funds, and, secondly, there is a lowering of the army's role as a factor that cements together the state system and obedience to the law. Meanwhile, all the state power institutions are being used to create conditions for the normal functioning of the state under the ordinary conditions that prevail, and under the emergency conditions it is only the army that is capable of fulfilling this task. From what has been stated it clearly follows that at the present time we are waiving the chief benefits to the advantage of the momentary ones. How, then, can a military man who understands all of this fail to go into politics?

Before our very eyes, rather than in accordance with anyone's ''command,'' as some people attempt to represent the situation, but, rather, by virtue of objective reasons, a new formation of Russian politicians is being born. What that formation will consist of does not raise any doubts. It should not be called the ''war party'' or the ''military party.'' It is the party of patriots.

The words ''military'' and ''patriot'' have always been inseparable, because a nonpatriot cannot be a military person. And if today there are so many people in shoulder boards among those laying claim to seats in the Duma, that means that the country is truly in a desperate situation.

Currently we still have perhaps the last opportunity to hold onto our Homeland's existing defense line.

PETROV: 40,000 TONNES OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS 'ACCURATE'

(By Anatoliy Yurkin)

MOSCOW.—Russia's store of 40,000 tonnes of chemical weapons, reported by Russian General Staff chief General Mikhail Kolesnikov, is an accurate figure, commander of Russian radiation, chemical and biological protection forces Colonel-General Stanislav Petrov told ITAR–TASS.

Petrov said he was surprised by the statement of Aleksey Yablokov, a member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, intersectoral commission chairman of the Ecological Safety Council, at a parliamentary meeting today that Russia has produced a total of 100,000 tonnes of chemical weapons.

Yablokov said they must have been dumped at secret sites.

Petrov said the Russian Defence Ministry has no secrets about the chemical weapons, and sites of its storage are known to the Russian Academy of Sciences and Western experts, who had visited the storage sites under international accords.

The general said Yablokov has any possibility to contact Defence Ministry officials for information about chemical weapons.

Yablokov knows full well that Russia lacks the great funds required for disposal programmes, Petrov continued, adding that President Boris Yeltsin had issued a decree on November 6, 1995, setting up a commission on chemical weapons.

The decree opens a prospect for Russia's meeting its international commitments in the area of chemical weapons, Petrov said.

He said Yablokov undoubtedly knows that and exploits the rostrum to his ends the election race.

OFFICIAL CONFIRMS SECURITY OF MINIATURE NUCLEAR WEAPONS

(By Lyudmila Yermakova)

MOSCOW.—Russia does have miniature nuclear ammunition, but panic over possible theft of it is unfounded, the head of the Russian Defence Ministry's ecological centre, Colonel Boris Alekseyev, said in a statement today.

His statement follows warnings by Aleksey Yablokov, the intersectoral commission chairman of the Russian Environmental Safety Council, at parliamentary hearings on environmental safety.

According to Alekseyev, a minimal weight of the nuclear charges is over 90 kilogrammes, not 30–40 kilogrammes, as asserted by Yablokov.

The ammunition is stored in arch-secure settings and have a fourth-degree protection system which precludes an accidental explosion.

Only the nuclear button, which is in the hands of the Russian president, can trigger this ammunition, Alekseyev said.

The military official said a restricted number of people have access to the nuclear charges. ''For this reason Yablokov might be uninformed about the details,'' he added.

The miniature nuclear ammunition is ''one of shields for Russia's security, and this is known in the world'', he said.

DECOMMISSIONED NUCLEAR SUBMARINES SAID TO POSE DANGER

MOSCOW.—Over 140 nuclear submarines have been decommissioned in Russia today, but 50 of them still contain nuclear fuel, chairman of Russian Security Council's commission for ecology and Corresponding Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Professor Aleksey Yablokov said on Tuesday [21 November] in the Federation Council.

Nuclear fuel cannot be extracted from 7–10 submarines ''for technical reasons,'' he said. ''These submarines are the source of super-high danger,'' said Yablokov.

Deputy chief of the Russian Defense Ministry's nuclear security inspection Viktor Kruglov confirmed for INTERFAX the presence of ''submarines from which it is impossible to unload nuclear fuel.'' However, he said those submarines do not present ''danger of radiation for the population or the environment.''

''The Defense Ministry has recommendations on how to scrap those submarines,'' the spokesman said. It is necessary to determine a burial site for them and earmark money for this program.

Kruglov said that there are four disaster submarines in Russia: one in the North Fleet and three in the Pacific Fleet.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MR. STUDDS IS LEAVING CONGRESS

HON. ANTHONY C. BEILENSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BEILENSON. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the gentleman form Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] not to seek re-election next year saddened and distressed many of his colleagues. His announcement means that this body will lose one of our very best, and most capable, Members.

Mr. STUDDS made his decision public at his open meeting at the Old Whaling Church at Edgartown, MA. I was greatly moved by his words of farewell to the people of his district, and I should like others to have the opportunity to read those words.

No one, Mr. Speaker, can read the gentleman's remarks and not appreciate how special and valuable a really good Member of Congress is.

No one can read the gentleman's remarks and not gain some insight into the best of this Congress, and the best of our constituents.

No one can read the gentleman's remarks and not gain some understanding of the close and healthy relationship that develops between Members of Congress and their constituents when there is the kind of trust and mutual respect that has clearly developed between the gentleman and the people he has represented so well these past 23 years.

I urge my colleagues and others to read these wise and humane words of a Member of Congress of great magnanimity and decency.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN GERRY E. STUDDS AT OLD WHALING CHURCH, EDGARTOWN, MA

Good morning. From the warmth of your welcome, I can only conclude that you've forgotten where I work.

Those of you who have been to our Open Meetings in the past already know that these are totally informal settings in which the only rule is that there are no rules. In the unlikely event that this is your first, perhaps you can ask your parents—or grandparents—since we've hosted well over a thousand in the last 23 years. In fact, our very first Open Meeting was right here on Martha's Vineyard, during my initial visit home after taking office in 1973.

I want to test your patience by amending the second rule that has always governed these meetings—the one that forbids me from speechifying. We'll get on with the Open Meeting in a moment, but first: I learned in Politics 101 always to show up prepared to make news.

There's no reason for melodrama. You must have suspected there was some reason that, after 23 years of these gatherings, we finally offered coffee and donuts.

Throughout my tenure representing this District, we have enjoyed a remarkable rapport that is based on one fundamental principle: mutual respect. We have looked each other in the eye, and talked directly and civilly about matters of importance. Over time, that trust has been more important than any single vote or issue or campaign.

That is why I want to take some time this morning to talk with you about why I have decided that this will be my last term in the United States Congress.

It will be my privilege to continue to represent this District vigorously for the next 14 months. Then I will move on to other fields of battle.

When this news spreads, I suspect some will ascribe it to the results of last November's elections—although it is a little unclear why we ought to be dissatisfied with 69 percent of the 1994 vote.

It's true that I have less than unbridled enthusiasm for the wrecking ball of the 104th Congress, and that I am as deeply troubled by the direction we're heading as when I first had the then-original idea of challenging an entrenched incumbent. But the basis for my decision goes much deeper.

Every two years, I have considered afresh whether I could summon the energy and enthusiasm to give the people of this District the kind of effective representation you deserve. Contrary to conventional political wisdom—since we have rarely observed political convention—I have always been entirely open and candid about these reassessments.

To everything, as the Biblical verse goes, there is a season—a time to plant and a time to harvest.

It is now time for me to chart a new course: by no means to retire, but to find new endeavors, both public and private, that will allow more than an occasional weekend or evening to catch up on thing neglected for a quarter century, like reading and writing and actually using my tide chart; to be a better partner, brother, uncle and friend; and to be a useful human being in new ways that the demands of elective office have precluded for most of my adult life.

There are few jobs on the fact of this earth which offer as much to, and require as much from, the right person. The work of a Congressman, if done properly, is all-consuming, If it does not take every ounce of strength—intellectual, emotional and physical—then it probably isn't being done right.

That's why our renowned grassroots army has endured even in the age of overpriced media campaigns; and why, year in and year out, after successive late-night Congressional sessions, we'd barnstorm the District for weekends of constituent meetings squeezed between field hearings, issue forums, plant tours, testimonials, press interviews and political events.

Perhaps that is what John Randolph, who preceded even me as a Member of Congress, was thinking two centuries ago when he said that ''Time is at once the most valuable and the most perishable of all our possessions.''

Since embarking on this improbable journey, I have been very conscious that each of us is allotted only so many hours and so many days on this earth.

Together, we have worked our hearts out; together, we have overcome odds and obstacles that would have discouraged most others; and together, you and I have strived to make many things better than we found them.

I never anticipated serving for 24 years, and it's probably divulging no great secret to admit that I do not thrive on what some consider indispensable parts of the job.

I am not by nature a particularly gregarious person. I get annoyed by frequent interruptions. I get tired of hearing myself talk.

And there are already far too many people in Washington who confuse themselves with the monuments.

In recent years, some of my political opponents have wondered—that's a polite way to put it—about a bill I apparently authored early on to limit the years of Congressional service. I've tried for several years to explain to them that, because term limits are such a good idea, I'd better stick around as long as it takes to see them enacted into law.

So I suppose, with the new majority in the House and Senate, I can now rest easy on that front. In fact, perhaps we should limit Members of Congress to a single term. That way, the freshman Republicans can go home still knowing everything.

Last November, the American people, or at least the few who voted, sent those freshmen to Washington.

Hard-working taxpayers—and not just ''angry'' white males'—feel their government is more responsive to 'special interests' than to the real problems of ordinary Americans—which was the very reason I first ran for Congress.

Of course, the special interests I ran against are the ones the Republicans have put back in charge. When the House earlier this year gutted the Clean Water Act, the bill was drafted by the very industries it was supposed to regulate. The NRA and the Christian Coalition are riding high, and the House is so efficient that we frequently hold committee hearings after enacting bills into law.

One of my committees this month managed to dismantle Medicare in 48 hours. Jesse Helms and Strom Thurmond have been transformed from fringe caricatures into committee chairmen.

The changes underway at this moment in Washington are based on the dangerous misperception of this country and its people. Perhaps you heard one Republican Congressman say this week that the proposed $500-per-child tax credit to families earning up to $200,000 was not a tax cut for the rich.

They're not rich, he said, they're lower-middle-class. He went on the define ''middle-class'' as an annual salary of $300,000 to $750,000, and anyone above that as ''upper-middle class''.

When the time comes, I will join you in doing what I can to require our next Congressman to be more tightly tethered than that to the planet the rest of us inhabit.

A great deal has happened since 1992, when I came very close to the decision I'm announcing today.

We had barely escaped alive from the previous, unusually vitriolic campaign, only to be greeted that summer by the chain-saw of Congressional redistricting. The new lines removed a third of the electorate, and half of the Democrats, by amputating our New Bedford family from this District for the first time since the founding of the Republic.

Suddenly we faced a tough primary, seven weeks away, in a substantially new District—as the price of admission to a hotly contested general election.

Had it not been for the prospect of a young presidential candidate named Clinton, working with a Democratic Congress and a new Committee Chairman named Studds, I would probably be sitting with you in the audience today.

But that constellation seemed so well aligned—and the opportunity to make a real

difference so clear—that Dean and I committed ourselves to yet another all-out reelection campaign and, if successful, to work through the first term of a Clinton Presidency.

I envisioned two years to launch the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on an aggressive new course and two more to work with the Administration to complete that agenda, before returning home.

One out of two isn't bad.

Still, while I have deep—nearly unfathomable—reservations about the direction the new Congressional majority is pulling this nation, my decision is at its core personal, not political.

I chose to discuss my plans here on Martha's Vineyard because, in a way, this is where that special trust I mentioned earlier began—in that first Open Meeting in 1973.

This is how you and I have always done our business—together, without fanfare, taking time to ask and explain and maybe even argue a little, and then rolling up our sleeves to get back to work.

That first trip home was a three-day swing through the Islands. In case your grandparents failed to mention it, we returned home that winter day feeling pretty good. In losing the 1970 election by the thinnest of margins, we have failed to carry a single town on either Nantucket or the Vineyard; in fact, we have won a total of one town in all of the Cape and Islands.

Then came the electoral earthquake of 1972. Not only did we win, again by a handful of votes, but we astonished everyone by taking Provincetown, Truro and West Tisbury!

I think it's fair to observe that times have changed.

What has not changed are the bedrock principles of wisdom, honesty and friendship on this Island, personified for me by two people who are not with us today: Betty Bryant, who could drown you in Portuguese guilt if you spent less than 20 of any 24 hours improving the lives of others—because she never had such days; and Gratia Harrington, proud Yankee daughter of an Island sea captain, whose strength, dignity and wit reserved her a front-row-center seat at every one of our Vineyard Open Meetings, well past her 100th birthday.

As everyone here knows, Betty took personal responsibility for our showing at the polls on the Vineyard and everywhere else. On the night of the 1992 primary, she collared me to report that we had won in Gosnold by 33–0 and in Chilmark by 251–2—and that she had already identified the misguided Chilmark couple.

Both Betty and Gratia would understand the reason I brought my news to this Island today, just as I will bring it to friends in Quincy, Hingham and Hyannis tomorrow: that by ever measure—geographical, historical, commercial, cultural and spiritual—this Congressional District is about the sea.

From the Irish moss I gathered off Cohasset and Scituate ledges as a boy and the lobster traps I pull these days in Provincetown Harbor, to the marine environmental notches on our proud legislative belt, nearly everything of consequence that you and I care about derives from a deep love and respect for the ocean.

If you visit the Race Point visitors center in the Cap Cod National Seashore, you may hear a recitation of these words from Harry Kemp, poet-laureate of the Cape:

There is battle here.
There is clean and vigorous war.
There are bivouacs visited by night's every star.
There are long barren slopes of enchantment burned clean by the sun, and
ramparts of strange new dreams to be stormed and won.
Here the five-petaled wild rose blossoms more sweet
Because the earth is barren
and the heat intolerable for lush domestic grass.
The ocean shines like many discs of brass,
Or between white hollows it lapses great and green
Where solitude sifts slowly in between
the hills of sparkling waste that rise and fall.
Hills whose one music is the seabird's call.
And there is all space that ever I can see.
The ocean completing all immensity,
and the sky—mother of infinity,
Where greatness on smallness jostles till both are one,
And a grain of sand stands doorkeeper to the sun.

Not everyone, however, shares our devotion to salt water.

You may have noticed, for example, that the new majority has not only eliminated the Congressional Committee that makes oceans policy, but also targeted the federal agency that administers it.

The kind of ''reform'' will undermine everything from Pacific tsunami warnings to the million-dollar-a-year whale-watching industry on Stellwagen Bank. And just think—a lot of the damage was done in a legislative vehicle called Reconciliation.

But we are not new to changes in the political tides. You and I know a little something about real reform. In 1970, we took on a Republican supporter of the Vietnam War in a District that had never before elected a Democrat to Congress—assembling a textbook grassroots campaign, before there even was a textbook for these things.

The stakes were so high, the commitment so deep and the coffers so empty that, by election day, we had 60 people working full-time on an entirely volunteer basis, directing our organization in every community in this District—often reaching down to the ward and block level.

My mother converted our modest home into a 24-hour staff hotel, restaurant and laundromat. For countless weekends, my sister Gaynor commuted from Buffalo to campaign in New Bedford supermarkets with my brother Colin, who carried a card, in Portuguese, saying ''Eu sou o seu irmao''—''I am his brother.''

My dad, a talented architect who kept his Republican roots very private, was working entire function rooms by the end of that race. One of my few regrets is that he was no longer with us by the time I was elected.

Dad was with us as we waited—and waited, until the afternoon following the election—for the Hingham totals, only to learn that we had fallen short by a half of one percent of the District-wide vote.

After a few hours of sleep, we started right back in. Two years later, after re-living our all-night vigil for Hingham's final count, ours was again the second closest race in the nation. This time we had prevailed.

That spring, when the House voted 202–202 to defeat an amendment on Vietnam War funding, every single person who had stuffed an envelope, held a sign, or contributed a dollar knew their work was helping to keep youngsters from Weymouth or Falmouth or New Bedford out of harm's way.

Since the original thrust for our candidacy was the appalling lack of official candor about Vietnam, it seemed self-evident that a Representative should actually engage his constituency in an ongoing dialogue about things that matter.

We pioneered the idea of weekly reports on every vote and twice-a-year Open Meetings in each of our four-dozen communities. For the first time in its history, we opened offices in *each* of the three regions of the District; in fact, we now have four.

Since you can do only so much well, we chose our battles carefully and developed expertise to carve out a national leadership role in coastal and marine issues. The philosophy has always been to stress the practical over the purely rhetorical or partisan, so our work would relate directly to the lives people lead, the places we work and the schools we attend.

And we somehow got by without poll-driven, consultant-crafted sound-bites.

As disorienting as Washington can be, there is no way you would ever let me drift too far off course. All it takes is a stroll through Quincy neighborhoods like Squantum or Hough's Neck, where people understand the *real* meaning of roots and family values.

And not too long ago, I came from Washington to Vineyard Haven in order to tour a marine pump-out facility—that's sort of a politically correct porta-potty on the water. The event was ripe for pretentious pomp, since the project was funded under a law I had written. Leave it to Jay Wilbur, the town harbormaster to flash a half-smile while pointing to the vessel's name: the PU–E–2.

Then there was the elderly gentleman who rose after a particularly lively Open Meeting in Harwich, pointed his finger at me and said: ''Young man, I disagree with everything you just said, and I want you to know I intend to support you as long as I live!''

I wasn't quite sure what to make of that comment until coming across—of all things—the words of a Republican. Theodore Roosevelt wrote that ''the most practical kind of politics is the politics of decency''.

You don't hear him quoted too often these days on the House floor or on the campaign trail.

I still subscribe to the notion that public discourse and political campaigns are supposed to help articulate and illuminate matters of importance so citizens can make intelligent decisions in their lives and at the polls.

Many of our political adversaries over the years have agreed, which is the source of our longstanding tradition of challenging *them* to debate the issues. In one memorable campaign, my opponent and I had so many debates—13 in all—that we joked that we knew each other's positions so thoroughly we could just as well trade places.

It is increasingly difficult today to imagine sharing a laugh, a constructive exchange, or anything else remotely genuine with a political opponent. Attack, distortion and demagoguery are now the tools of the trade.

In this era of pandering, pontificating and potential third parties, it occurs to me that the rationale for our first candidacy remains hauntingly relevant. As I said in announcing our 1972 candidacy:

''The people of this District—like the people of this country—are far ahead of the politicians who are supposed to represent and lead them.

''The basic assumption seems to be that we, the American people, are too stupid to know and too heartless to care what our country is doing and what it is leaving undone. They count on our being too apathetic to insist that our government represent the best that is in each one of us, rather than pander to the worst. They think we will accept conventional politicians playing the cowardly game of conventional politics.

''There is a hunger in this country. It is a hunger for leadership—for candor, for courage, and for compassion. It is a hunger for leaders whose vision extends further forward than the next election and whose memories go further back than the last.''

If working with six Presidents has taught me anything about leadership, it is that the world is not divided into good guys and bad guys. Human nature is not that simple.

We all have the capacity for insecurity, prejudice and fear. It is to this darker side that the demagogue plays.

Each of us can also evince strength, tolerance and compassion, and it is on these ''better angels of our nature'' that the leader calls.

I am making my decision public today, more than a year before the next election, to ensure plenty of time for voters and—brace yourselves—potential candidates to assess its consequences.

At the same time, I want to underscore my commitment to our full plate of issues for the coming year.

When I see assaults on education, child nutrition and Medicaid; plans to revive Star Wars, build B–2 Bombers and legalize corporate raids on employee pension funds; and ''reforms'' that increase taxes only on people with annual incomes under $30,000; you can be assured that my voice will be as strong as ever.

I will continue to affirm our highest priorities—restoring shipbuilding to the Quincy Shipyard and cleaning up toxic pollution at the Massachusetts Military Reservation.

I will give special attention—as a Member of Congress, and then as a private citizen—to realizing our dream of making the Boston Harbor Islands a national park.

And as one who marched 30 years ago with Dr. King from Selma to Montgomery, I will advance, in every way I can, the cause of civil rights for all Americans—black and white, gay and straight.

When confronted each day by life's crises, there are always two basic responses—despair or determination. Despair sometimes seems more logical, but determination is far more productive and far better for the soul.

Many of my colleagues were shocked when, nearly ten years ago, I sent a copy of Surgeon General Koop's Report on AIDS to every household in this District. (That, incidentally would be moot today; aside from curtailing use of the Congressional frank, the House recently voted to abolish altogether the position of Surgeon General.)

I did so because 20,000 American—including 800 Massachusetts residents—had already died from the epidemic. President Reagan had yet to even utter the name of the disease, and Dr. Koop was told to let his lifesaving information gather dust on a warehouse shelf.

Too many people in my own life have been touched by HIV. For Dean and me, there are periods of time when our most common social gatherings are funerals of friends who have died far too young.

The concerns of the gay community, like those of a Congressman who happens to be gay, are far broader than AIDS. To me, however, it is impossible to look back at the last quarter-century, or ahead to the next, without considering why this public health emergency has been handled so negligently.

My colleagues called the District-wide mailing political suicide—until I started sharing the overwhelming response. What you told me was, ''What took so long?''

This constituency has always had a keen understanding that actions in Washington have consequences at home—that if you gut environmental protections, you can smell and taste dirty air and water in Plymouth and Yarmouth; that if you decimate education programs, kids in Brockton and Wellfleet may never be able to afford college; that if you are too timid, too closeted or too bigoted to confront a public health epidemic, you could pull the plug on AIDS housing in Provincetown and Marshfield.

At one Open Meeting in New Bedford, one young man got up, visibly shaking. He said that his wife had lost her job and that he was scared to death of losing his own: ''You've got to do something,'' he said. ''I've got kids. How am I going to stand it?''

Apologizing for taking too much time, he then added that he wanted to leave me with a letter. It wasn't until later that I read It—an impassioned plea to stop U.S. involvement in El Salvador.

It was a demonstration, reflected over and over across this Congressional District, of people's capacity not simply to experience their own pain, but to reach out and see beyond it.

I'll never forget the words of the Mayor of Cordova, Alaska, at a Congressional hearing on the oil spill in Prince William Sound. He told members of the Subcommittee that the two most beautiful places in the world were his home—and each of ours. ''Whatever you do,'' he said, ''go back and never let what happened here occur where you're from.''

This District is a microcosm of the nation—rich in human resources and rich in human problems. We are cities and suburbs, countryside and islands—and we are a living reminder of the origins of us all, with a substantial and continuing immigration of new Americans, whether they arrive speaking Portuguese or Vietnamese.

Never has an elected representative been so blessed by the beauty of his District and by the decency and common sense of his constituents. You have stood with me in times of triumph and in times of extraordinary personal challenge. For that I am profoundly grateful.

In turn, you and I both owe another debt of thanks to a small number of remarkable people whose labor, by definition, goes unnoticed and unheralded. The truth, however, is that so very much of the real work is done by—and the real credit for the considerable success we have enjoyed belongs to—the members of my staff.

I could not name a single accomplishment over the last two decades that would have come to fruition without the competence, creativity and sweat of these dedicated individuals. They are devoted public servants, who spend inhuman numbers of hours to see that the potential of this region is realized in the federal arena. These are my friends and my colleagues, whom it has been a privilege to work beside. They have meant more to the cities and towns of this District than will ever be fully acknowledged.

As I gathered my thoughts to chat with you today. I though a lot about an Island resident who taught many of us about things of lasting value, Henry Beetle Hough. Because my favorite of his book was ''Tuesday Will Be Different,'' I would always ask him whether he was really sure the next one would be different.

As if this surprises anyone, Henry now gets the last word. For me at least, the first Tuesday of November 1996 will be very different indeed.

For the privilege of being allowed to speak and vote in your name—for the last 23 years and over the next 14 months—I thank you with all my heart.

GEORGIA MEDICARE ADVISORY GROUP, SENIOR CITIZEN TASK FORCE REPORT FINDINGS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, in the Sixth District of Georgia, we formed a Medicare Advisory Group and a Senior Citizens Task Force to help make policy recommendations to preserve the Medicare Program. Part of the learning process for us was developing a Communications Team that went out to the people of the Sixth District and asked for their ideas based on first-hand experiences. Our findings were not surprising, but were different from what we had heard from those who had initiated a scare campaign against seniors.

The truth was that when the public knew the facts, they overwhelmingly supported Republican efforts to reform Medicare. One finding that you will not hear the scare tacticians using is that 79 percent of those we asked believe that seniors should have greater choices in health care. Compare the findings which the Communications Team presented to me on July 9, 1995, with our Medicare Preservation Act of 1995, and you will see that our plan reflects the beliefs of a majority of those we polled.

I am submitting for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the findings of the Report that I believe represent what my colleagues are hearing all over the Nation.

MEDICARE ADVISORY GROUP AND SENIOR CITIZEN TASK FORCE COMMUNICATIONS TEAM SUMMARY REPORT

In July 1995 Congressman Newt Gingrich appointed a group of citizens to The Georgia Sixth District Medicare Advisory Group and Senior Citizens Task Force. The purpose of the group was to obtain grass roots input and feedback on issues related to strengthening and improving Medicare, thereby allowing the citizenry to be actively involved in upcoming legislation related to Medicare.

The group was composed of thirty-eight constituents, consisting of the following:

1. Senior citizens;
2. Doctors, nurses and other health care providers with experience in dealing with Medicare and with senior citizens;
3. Senior service experts, particularly directors or representatives of community-based programs, such as senior service centers;
4. Government officials familiar with the current Medicare program;
5. Representatives from private industries who could provide knowledge regarding medical costs or novel solutions, particularly employing innovative technology; and
6. Volunteers and advocates for senior citizens.

The entire group met with Congressman Gingrich on four occasions, to ask questions and to provide feedback to him. Following their initial meeting with Congressman Gingrich, it was decided by the group members that they would divide into four working groups, which would meet separately, to tackle the four areas they considered most vital. These were: Medicare Fraud, Medical Technology, Alternatives to Medicare, and Communication. Each group reviewed information and sought input from citizens throughout the district, prior to producing and submitting its final report to Congressman Gingrich on September 9, 1995.

The Communication working group was made up of 12 members, 6 of whom were senior citizens. The group was chaired by Laura Linn, a registered nurse currently employed as a clinical specialist.

The group developed a questionnaire, which they administered to 565 seniors throughout the Sixth District. In order to collect data, several senior centers throughout the Sixth District were visited. In addition to administering the questionnaire, the group also made available a letter from Congressman Gingrich and a Contract with Seniors. Those materials, along with results of

the questionnaire, are included with this report.

An analysis of the questionnaire results reveal the following:

a) More than 75% of those questioned knew that Medicare was going bankrupt;

b) More than 75% were very concerned about Medicare going bankrupt, and more than 93% thought that Congress should take steps to save Medicare;

c) In terms of the changes that should be made, 67.8% said that some changes should be made but that the program should be preserved, while 11.2% wanted a complete redesign. Only 10% thought that there should be no changes in the current program;

d) While 48% preferred getting a Medicare policy directly from the government, 15% would approve of a voucher or check to purchase private insurance and nearly 37% were undecided;

e) More than half favored reduction in payments to hospitals and doctors and thought that seniors should receive incentives for identifying fraud;

f) Personally 77.2% would be willing to check their bills for fraud and abuse, 53.5% would be willing to engage in preventive and educational programs to stay healthy, and 47.5% would be willing to engage in cost-pricing to locate the most economical, quality provider;

g) Nearly 75% thought that fraud and abuse is a serious problem that needs to be addressed when Congress reforms Medicare, while 52.7% thought that lack of incentives for finding affordable care is a serious problem in the current system;

h) While 16% claim that they always shop for economical treatment, 55% said that they would if there were incentives for doing so;

i) Seventy-nine percent of respondents believe that senior citizens should have greater choice in their medical care programs, assuming that Medicare would be one of those choices.

The Communications group presented these findings to Congressman Newt Gingrich on July 9, 1995. Reports from the Medicare Fraud, Medical Technology and Alternatives to Medicare groups were also presented at that time. All information was reviewed by health care policy staff and considered in the drafting of subsequent Medicare legislation.

A CONTRACT WITH OUR SENIORS TO SAVE, STRENGTHEN AND PRESERVE MEDICARE

1. The Clinton administration's trustee's report warns the Medicare Trust Fund starts to go broke next year. The Program is Bankrupt by 2002.

2. The House Republicans will save, strengthen, and preserve Medicare through new technologies, new management and new approaches.

3. Medicare is growing at 10.5% a year, more than twice the rate of private health care spending. We can make Medicare solvent by slowing the rate of growth.

4. We will increase Medicare spending over 7 years from $4,800 per beneficiary today to $6,700 in 2002.

5. Medicare and Medicaid are government-run health care programs filled with waste and fraud—tens of billions a year (GAO). We'll crack down on this waste.

6. And we'll empower seniors to fight waste and fraud if we pay them a share of any waste they find in their own bills.

7. We will preserve the current Medicare system for those who want it.

8. We will engage in a dialogue with seniors since we believe the best ideas come from the Grass Roots.

9. Together we can create a system that offers the best care at the lowest cost with seniors having the greatest control over their own health care.

TOGETHER WE WILL STRENGTHEN MEDICARE SO IT CAN BE SAVED AND PRESERVED

SAVING, STRENGTHENING & PRESERVING MEDICARE: A QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SENIORS; (N=565) **are.**

Gender of Sample=35.8% Male; 45.3% Female; 18.9% No response.

1. Did you know that President Clinton's Board of Trustees reported that Medicare will be bankrupt by the year 2002?
A. Yes 75.9%
B. No 19.6%
No response 4.4%

2. How concerned are you about Medicare going bankrupt?
A. Very concerned 75.2%
B. Somewhat concerned 13.5%
C. Not concerned at all 3.5%
D. Undecided 4.2%
No response 3.5%

3. Do you think that Congress should try to save Medicare?
A. Yes 93.1%
B. No 1.2%
C. Undecided 2.8%
No response 2.8%

4. Do you think that Congress should (check one):
A. Completely redesign Medicare 11.2%
B. Make some changes in Medicare but preserve the program 67.8%
C. Leave Medicare alone, even though it is going broke 10.1%
D. Undecided 5.3%
No response 5.5%

5. Would you prefer to (check one):
A. Get a Medicare policy directly from the government 48.3%
B. Receive a check or voucher to purchase private insurance 15%
C. Undecided 28.5%
No response 8.1%

6. In order to save Medicare, which of the following would you favor (check all that apply):
A. Have wealthy senior citizens pay a higher premium 37%
B. Reduce payments to physicians and hospitals for care they provide 50.4%
C. Provide incentives for seniors to join managed health care plans 24.4%
D. Provide seniors with incentives for locating fraud and abuse in their bills 59.1%
E. Raise the premiums for all Medicare recipients 15.4%
F. Raise payroll taxes 9.6%
G. Reduce benefits offered to seniors 5.7%
H. Raise the age of Medicare eligibility from 65 to 67 beginning in the year 2000. 34.5%

7. In order to save Medicare would you personally be willing to (check all that apply):
A. Check your bill for fraud and abuse 77.2%
B. Engage in preventive or educational programs to learn how to stay healthy 53.5%
C. Engage in cost-pricing to locate the most economical, quality provider 47.5%
D. Pay more money in terms of higher taxes or premiums 11%

8. As Congress looks at improving Medicare, what do you think are serious problems that ought to be addressed (check all that apply):
A. Excessive amounts of paperwork 62.8%
B. Inability to understand rules/regulations 43.7%
C. Fraud and abuse 74.3%
D. Lack of incentives for seniors to locate affordable care 52.7%
E. Issues related to long-term care 52.7%

9. Do you ordinarily check your Medicare bills for accuracy?
A. Yes 77.9%
B. No 11.3%
No response 10.8%

10. How often do you find out the cost of Medicare procedures prior to having them done?
A. Always 19.3%
B. Usually 21.4%
C. Occasionally 20.5%
D. Never 25.7%
No response 13.1%

11. How often do you shop for more economical treatment of comparable quality?
A. Always 16.6%
B. Usually 16.5%
C. Occasionally 17.5%
D. Never 34.3%
No response 15%

12. If you were rewarded monetarily for finding more affordable treatment of comparable quality, would you?
A. Yes 55%
B. No 11.5%
C. Undecided 19.8%
No response 13.6%

13. Have you ever suspected fraud or abuse on your Medicare bills?
A. Yes 38.5%
B. No 48.5%
No response 12.6%

14. If you find instances of billing errors on Medicare bills, do you do anything to rectify the situation? (If so, give details and the usual outcome)
A. Always 31.9%
B. Usually 14%
C. Occasionally 10.1%
D. Never 12.4%
E. Not applicable 16.5%
No response 15.6%

15. Would you try to locate and report instances of fraud and abuse on your Medicare bills, if there was a financial incentive for doing so?
A. Yes 72%
B. No 6.9%
C. Undecided 9%
No response 12%

16. Do you think that senior citizens should have greater choice in their medical care programs, assuming that Medicare is one of the choices?
A. Yes 79.5%
B. No 4.2%
C. Undecided 7.8%
No response 8.5%

17. What are your major concerns regarding health care?

18. If you could tell Newt one thing about saving Medicare what would that be?

KILDEE HONORS LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, in January, 1996 we will be celebrating national School Board Recognition Month in this country. In honor of this occasion I rise today to pay tribute to the contributions local school boards make to our education system.

As a nation we place a high premium on the benefits to be gained from pursuing educational goals. Local school board members are elected by the community to ensure that everyone is given the opportunity for self-improvement through education. School boards seek community input and involvement in the education process. They are the liaison between the community and our schools. The members of school boards have accepted the responsibility of shaping the education of future generations and thereby the future of our

Nation. School boards must assess the needs of their communities and provide the learning opportunities to meet these demands. They play a vital role in safeguarding students and schools.

The theme for 1996 is ''Uniting Communities through Public Education''. This spotlights the role local school boards have in bringing together persons from all walks of life. They help unite us into one nation. Through the dedication of local school boards, all Americans can learn and work together. School board members speak for all schoolchildren regardless of their background or goals.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House of Representatives join with me today in honoring these dedicated individuals who have accepted the challenge to provide quality education to every schoolchild. They play a historic role in carrying on public education's proud tradition.

TRIBUTE TO JIM MILLS' 40 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE MIDDLETOWN COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years, Jim Mills has served the Middletown area through his local reporting and editorial writing at the Middletown Journal. Jim began his career at the Journal in 1995 starting off as a reporter covering local government. In 1957, he was appointed Sunday editor and moved to city editor in 1960. From 1972 until 1981 Jim was the managing editor of the paper. Ultimately, in 1981, he headed the newsroom and retained the title managing editor.

Jim and Middletown, OH have seen many important news stories over the last four decades. Some of the local highlights include the growth and restructuring of Armco to its present organization as AK Steel, creation of the City Centre Mall, and redevelopment of the downtown area, State championships for area high schools, and the change Middletown and its business community have undergone.

Jim and the Middletown Journal staff were always conscientious to bring the local angle to national news items ranging from the John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Robert Kennedy assassinations, the Vietnam war, the Iranian hostage crisis, Desert Storm, and the explosion of the Space Shuttle *Challenger* explosion.

Jim has received several awards for his dedication and continuous service. Among them are an award from the Associated Press Society of Ohio for exemplary service to the news-gathering business and his assistance to the Xenia Daily Gazette publish and report the news when its' offices were destroyed in a 1974 tornado. For coverage of the devastation the Gazette won a Pulitzer Prize.

During the past four decades, Jim has worked with hundreds of reporters and local officials. They join me in saluting Jim for his work and wishing him the best in his retirement.

A TRIBUTE TO HELEN BEST

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Whereas, Mrs. Helen Best, should be recognized for celebrating her 80th birthday on December 14, 1995; and,

Whereas, Mrs. Helen Best, should be honored for her achievements, including her membership to the Carroll County Precinct Committee for forty years, deputy director and director of the Carroll County Board of Elections, and committee chair of the Subcommittee on Elections and Candidate Services; and,

Whereas, Mrs. Helen Best, has demonstrated her commitment to Carroll County and the surrounding area; and,

Whereas, the county owes Mrs. Helen Best a great deal of gratitude for her selfless, devoted service; and,

Whereas, I join the residents of Carroll County, with distinct pleasure, in celebrating Mrs. Helen Best 80th birthday.

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT FOR H.R. 1020

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the sponsor of H.R. 1020, the Integrated Spent Nuclear Fuel Management Act of 1995, a bill that will make the Federal Government live up to its promise of building and operating a high-level nuclear waste repository by January 31, 1998. While nearly 200 of my colleagues have cosponsored H.R. 1020, there are several that were unable to do so after the bill was put on the House calendar. I would like to acknowledge the following Members as supporters of doing what is right, making the Government live up to its promises: CHARLES BASS, HELEN CHENOWETH, BARBARA CUBIN, JAY DICKEY, VAN HILLEARY, MARGE ROUKEMA, MAC THORNBERRY.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I don't know what we need to do to get a clear budget plan from the President, but with each day it becomes increasingly obvious that he just doesn't have one.

Our Republican negotiators need an explicit budget plan from the President. The plan submitted over the weekend is at least $75 billion out of balance. It is a phony. We cannot come to an agreement when all the White House is prepared to offer are superficial numbers severely deficient in detail.

Mr. Speaker, the President must give Republicans a specific plan with specific reforms and numbers. And, he needs to make sure it reaches balance in 7 years. My Republican colleagues and I have a plan, a real, honest balanced budget on the table. We are prepared to remain in Washington through Christmas to achieve an agreement, but we need the President and his Democrat colleagues to get serious and get to work.

TRIBUTE TO DON MACCULLOUGH, ''MR. EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING'' IN SOUTH FLORIDA

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a true pioneer in public television, Mr. Don MacCullough, who will be retiring in a few weeks after over 30 years with WLRN–TV in Miami—the past 22 years as general manager.

Throughout his career, Don MacCullough exemplified all that is right with educational television. A tireless worker, his determination helped keep WLRN based in Miami when others wanted to move it elsewhere. His dedication and skill helped the station grow in prestige over the years. His creativity and willingness to try new approaches brought in legions of new, loyal viewers, and helped make WLRN the community institution that it is today. Finally, the reputation he built over the years made him a leader in the industry. When Don MacCullough speaks, people listen.

It is difficult to think of public television in south Florida without Don MacCullough. However, the legacy he created will continue to enrich the lives of public television viewers for years to come.

I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Don MacCullough on a remarkable career and thanking him for a job well done. We wish you every success in your future endeavors.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

•—ContinuedE 2413

SPEECH OF

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1995

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, today's authorization bill represents a recommitment of this Congress to the men and women who bravely serve and defend this Nation. This bill contains the funding necessary to assure that when we ask our troops to defend our national interest abroad, they go with the very best we can give them.

Here and now, C–17's and C–130's will safely and efficiently airlift our troops to Bosnia. For the future, the F–22 air superiority aircraft continues through the development stages.

The bill expresses the Congress' continued commitment to the B–2 program, notwithstanding the delay on funding until the end of March. In light of this situation, it is incumbent on Secretary Perry to bridge this time period and ensure that industrial activity can continue by freeing up $25 million yet to be obligated from the 1995 budget.

The Congress spoke clearly in this authorization bill and in its appropriation measure:

The B–2 is a vital part of our bomber modernization program. And until a final disposition is made on the future procurement of additional bombers, we must preserve the industrial base with short-term funding action, action most appropriately taken by the Secretary of Defense.

It is important to note that all of the procurement priorities authorized in this legislation fit within the balanced budget the new majority has sent to the President. If this President will continue to expect so much from our military men and women, he must be prepared to give them the very best we can afford and sign this authorization when presented. As leaders, we owe them that.

TRIBUTE TO LYNETTE FREEMAN

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, We often read stories about young people across America who possess remarkable talent and ability. Most impressive are the stories we read about school students who have set goals for themselves, and exhibit the determination to reach those goals. I rise today to salute a young student who is one such individual.

Lynette Freeman is 12 years old, and a seventh grade student at Andrews School in Willoughby OH. Lynette is president of her seventh grade class and a member of the Environmental Club, the Literary Magazine, the Language Club and the Riding Club. These extracurricular activities are in addition to a challenging academic schedule, which includes life science, honors algebra, French and Spanish. For Lynette, however, her first love is the theater. She started acting at the age of three. Her stage credits include Annie Get Your Gun, Penelope, Pride of the Pickle Factory, as well as productions at Cuyahoga Community College.

Mr. Speaker, the Plain Dealer newspaper in Cleveland, OH, recently profiled Lynette Freeman. The paper examined how this young student has developed effective time-management skills that enable her to succeed academically and socially. In whatever field she pursues, it is obvious that this young woman is headed for success. I take pride in saluting Lynette Freeman. I am also pleased to share the Plain Dealer profile with my colleagues. The article is certainly worthwhile reading.

[From the Plain Dealer, Dec. 11, 1995]

SEVENTH GRADER AHEAD OF HER TIME AT JUGGLING SCHOOL, ACTIVITIES

(By April McClellan-Copeland)

WILLOUGHBY.—Twelve-year-old Lynette Freeman talks about time management as if she is the CEO of a major corporation.

That's because it takes the time-management skills of an executive for the Andrews School seventh-grader to fit all of her extracurricular activities into a 24-hour day.

Lynnette is president of the seventh-grade class and a member of the Environmental Club, the literary magazine, the Language Club and the Riding Club.

She plays tennis with her mother, Ruth; takes piano, singing and ballet lessons; and even makes time to write poetry and short stories in a journal.

Lynnette, an East Cleveland resident, also reserves enough time to take part in her favorite hobby: performing in plays at the East Cleveland Theater, where she has studied for several years.

And she fits all of these activities around a challenging academic schedule, which includes life science, honors algebra, French and Spanish.

''I do some of my school work ahead of time,'' said Lynnette, as she used her lunch period to talk to a visitor and munch on onion rings and a cheeseburger in the Andrews cafeteria. ''I do as much in class as I can and in study hall. I manage my time. All of my activities are like studying for school. This is all a commitment I make.''

Lynnette said her parents, Ruth and Linton, don't push her to participate in so many activities. She said these are all things in which she has shown a natural interest.

But when the going gets tough, as sometimes it does when she has to finish an English paper at 1 a.m., Lynnette's parents give her the pep talks that keep her motivated.

''This is all my choice,'' Lynnette said. ''Sometimes I want to quit. But my parents say, 'You made this commitment.' They give me this extra boost.''

Lynnette grins as she talks about how ballet makes her feel strong and about her trip to Europe next summer through the U.S. government-sponsored People Program student ambassadorship.

But mention the theater and a smile spreads across Lynnette's face so broad it makes her squint.

''My favorite activity is when I'm acting in the theater,'' Lynnette said. ''I get to be someone else and I get to go into character. I like drama and theater because of opening night. I get to put on a costume and makeup.''

Lynnette most recently played the character Jessie, the sister of Annie Oakley, in a production of ''Annie Get Your Gun'' at the East Cleveland Theater.

She talks incessantly about her stage successes, as well as some of her blunders. The experiences are funny to her, but they remind her that drama is hard work.

But perhaps her fondest memories are reserved for humorous scenes like the one in the East Cleveland Theater production ''Penelope, Pride of the Pickle Factory.''

Reciting some of the tongue-twisting alliterations in her favorite scene in ''Penelope'' reduced her maturity to a gaggle of giggles only a child could appreciate.

''In the first scene, we are talking about what we had for lunch,'' Lynnette said, pausing to let out a hearty laugh. ''I had to say I had a pickled peanut butter sandwich.''

Lynnette started acting when she was 3 years old. She has also performed in productions at Cuyahoga Community College.

''My parents would take me to see different plays. I'd say, 'Gee, I want to have that lead part,' As I cleaned my room, I would be acting like I was in a play. My cat was my audience.''

A FRIEND OF MORE THAN THE COURT

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, our judicial system is critically dependent upon the people who toil on behalf of the public interest. This is certainly true in our criminal justice system, and is equally true in our civil justice system, particularly in our family courts. Nothing can be more traumatic than the intervention of the courts in our day-to-day activities, but in some matters there is no choice but the court's involvement. It is at times like these that we should be particularly thankful that caring and skilled people, like Leonard Portnoy, have spent their careers on behalf of those who must deal with our court system.

After 20 years of serving as friend of the court, Leonard Portnoy of Bay City, MI, is retiring next week. A thoughtful gentleman who never spared in his generous consideration of the difficulties faced by people dealing with the court, he is known by many as a patient, helpful, and dedicated individual who has the delicate task of dealing with people at a very tense time in their lives. He is in charge of making recommendations to the court about child custody, visitation rights, and support payments. He also has to operate as a mediator regarding the safeguarding of these rights. And he also must serve as the enforcer who must deal with any violation of the court's orders.

Leonard Portnoy has been in our community since 1969 in response to an ad for a staff attorney position at the Bay-Midland Legal Aid Society. He then became assistant Bay County prosecutor for Eugene Penzien, who himself is retiring as a Bay County circuit court judge next month. He became acting friend of the court in 1974, and then was officially appointed by Governor Milliken in 1975 following the death of Maxine Clarey, the prior friend of the court.

Over the years, friend of the Court Portnoy had to deal with a never-ending and demanding caseload. He had to deal with the likely stresses associated with having to sort out difficult situations at often less than friendly and objective times. He has had to administer an office that annually must oversee millions of dollars in support payments for the people under the court's jurisdiction.

Even in this important and often trying profession, Leonard Portnoy is known for having maintained his sense of humor, and for being perhaps the best target for April Fool's Day jokes in the friend of the court system. That spirit, along with the balance of convictions, has made him among the best of friends of the court that I have ever encountered.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing Leonard and his wife Irene the very best as he enters retirement. His career has been of great value to thousands of people. He leaves big shoes to fill.

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW GIBBS

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding East Texan, Andrew James Gibbs of Mabank, TX, who died recently at the age of 79. Andrew Gibbs was a dear friend and long-time business and civic leader of Mabank who devoted a lifetime to the betterment of his community.

Born on January 11, 1916, in Elm Grove, to J. Cullen and Ella Higginbotham, Andrew grew up in Elm Grove and married his hometown sweetheart, Arlene McAfee. At the age of 19, he began working at Tri-County Ford and at

his father's bank. During World War II he served in the U.S. Navy and then returned to Mabank, where he purchased Tri-County Ford and raised cattle.

During the following years and until his death, he was a prosperous businessman who also devoted much of his time and energy to his community. He was active in virtually every civic activity in the region. He served as president of the Chamber of Commerce, Mabank Industrial Foundation, and Cedar Creek Hospital Board; member of the Mabank Independent School District Board of Trustees and the Trinity River Improvement Association; chairman of the board of Elm Grove Methodist Church and Elm Grove Cemetery Committee; president of Mabank Roping and Riding Club and organizer and president of the Cedar Creek Country Club and was a Mason with Roddy Blue Lodge. In 1977 he was named Citizen of the Year by Henderson, Kaufman, and Van Zandt counties in recognition of his extraordinary contributions.

Andrew also was an ardent supporter of higher education in the area. In 1970 he was appointed to the Board of Trustees of Henderson County Junior College, now Trinity Valley Community College. During his 20-year tenure and as board president, he saw enrollment grow from 1,000 to almost 5,000 students and the college expand from the Athens campus to Palestine, Terrell, and Kaufman campuses. On April 6, 1995, the Andrew Gibbs Academic Building was dedicated—a fitting tribute to his leadership, dedication, and countless hours of service on behalf of the college.

Andrew is survived by his wife, Alene; daughters, Andrea and Bettie, sons-in-law, and grandchildren, plus numerous friends and associates. He also leaves behind a powerful legacy of public service—a legacy of generosity and dedication to his family and his community. As the local newspaper, The Monitor, stated, ''Men of his stature are often referred to as 'pillars of the community.' Andrew Gibbs was more than that, he was the foundation.''

Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to pay a final tribute to this outstanding American and my good friend, Andrew Gibbs, whose life was an inspiration to all those who knew him and whose memory will survive for future generations.

IN HONOR OF DAISY VONDRAK

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a fine resident of the Third Congressional District who passed away on Sunday, December 17, 1996. Mrs. Daisy Vondrak, 80, a resident of the Chicago Lawn neighborhood, died on Sunday in the Brentwood Nursing Center in Burbank, IL.

Mrs. Daisy Vondrak was the cofounder of Vondrak Publications. For almost 40 years, she coowned and operated with her husband, Edward, the Southwest News Herald and four other local community newspapers. Mrs. Vondrak handled the bookkeeping and finances of the newspaper, while her husband was in charge of the editorial operation. She watched the books closely; her attention to detail and strong work ethic pulled both the couple and the newspaper through many tough times.

During the Depression, Mrs. Vondrak and her husband purchased a small paper, the Gage Park Herald, that primarily provided neighborhood news to servicemen away from home. Deciding to broaden their publishing efforts in 1946, they attempted to purchase the Southwest News. Her husband was then an editor for the Life newspapers. They had to borrow all they could from friends and relatives and neighbors. It was a big chance for two young adults to take but they did it. Mr. and Mrs. Vondrak started out with just the two of them and ended up with 52 employees. The Vondraks retired in 1987 and initiated a humorous publication, the Chuckle Town Times.

The weekly newspapers the Vondraks copublished covered such southwest side communities as Chicago Lawn, Gage Park, Clearing, and Marquette Manor and the suburbs of Oak Lawn, Evergreen Park, Justice, Bridgeview, and Hickory Hills. The newspapers provide both national and neighborhood news to their subscribers. By faithfully watching the books and taking care of business, Mrs. Vondrak guaranteed that her neighbors would know what was going on around them in the community, the Nation, and the world. She provided a wonderful community service and will be sorely missed.

I first met Mrs. Vondrak in 1959, when I worked as the physical education instructor at Marquette Park. Every Monday night, I would submit stories to her or her husband Ed about activities at the park that would appear in the Thursday edition of the Southwest News Herald. I knew her personally and saw each week how dedicated she was to keeping the local publications up and running.

Mrs. Vondrak is survived by her two sons, James and Edward, a sister, a brother, and six grandchildren. I would like my colleagues to join me in offering sincere condolences to Mrs. Daisy Vondrak's family. She was a hard worker and strong businesswoman who will be missed by the entire community.

TAX RELIEF AND THE RIGHT TO WORK FOR OLDER AMERICANS

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the House of Representatives for passing H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act of 1995, which ends the practice of punishing older Americans who want to work.

Earlier this year, I promised the one million working, older Americans financial relief from the punitive Social Security earnings limit which is wrongly imposed on them. H.R. 2684, fulfills my promise by increasing the earnings limit to $30,000 by the year 2002. Today, many people across the Nation want or need to work beyond the age of 64 because a fixed Social Security income alone cannot provide adequate financial resources.

This Nation has a tremendous amount of talent available in its older Americans. Younger people in the workplace gain a lot through the experience of these individuals who continue to work. Simply put, lifting the earnings limit is the right thing to do because it is good for all of us.

When fully phased in, the Senior Citizens' Right to Work Act will exempt about 50 percent of the people who currently have to comply with the earnings limit. These individuals have worked hard to pay into the Social Security trust fund. This legislation keeps our promise to lift the earnings limit for older people so they can continue to contribute to our Nation.

ENFORCING THE PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT AND PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND OTHER FEDERAL TRUST FUNDS

SPEECH OF

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 14, 1995

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, article I, section 8 of the Constitution clearly states that it is the Congress who has the power ''to borrow money on the credit of the United States,'' not the President or the executive branch. The problem that continues to trigger increases in the debt limit is the failure to balance the Federal budget. Balancing the budget is the first step in paying off the ever-mounting debts that have accumulated for future generations.

Passing the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 could be the best gift we ever give our children but this cannot be done without the President's help. We offered the President a balanced budget which included a raised debt ceiling but the President vetoed it.

Instead of negotiating a balanced budget plan, the President permitted the Treasury to raid two Federal trust funds—taking a total of $61.3 billion from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund and the Federal Employees Thrift Savings Fund [G-fund]. By shifting these funds, the President bought more time to allow the Government to skirt the debt limit and avoid a default.

While no one wants a default, disinvesting retirement funds to free up room under the debt ceiling circumvents the debt limit as well as Congress' role in authorizing Federal borrowing. Moreover it allows the administration to avoid having to change its spending habits—a change which the American people have demanded.

The administration says that those funds will be repaid with interest but that interest is going to have to come from somewhere. Every dollar the administration removes from the trust funds can then be spent by issuing new debt to the public. Again, we are left with another Government bill with more interest payments at taxpayers' expense.

To better envision the significance of the debt limit and balancing the budget, I like to use the analogy of a credit care limit. When one has spent one's maximum spending/credit limit, one cannot keep on spending. Instead, one must take steps to balance his or her budget so that the output does not exceed the input. In other words they must change their spending habits.

Living within one's means is the financial reality that individual Americans confront everyday. People cannot simply keep calling the credit card company asking it to raise their

credit limit. That is essentially what the administration wants this Congress to do. It wants Congress to raise its credit limit or the debt ceiling without any strategy for paying off its debt.

Balancing the budget is a step in the right direction; it diminishes the continuing need for having the debt or borrowing level raised. The Federal debt or credit card bill is now about $5 trillion, and that does not include the interest. The fiscal year 1996 budget estimates that the U.S. Government will spend about $256 billion in 1996, or about 16 percent of the budget, just to pay the interest on this debt.

H.R. 2621 is a bill to enforce the public debt limit and to protect the Social Security and other Federal trust funds. It ends the debt-ceiling smoke and mirrors. With the $21 billion in the G-fund, $365 billion in the Social Security Retirement Fund, $143 billion in the Medicare Trust Fund, and $483 billion in the Social Security Trust Fund, there is money for the administration to disinvest and build up more and more debt with more and more interest payments thereby sidestepping the Constitution. This bill ensures what the Constitution says about the authority to issue debt—Congress is vested with the ''Power . . . To borrow Money on the Credit of the United States.''

The reason we are having this current confrontation in Washington is not simply over how the Government keeps its books, or when we reach a balanced budget. The true confrontation is changing the way Government operates. We are in the midst of a revolution as dramatic as Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal and its expansion of Government into every aspect of our lives. The question is whether we will have more Governmental control over our lives, higher taxes, more borrowing, and more interest payments, or whether we will go back to what made this country great—a frugal Government and individual responsibility. I agree with the views Thomas Jefferson expressed in his letter to Elbridge Gerry nearly 200 years ago—''I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt, on the principle of its being a public blessing.''

H.R. 2621 not only protects our retirement funds from senseless and expensive manipulation, it sends the President a clear message that the American public and this Congress is serious about balancing the budget.

DEDICATED, PROFESSIONAL, AND CARING

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the greatest need that all of us have throughout our lives is for food. And contrary to some accepted myths, it doesn't just magically appear on the grocery store shelves overnight. Food gets from farm to table through the professional and skillful efforts of many people who have spent their careers in agribusiness. Ronald W. Stebbins is one of these committed professionals who after having been involved in agribusiness for the past 40 years is about to retire.

Born and raised on a dairy and potato farm in Kalkaska County, MI, and having attended Michigan State University, over his career Ron Stebbins has worked for private industry, for cooperatives, and for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He has worked throughout Michigan, and has developed a very impressive international marketing capability. He is well respected as a leader in agribusiness, and has served as an officer of several different professional agricultural associations, including the Michigan Bean Shippers Association, the Michigan Grain and Agri-Dealers Association, St. Paul Bank for Cooperatives, the Bank of Alma, and Valley Marketing, Inc.

In his capacity as president, secretary, and treasurer of the Michigan Agri-Business Association, Ron has helped to increase the professionalism and capability of Michigan's men and women in agribusiness. Educational events, informative meetings, legislative activities, insurance and other services have all been provided by this association, and Ron Stebbins has helped develop and improve many of these efforts.

Ron is very well known to many farmers in Michigan agriculture. Certainly his work as a grain trader has brought him in contact with many farmers, as did his work as supervisor for USDA's grain storage program many farm bills ago. His work over the years specifically with dry beans has made him a world leader in one of the most vital commodities for the economic well-being of our area's agriculture. His work with advisory committees has helped him to maintain a close eye on the moods and needs of our producers. Many farmers and traders alike know that when they speak with Rob Stebbins, they are getting an informed and dependable assessment on important agribusiness conditions.

This gentleman has also maintained significant involvement with his community over the years, including his service as a member of several area groups in Ithaca and Gratiot County, as well as having served as a councilman for the city of Ithaca and a director of the Gratiot County Hospital Board. Together with his wife of 38 years, Mary Kay, his three children and five grandchildren, Ron continues to offer the kind of role model that all of our children should see. Commitment to family, dedication to professionalism, concern about his community, all of these factors of which Ron can be proud, and examples for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of 40 years of devoted expertise and consistent professionalism, I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in wishing Ron and his family the very best on his retirement.

IN MEMORY OF TOBY FARMER

HON. RALPH M. HALL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during this holiday season our thoughts naturally turn to children—our own children and grandchildren, children of our friends, children in our community, children in need. I would like to tell my colleagues about a special child, Andrew Michael ''Toby'' Farmer, a child who died of cancer on December 2.

Words are inadequate to convey our sense of grief and compassion in the loss of a child. Andrew was 10 years old, the son of David and Janet Farmer of Stafford County and brother to Allison Marie Farmer. He was a fifth-grade student at Garrisonville Elementary School. And he was a fighter. His mother wrote to me, ''Andrew had a tough time, but he never, ever complained. He was and is the strongest person I have ever known.

Such courage in the face of death—particularly such courage in a young boy—humbles and saddens us, Mr. Speaker, but also should inspire us to work harder to find the elusive cure for a disease that prematurely ends too many lives each year. We must be sure that programs vital to biomedical research are protected and strengthened where needed. One of those programs, Mr. Speaker, is the international space station, and I commend this body for supporting funding of the space station earlier this year. The weightless environment of the space station has enormous potential for medical research—research that could lead to cures or better treatments for cancer and other diseases—and I urge my colleagues to continue support for such programs in the years to come.

Our hearts go out to Andrew's parents, sister, grandparents, and his many friends, and I ask my colleagues also to join me today in paying our last respects to this brave young man. Andrew ''Toby'' Farmer lived the remaining days of what should have been the normal life of a 10-year-old boy by displaying extraordinary strength and courage. Mr. Speaker, he is an inspiration to all those who knew him and loved him—and he will be missed.

BRINGING THE TERRORISM BILL TO THE FLOOR

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Republican leadership reversed itself again on the terrorism bill. Repeatedly, the leadership had promised to bring this legislation to the floor. First they said they would do it by Memorial Day. Then they said it would come up before August recess. Finally, they pledged a vote by the end of the year.

Yesterday afternoon, however, the bill was abruptly yanked from this week's floor schedule.

Yesterday, I also received a letter from Ms. Victoria Cummock of Coral Gables, FL. Ms. Cummock's husband was killed 7 years ago when Pan Am Flight 103 exploded over Lockerbie, Scotland. As a victim of this random, senseless terrorist attack, she had dearly hoped that the House would finally move toward passage of the terrorism bill. Once again, her hopes have been dashed by the leadership's pandering to the far right.

I would like to enter Ms. Cummock's statement in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, to demonstrate to all of my colleagues how important this legislation really is. I share her hope that Congress will move urgently to pass the anti-terrorism bill right away, rather than waiting for another tragedy to spur action.

I ask unanimous consent that her letter appear directly following these remarks:

FAMILIES OF PAN-AM 103 LOCKERBIE,
Coral Gables, FL, December 13, 1995.

Re H.R. 1710/sub/H.R. 2703 counter-terrorism legislation.

Hon. CHARLES SCHUMER,
House Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHUMER: I am the widow of John Binning Cummock, a 38 yr. old American father of three, who was killed by terrorist, abroad Pan Am 103 over Lockerbie Scotland. Additionally, I am the Vice President of the Pan Am 103 Families group representing over 180 next-of-kin. I am writing in support of HR 2703 substatute for HR 1710. I feel that this current legislation is the most comprehensive and proactive approach to protect Americans from terrorism that I have seen come out of Congress in the last seven years.

After the bombing of the Murrah building in Oklahoma City, Congress vowed to get tough and pass this legislation by Memorial Day '95. Quick progress was made on the Senate side but sadly the House seems to have come to a screeching halt on debating this bill. Now that the media focus has faded from the Oklahoma City bombing, my fear is that Congress will recess before enacting this badly needed legislation. it is imperative that Congress does not forget its responsibility, not only to protect the American people, but to support the law enforcement agencies who are trying to respond to the escalating and changing threats.

In less than seven years, I have looked into the faces of hundreds of American families that have been devastated by terrorism, after the bombing of Pan Am 103, the World Trade Center and most recently after spending 11 days in Oklahoma City under the sponsorship of the American Red Cross. I know all to well what they have been sentenced to live with under the current system. We owe it to our children and to future generations to be able to live in a safe and secure America. American children must now grow up feeling like they are walking targets to potential terrorist attacks, both domestically and internationally. Unfortunately, the children of the victims of terrorism remember all too well the questions of who is protecting them and where is justice? Let us not afford more consideration and rights to illegal aliens, felons or potential terrorists, than we do to our children who daily pledge allegiance to the American flag.

Specifically, for the Pan Am 103 families the FSIA Amendment within Section 804 is of particular importance. This will provide victims of terrorism an avenue to pursue terrorist sponsoring Nations, where none existed before, by waiving Sovereign Immunity for specific acts of terrorism against American. Clearly, history has shown that the current system, of diplomacy takes decades and only serves to re-victimize the victims' families by providing little or no remedy. In our case, as the KAL 007 flight which occurred over 12 years ago, no progress is in sight. A failure to achieve swift and adequate resolution only to continues the emotional pain, and anguish of the families especially the children. Victims' families are not entitled to access the mental health and other areas of support currently available to other American victims of violent crimes. Hence, America turns its back on the families of those who made the ultimate sacrifice for being Americans. To potentially receive compensation after 40 years can not buy back my children's childhood, especially if they have been too traumatized to be able to learn how to read or sleep through the night.

I hope that we can count on your full support when this bill is placed for a vote. I can be reached at (305) 667–7218 or Skypage 1 (800) 592–8770. My hope is that it will not take another incident to refocus Washington's priorities on counter-terrorism, and other Americans can be spared our fate. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

M. VICTORIA CUMMOCK,
V.P. Pam Am 103 Lockerbie,
Widow of John B. Cummock.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

••••••••••§¶x•—ContinuedE 2417

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, December 15, 1995

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to make clear that I see many good facets to this bill. However, I call attention to a portion of it, on the consequences of an HIV-positive test result, that was not debated in the House, primarily because many of us believed that it would be removed by the Senate. The President has suggested that he will veto this bill. If he does and this chamber has another opportunity to consider it, it is essential that we directly address and debate the issue of HIV testing and test results in the military.

We should be aware that section 561 of this bill—section 567 of the Conference Report—provides that any member of the military who is determined through testing to be HIV-positive be automatically dismissed. Specifically, this section requires the Secretary of Defense to separate or retire service members who test HIV-positive within 6 months of their positive test. This requirement represents a serious public policy and public health problem that should not become law in this country.

The issue is not simply testing for HIV because I believe there are appropriate public health reasons and goals for such testing. For example, I have worked very closely with other Members, both Republicans and Democrats, including the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN], and others, on the issue of mandatory testing of infants as part of the reauthorization of the Ryan White CARE Act. Many advances in the treatment of HIV disease have been developed and are becoming increasingly available; this is a positive situation that did not exist previously. HIV testing, if done appropriately and sensitively, should lead individuals who test positive to seek treatment and care. Effective treatments ultimately may lead to a cure for HIV disease. If testing leads to treatment and to a cure, then all of us ought to support it. Under these circumstances, we should encourage testing for every element of American society. Testing is currently one of the most important means of HIV prevention that exists.

But, when mandatory testing leads to mandatory job discrimination, we send a signal to everyone in American society not to get tested. That is, we send precisely the opposite message than we really want to send. The mandatory discharge specified in this bill occurs regardless of the HIV-positive individual's health and fitness and despite the fact that people continue to work productively for several years after being infected with HIV. We should not presume that a positive HIV test automatically means an inability to effectively carry out duties or to engage in productive work. Yet, this presumption seems to underlie the mandatory discharge provision in this bill.

The mandatory discharge specified in this bill also singles out HIV disease from other medical conditions. It treats military personnel who test HIV-positive differently than personnel with other diseases or conditions. In this sense, then, section 561 is blatantly discriminatory. The issue becomes one of HIV status rather than health status and the ability to carry out duties.

If we allow this provision to remain, furthermore, we likely set ourselves on a slippery slope to continuing and increasing discrimination. Today it is the military, tomorrow it will be military contractors, and the next day it will be all of the independent private sector. We have to change this provision before this bill becomes law. We should not encourage, and certainly not legislate, discrimination against any American citizen.

The provision for mandatory discharge of members of the armed forces who test HIV-positive should not be in this bill. Instead, we should encourage HIV testing in a context in which individuals can and will seek out effective treatments. These treatments may extend their lives, allow them to continue to work productively, and one day, produce a cure for HIV disease. Individuals who seek or are tested for HIV should not be punished for their test results. The positive elements of this bill aside, therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose this Department of Defense authorization bill conference report.

ENGLISH: LANGUAGE OF OPPORTUNITY I

••§¶x•—ContinuedE 2417

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to share with the Members of this distinguished body and the good people of this country an account which reveals a great deal about legislation which I have introduced to establish English as the official language of the Federal Government. I have my good friend Mr. Tommy Macchiaroli to thank for passing along this story to me, and I am pleased to now present it to you.

As you know, I have been a principal sponsor of legislation to establish English as the official language of the Federal Government since the 101st Congress. I have studied the official English issue at length and have explored its tremendous potential to contribute to the well-being and prosperity of this country. However, even though I have become very familiar with the comprehensive reports, the historical lessons, and the compelling logic which confirm the need for this kind of legislation, I am still struck by the experiences and straightforward wisdom of folks who have visited the question of a common language on the most personal of levels. Anthony Macchiaroli, an immigrant from Italy, is one of these individuals, and it is his inspiring story that I would like to relate to you today.

It is my hope that we will learn from the dedication, the workmanlike approach, and the ultimate success of this proud American. His example tells us quite a bit about the economics of official English legislation, demonstrating

the new members of this great democracy must have use of the English language in order to get ahead and become fully productive citizens. It is clear from the experience of Mr. Macchiaroli that the linguistic welfare of multilingual government is nothing short of a handicap to individuals entering our country. Regrettably, the handicap of multilingual government affects all Americans, resulting in severe social and monetary costs. I commend to you the story of Mr. Macchiaroli, as it appeared in an article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette on September 3 of this year.

I WORKED HARD—BUT IT NEVER HURT ME

Tomorrow we pause to pay tribute to the workers who built this country. Many of those workers were immigrants, who came to America seeking a better life.

Anthony J. Macchiaroli is such a worker. The 60-year-old North Versailles resident quietly operates his New Eastland Mall store Valley Shoe Repair, where soles are mended Italian style—by hand.

''Tony,'' who came to the United States from Salerno, Italy, in 1953, says hard work has kept him in business at the mall since 1963.

Macchiaroli stepped off a boat in New York at age 17 with 35 cents. He went to live with an aunt and uncle in East Pittsburgh, and later opened a shoe repair shop, got married, and was able to send his two children to college. One of his sons is a physician in Johnstown, the other an electrical engineer in Florida.

He doesn't plant to retire but says instead he'll shorten his work week in coming years. ''I really enjoy what I'm doing,'' he says. ''I don't think I'll ever retire because I do enjoy talking to the people, and my customers need me too. It's a lost art—fixing America was a dream. It was like I could never come here. I used to pray a lot to God to let me see that I could go to America. My uncle and aunt used to send me letters with stamps of the Statue of Liberty on them. Whenever I'd get those letters, I'd wonder if I'd ever really get to see her.

I've been here 42 years, and America has been good to me. If you have ambition, you can do anything here. It truly is the land of opportunity—believe me. If people set a goal here, they can achieve it.

I came to America March 10, 1953. I was not quite 18 yet and was an orphan. My father died when I was 17 months old and my mother died when I was 3½. Before she died, my mother had written to her brother in Pittsburgh and said, ''If anything happens to me, I'd like my son to come to America near you.'' I still have that letter today. She died in a hospital in Naples, and left me in a convent with nuns until my father's sister could take me out. She raised me until I came to the United States.

I wanted to come here because it was a new land and I had heard so much about the country, that it was so great. But it wasn't like today where you can come right away or come as a tourist. You had to wait. Three times my papers expired before I could go. Finally my uncle and aunt, Vito and Anna Parente, were able to get me. They had to guarantee me a house and job, and they didn't have a house themselves and had to buy one because of me. It was almost like they were adopting me. I'll never forget them, that's for sure.

In the small towns like Bellosguardo in Salerno, where I grew up, you always learn a trade. I had bad feet from an accident where I was burned as a baby, so I wanted to be a shoemaker. In Italy, you sit while working as a shoemaker, but here you do the work standing up.

My first job here was in Homestead with a shoemaker. I got $8 a day, six days a week, 12 hours a day. My boss justified my wage by saying, ''You can't talk English and you can't run the machines.'' We made all handmade shoes in Italy, so I didn't know how to operate the machines. But here I could still rip shoes apart, wash windows, shine shoes. . . I worked hard—but it never hurt me. I learned a lot.

Five years later, I opened my own shoe repair business in the Great Valley Shopping Center. I was there five years and moved to the Eastland Mall in 1963 when it was being built, and I've been here ever since.

I had difficult time at first because I couldn't speak English. But people were wonderful to me, I went to night school for five years to learn to speak English. I can read good English, but I still can't write good.

In 1957, I went to the hospital to have surgery I met a nice girl, a student nurse Rosemarie Billey, from United, near Mount Pleasant. And there was my fortune.

We got married in 1959 and had two sons. In 1969 I brought her and my children back to my hometown and traveled through Italy for three weeks. While we were there, my wife asked me if I ever wanted to go back there to live. I said, ''No, No way.'' I'll never forget that I was born there, but America is my country now, and I'll fight for it.

In America there is so much opportunity. It seems everything I wanted came true. I wanted to get married, have a family and educate my children, and I did. I'm very appreciative. If I die tomorrow, I'll die a happy man.

THANK YOU, GERALD L. BOOMS

HON. JAMES A. BARCIA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 19, 1995

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the education of our young people is most vital if our Nation is to continue its history of accomplishment into the future. And nothing is more vital to education than the people who are dedicated to providing the type of services that are essential to the successful operation of our schools. Ubly Community Schools has been blessed over the past 33 years with the committed service of Gerald L. Booms. He is being recognized on December 27 for his generous service to the young people of his community at a retirement dinner.

Gerald Booms started as a bus driver in 1962, which he continued until 1972. He also worked as a part-time custodian, making sure that not only would students arrive at school safely, but they also would have a safe and well-tended school to attend. For the last 20 years, he has served as director of transportation for Ubly Schools, again overseeing the effective operation of this system.

During his time with Ubly Schools, Gerald Booms has remained involved with several other activities. He has been a member of the Michigan Association of Pupil Transportation, serving as a regional representative for 10 years. He also holds membership in the Ubly Community Club.

He has been very involved with his religious convictions as a member of St. Mary Catholic Church of Parisville, and its men's club. He also was president of its parish council. He is a member of St. John the Evangelist Catholic Church of Ubly, and the Ruth Knights of Columbus Council No. 3823.

Gerald and his wife, Georgeann know the importance of education to young people, being the proud parents of 7 of their own children, and the grandparents of 21 children. He has taken the care that he has for his own family, and extended it to the other children of his community who have benefited from safe transport to and from school.

Mr. Speaker, we need to remember and honor those who make it possible for our young people to receive the education they deserve and that our Nation needs. Gerald L. Booms has earned our thanks for his years of service. I urge you and all of our colleagues to join me in thanking him for his career of caring, and wish him and his family the very best in retirement.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to DOD Authorizations Conference Report.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S18835–S18933

Measures Introduced: One bill and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1485, and S. Res. 199 and 200. **Pages S18919–20**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1196, to transfer certain National Forest System lands adjacent to the townsite of Cuprum, Idaho. (S. Rept. No. 104–189)

S. 426, to authorize the Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity to establish a memorial to Martin Luther King, Jr., in the District of Columbia. (S. Rept. No. 104–190)

S. Res. 199, directing the Senate Legal Counsel to bring a civil action to enforce a subpoena of the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters to William H. Kennedy, III. (S. Rept. No. 104–191)

S. 884, to designate certain public lands in the State of Utah as wilderness, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104–192)

S. 1180, to amend title XIX of the Public Health Service Act to provide for health performance partnerships, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 104–193)

H.R. 965, to designate the Federal building located at 600 Martin Luther King, Jr. Place in Louisville, Kentucky, as the ''Romano L. Mazzoli Federal Building''.

H.R. 1253, to rename the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge.

S. 776, to reauthorize the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act and the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act.

S. 1315, to designate the Federal Triangle Project under construction at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, as the ''Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center''.

S. 1388, to designate the United States courthouse located at 800 Market Street in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the ''Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse''. **Page S18919**

Passage Vitiated:

Export Sanctions: Senate vitiated passage of S. 1228, to impose sanctions on foreign persons exporting petroleum products, natural gas, or related technology to Iran, and the bill was returned to the Senate calendar. **Page S18835**

National Defense Authorizations Act—Conference Report: By 51 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 608), Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1530, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, and to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, clearing the measure for the President.

Pages S18835–S18902, S18904–05

Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, 1996: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the cloture vote on a motion to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 2127, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, to occur on Wednesday, December 20, 1995. **Page S18931**

Subpoena Enforcement—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of S. Res. 199, directing the Senate Legal Counsel to bring a civil action to enforce a subpoena of the Special Committee to Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation, on Wednesday, December 20, 1995. **Pages S18920–21**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Speight Jenkins, of Washington, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2000.

Mary Ann Vial Lemmon, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Michael D. Schattman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas. **Page S18933**

Messages From the House: **Pages S18917–18**

Measures Referred: **Page S18918**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S18918**

Communications: **Page S18918**

Petitions: **Pages S18918–19**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S18919**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Page S18920**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S18920**

Authority for Committees: **Page S18922**

Additional Statements: **Pages S18922–31**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total–608) **Pages S18904–05**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 8:08 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Wednesday, December 20, 1995. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S18932–33.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

BOSNIA

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations held hearings to examine the impact of United States participation in the economic reconstruction of Bosnia, receiving testimony from Richard C. Holbrooke, Assistant Secretary of State for European and Canadian Affairs; and J. Brian Atwood, Administrator, Agency for International Development.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee ordered favorably reported the following bills:

S. 776, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1995 through 1998 for programs of the Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act and provisions of the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act relating to Atlantic striped bass research;

S. 1005, to improve the process of constructing, altering, purchasing, and acquiring public buildings, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1315, to designate the Federal Triangle Project under construction at 14th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, in the District of Columbia, as the "Ronald Reagan Building and International Trade Center";

S. 1388, to designate the United States courthouse located at 800 Market Street in Knoxville, Tennessee, as the "Howard H. Baker, Jr. United States Courthouse";

H.R. 965, to designate the Federal building located at 600 Martin Luther King, Jr. Place in Louisville, Kentucky, as the "Romano L. Mazzoli Federal Building";

H.R. 1253, to rename the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge as the Don Edwards San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge;

H.R. 2005, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections in maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; and

S. 1406, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Eufaula, Oklahoma, a parcel of land located at the Eufaula Lake project.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee held hearings on the nominations of William A. Fletcher, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, Bernice B. Donald, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Barbara S. Jones and Jed S. Rakoff, each to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, Joan A. Lenard, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and C. Lynwood Smith, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama. Mr. Fletcher was introduced by Senator Feinstein, Ms. Donald was introduced by Senators Thompson and Frist, and Ms. Lenard was introduced by Senators Mack and Graham.

TEEN DRUG USE

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded hearings to examine recent trends in drug use among American youth, focusing on prevention and treatment programs, after receiving testimony from Lloyd D. Johnston, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; James Alan Fox, Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts; James N. Hall, Up Front Drug Information Center, Miami, Florida; James E. Burke, Partnership for a Drug-Free America, and Duane Garcia, both of New York, New York; and Tod Hedrick, Greenwich, Connecticut.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 5 public bills, H.R. 2808–2812; and 6 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 123, and H. Res. 311–315 were introduced. **Pages H15135–36**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H. Res. 312, waiving points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2539, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation (H. Rept. 104–426); and

H. Res. 313, providing for the consideration of H.R. 558, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact (H. Rept. 104–427). **Pages H15135, H15168**

Private Calendar: On the call of the Private Calendar, the House sent to the Senate without amendment the following measures: H.R. 418, H.R. 419, and H.R. 1315, all private bills. **Page H15096**

Suspensions: House voted to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Burma and the U.N. General Assembly: H. Res. 274, amended, concerning Burma and the United Nations General Assembly; **Pages H15104–06**

Middle East peace facilitation: H.R. 2808, to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996; **Pages H15106–07**

Export-Import Bank tied-aid program: H.R. 2203, amended, to reauthorize the tied-aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project; **Pages H15107–08**

Smithsonian sesquicentennial: H.R. 2627, amended, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Smithsonian Institution; **Pages H15108–11**

Provisional approval of House employee regulations: H. Res. 311, to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to the House of Representatives and employees of the House of Representatives and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996; and **Pages H15111–16**

Expo '98: H. Con. Res. 91, expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should participate in Expo '98 in Lisbon, Portugal. Subsequently, S. Con. Res. 22, a similar Senate-passed measure, was agreed to in lieu—clearing the measure. H. Con. Res. 91 was laid on the table. **Pages H15103–04**

Late Report: Conferees received permission to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 1655, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System. **Page H15130**

Budget Proposal: By a yea-and-nay vote of 412 nays, with 5 voting "present," Roll No. 869, the House failed to agree to H. Con. Res. 122, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002. **Pages H15130–34, H15137–55**

H. Res. 309, the rule under which the concurrent resolution was considered, was agreed to earlier by a recorded vote of 229 ayes to 189 noes, Roll No. 868. Agreed to order the previous question on the resolution by a yea-and-nay vote of 230 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 867. **Pages H15116–29**

Presidential Veto Messages: Agreed to a unanimous-consent request that, if the Chair lays before the House today a veto message from the President on H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, the objections of the President be spread at large upon the Journal of the House and that the message and the bill be ordered printed as a House document and that consideration of the veto message be postponed until tomorrow; and **Page H15156**

Agreed to a unanimous consent request that, if the Chair lays before the House today a veto message from the President on H.R. 1058, to reform Federal securities legislation, the objections of the President be spread at large upon the Journal and that the message and bill be ordered printed as a House document and that consideration of the veto message be postponed until tomorrow. **Pages H15156–57**

Suspensions: House voted to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Provisional approval of regulations regarding joint congressional employees: H. Con. Res. 123, to provide for the provisional approval of regulations applicable to certain covered employing offices and covered employees and to be issued by the Office of Compliance before January 23, 1996; **Pages H15155–56**

Days of Remembrance: H. Con. Res. 106, amended, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to commemorate the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust. Agreed to amend the title; **Page H15157**

Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building: H.R. 1398, to designate the United States Post Office building located at 1203 Lemay Ferry Road, St. Louis, Missouri, as the "Charles J. Coyle Post Office Building"; **Pages H15157–58**

Edward Madigan Post Office Building: H.R. 1880 to designate the United States Post Office building located at 102 South McLean, Lincoln, Illinois, as the "Edward Madigan Post Office Building"; **Pages H15158–60**

Holk Post Office Building: H.R. 2262, to designate the United States Post Office building located at 218 North Alston Street in Foley, Alabama, as the "Holk Post Office Building"; **Pages H15160–61**

Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building: H.R. 2704, amended, to provide that the United States Post Office building that is to be located on the 2600 block of East 75th Street in Chicago, Illinois, shall be known and designated as the "Charles A. Hayes Post Office Building"; Agreed to amend the title; and **Pages H15161–62**

Farm credit system relief: H.R. 2029, amended, to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to provide regulatory relief. Agreed to amend the title. **Pages H15162–66**

Presidential Veto Message—Commerce, Justice, State, the Judiciary: Read a message from the President wherein he announces his veto of H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and explains his reasons therefor—ordered printed. (H. Doc. 104–149) **Pages H15166–67**

Referral: One Senate-passed measure was referred to the appropriate House committee. **Page H15134**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on page H15096.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H15128–29, H15129, and H15155.

Adjournment: Met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands approved for full Committee action the following bills: H.R. 1129, amended, to amend the National Trails Systems Act to designate the route from Selma to Montgomery as a National Historic Trail; H.R. 2107, amended, Visitor Services Improvement and Outdoor Legacy Act of 1995; H.R. 1527, amended, to amend the National Forest Ski Area Permit Act of 1986 to clarify the authorities and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture in issuing ski area permits on National Forest System lands and to withdraw lands within ski area permit boundaries from the operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws; and H.R. 2464, to amend Public Law 103–93 to provide additional lands within the State of Utah for the Goshute Indian Reservation.

OVERSIGHT—SOUTHERN SALVAGE TIMBER AND FOREST HEALTH

Committee on Resources: Salvage Timber and Forest Health Task Force held an oversight hearing on Salvage Timber and Forest Health focusing on Southern Salvage and Forest Health Issues. Testimony was heard from Representatives Herger, Furse, and Riggs; Robert Joslin, Regional Forester, Southern Region, Forest Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL COMPACT

Committee on Rules: Granted an open rule providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 558, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact. The rule accords priority in recognition to those Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representative Schaefer.

ICC ELIMINATION

Committee on Rules: Granted a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report on H.R. 2539, to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, and to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States, Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation. Testimony was heard from Chairman Shuster and Representatives Molinari and Oberstar.

FUTURE OF TECHNOLOGY—IC

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Continued hearings on IC21: The Intelligence Community in the 21st Century. Testimony was heard from John M. Deutch, Director, CIA.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST *p. D1444)*

H.R. 2204, to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950. Signed December 18, 1995. (P.L. 104–64)

BILLS VETOED

H.R. 2076, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996. Vetoed December 19, 1995.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 1995

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold hearings on S. 594, to provide for the administration of certain Presidio properties at minimal cost to the Federal taxpayer, 9:30 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on the Judiciary, business meeting, to consider pending calendar business, 10 a.m., SD–226.

House

Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, executive, to consider pending business, 10 a.m., HT–2M Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Wednesday, December 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Senate will consider S. Res. 199, directing the Senate Legal Counsel to bring a civil action to enforce a subpoena of the Special Committee To Investigate the Whitewater Development Corporation.

Senate will also resume consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 2127, Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations, 1996, with a cloture vote scheduled to occur thereon.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, December 20

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of conference report on H.R. 2539, ICC Elimination Reform;

Consideration of H.R. 558, Texas Low-Level Waste; and

Consideration of the further vetoes of H.R. 2076, Commerce, State, Justice, the Judiciary appropriations for fiscal year 1996; and H.R. 1058, Federal Securities Litigation Reform.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barcia, James A., Mich., E2414, E2416, E2418
Beilenson, Anthony C., Calif., E2409
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E2413
Chambliss, Saxby, Ga., E2413
Clay, William (Bill), Mo., E2414
Emerson, Bill, Mo., E2417
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E2415
Gingrich, Newt, Ga., E2411
Gunderson, Steve, Wis., E2417
Hall, Ralph M., Tex., E2414, E2416
Kildee, Dale E., Mich., E2412
Lipinski, William O., Ill., E2415
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E2413
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E2413
Packard, Ron, Calif., E2413
Schumer, Charles E., N.Y., E2416
Upton, Fred, Mich., E2413
Watts, J.C., Jr., Okla., E2415

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.