United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1995 No. 6

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

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

May Your good grace, O God, be with all who call upon You, and may Your spirit of peace and reconciliation, Your word of purpose and direction, and Your command to do justice, touch each of us in the depths of our own hearts. We are aware, O gracious God, that we do not walk alone through the paths of life, but we are surrounded by Your love and by the support and encouragement of our colleagues, our friends, and our families. For all those gifts and for the blessings of each new day, we offer this prayer of thanksgiving and praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TIAHRT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

PRIORITY AMENDMENTS FOR MANDATE REFORM BILL; AND PROCEDURES FOR SUBMISSION OF AMENDMENT FOR PRINTING ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1, THE BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules anticipates meeting next week to report an open rule for the consideration of H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995.

The rule may include a provision giving priority in recognition to Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the amendment section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration—though this would not be mandatory.

The amendments must still be consistent with House rules and are given no special protection by being printed.

If Members are interested in priority recognition, they may wish to print their amendments in the RECORD prior to Friday, January 20, when the bill is tentatively scheduled for consideration. It is not necessary to submit your amendments to the Rules Committee or to testify.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted to the bill as reported from the committees of jurisdiction. Amendments should be titled, ''Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule XXIII'' and submitted at the Speaker's table.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules anticipates meeting the week of January 23 to report a rule for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, the balanced budget constitutional amendment.

The rule may include a provision permitting only the offering of amendments in the nature of a substitute by Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the amendment section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than Friday, January 20.

The amendments must still be consistent with House rules and would be given no special protection by being printed.

If Members are interested in having their amendments considered as a substitute for House Joint Resolution 1 as reported by the Judiciary Committee, they must draft them as amendments in the nature of a substitute and print them in the RECORD not later than Friday, January 20.

Amendments should be titled, ''Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule XXIII'' and submitted at the Speaker's table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 32) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 32

Resolved, That the following named Members be and they are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT

Mr. Fazio, Ranking Minority Member;
Mr. Gejdenson;
Mr. Hoyer;
Mr. Jefferson;
Mr. Pastor.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

☐ 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

REFERENCES TO COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND COMPETITIVENESS IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 12 TO BE DEEMED TO BE TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any references to the Committee on Technology and Competitiveness in House Resolution 12 adopted on January 4, 1995, be to the Committee on Science.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 5, 1995, at the organizational meeting for the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee designated the following members to serve on the Joint Committee on Taxation for the 104th Congress, pursuant to Section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: Mr. Archer, Mr. Crane, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Gibbons, and Mr. Rangel.

With best personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution No. 1.

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

There was no objection.

READING THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states on the first day of Congress a Republican House will force Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else, cut one-third of committee staffs, and cut the congressional budget. We have done that.

In the next 93 days we will vote on the following 10 items:

One, a balanced budget amendment and line-item veto;

Two. A new crime bill to stop violent criminals;

Three. Welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence;

Four. Family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children;

Five. Tax cuts for families to lift government's burden from middle-income Americans;

Six. National security restoration to protect our freedoms;

Seven. Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without government penalty;

Eight. Government regulation and unfunded mandate reforms;

Nine. Commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits; and

Ten. Congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL POLICY TOWARD GAMBLING

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in 1976 the Commission on the Review of a National Policy Toward Gambling issued its final report to Congress. In the 20 years since that time, however, much has changed. Gambling has gone from a $1 billion-a-year industry in the United States to a $30-billion industry. There was one State that legalized casino gambling then; today some form of gambling is legal in 48 of the 50 States.

A competition exists between the States. A competition exists between the States and foreign countries. A competition exists between the States and Indian tribes, whereas 20 years ago no Indian tribe was authorized to have legalized gambling.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the establishment of a new Commission to pursue a national policy toward gambling in the United States.

□ 1110

CONGRESS MUST LIVE WITH BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as taxes increase, as government regulations get more and more burdensome, as the bureaucracy becomes more and more expensive, America's middle class has had to tighten their belts. Even though they are out there working as hard as they can, year after year, because of our actions in spending in Congress, they have to squeeze in a little bit more.

But now it is our turn. It is time for us to match our revenues with our expenses. We need to have a balanced budget amendment. Our last balanced budget was in 1969, and since then Congress has decided that it could defy gravity by spending indefinitely more money than we take in.

The balanced budget amendment will put an end to this fantasy. It is not a new concept. State, city, and county governments all over America have had a balanced budget. They have to have one by law. It is now our turn. If we had had one all along, we would not have the $4.5 trillion debt we must now contend with.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans want a more open and honest government. Last week I voted with the majority to open our Congress to ensure public hearings. But also last week the Committee on the Budget rejected on a party line vote a requirement requiring Congress to tell how the balanced budget amendment would be implemented.

We should require this House to specify those cuts to reach that balanced budget. The Congressional Budget Office has said it would cost $1.2 trillion in cuts by the year 2002 to reach that balanced budget. In the name of honesty, openness, and constructive planning, we must set that course to achieve the goal.

The people need to know how and what and when these cuts will be made. We talk about a Contract With America. Let us not forget our contract with our senior citizens in 1935 for Social Security, our seniors for health care in 1965, and our veterans that provide them benefits for their sacrifices for their country.

The people of these United States will remember that our contract is renewed next year unless we tell them how we are going to fulfill the contract we agreed to.

BAN UNFUNDED MANDATES ON STATES

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate is considering a bill to ban unfunded mandates by Congress for States like Kansas. We must join with them so that no longer will Congress be able to mandate that States do things without funding. No longer will Congress attempt to balance the budget on the backs of the States.

It took the Republican majority in the House and senate to bring this important issue to a vote. We will finally enact what State Governors like Kansas Gov. Bill Graves and State legislatures have been asking for years, to relieve the arrogant burden of denying money to States to pay for the Federal Government's mandates.

Just as the American people have called for a ban on unfunded mandates, they have also called on Congress to balance the budget. Starting now we will work to control our spending and our own budget. It is what the people want, and what we intend to give the people.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE HISTORIAN

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, like the energizer bunny, the Christina Jeffrey story keeps going and going and going. Yesterday Speaker GINGRICH's spokesperson, Tony Blankley, said that they did not know that Christina Jeffrey believed that a Holocaust class should reflect the views of the Nazis.

Today we read in the Atlanta Constitution that Ms. Jeffrey told Speaker GINGRICH's staff a month ago. But even worse was today's revelations of why Ms. Jeffrey thought she was fired. Yesterday Mr. Blankley said that Speaker GINGRICH held Ms. Jeffrey in high regard, and today we find out she believes that she was told she had to go because ''There would be marches and demonstrations and fundraising efforts to raise money to turn over the House to Democrats.''

What was Speaker GINGRICH's motivation in firing Ms. Jeffrey? Was it because he disagreed with her views, as he should have, or was it because of adverse publicity and bad political consequences?

Yesterday I praised the Speaker for quickly firing her. I stand by that, but there are many questions that must, must be answered.

PASS THE BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to respond to the Democrats' call for specific cuts in the Federal budget. They well know that Republicans have pledged to consider all proposals except for Social Security. Their insistence is an effort to divert attention from the real issue. Congress can only tackle the issue of how to balance the budget after we decide to balance the budget.

The Democrats' desire to place the proverbial cart before the horse led the American people to give their House to the new Republican majority. We must not let empty partisan rhetoric sway us from the task we have been sent here to do; namely, to bring fiscal responsibility to Washington. We owe the American people that much. It is time to stand and deliver by passing the balanced budget amendment.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE HISTORIAN

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a new chapter opened today in the history surrounding the hiring and the firing of the House Historian. Today, the former Historian reveals to the Atlanta Constitution that she had indeed informed the Speaker's office about her views on the teaching of the Holocaust before she was hired. This directly contradicts the statements that had been made by the Speaker's office. The Historian was fired because her opposition to funding a course on the Holocaust was wrong because it did not reflect what she called the Nazi point of view or the Ku Klux Klan point of view. Such extremism from the person hired to chronicle an important part of the history of our government is an affront to this body and to all Americans.

How could a person known to have such extreme views on this issue and one that is so sensitive to so many Americans, how could that person have been hired? But perhaps we should not be surprised. This is not the only office that the new Speaker has turned into a partisan political tool. The same thing was done in selecting the House administrator. I fear that we are seeing the beginning of a dangerous pattern.

PUBLIC HOUSING RENT REFORM

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the reform of our Nation's welfare system, our deliberations must include a close examination of the federally mandated system of calculating rents paid by residents of America's public housing.

The evidence is striking. The current system of establishing rents in public housing is set by bureaucrats in Washington. It provides no flexibility to provide incentives for residents to make a better wage or even find work.

In most cases, if a resident of public housing obtains gainful employment, they end up with less disposable income than if they had stayed on welfare. That is right, less money by going to work. Is it any wonder we have generations of people who are addicted to the public dole?

In the last Congress, this body passed a housing bill which included a provision which I sponsored, entitled the Rent Reform and Empowerment Act, which would reduce these disincentives through a system of income disallowances and ceiling rents. Unfortunately, it was killed in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing this important legislation. It is time we applied a little common sense. And keep in mind it has been this Government that has imposed some of the highest tax rates on America's poor.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE HISTORIAN

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, not even the Speaker of the House agrees. His choice of a Historian for this House is unfit to serve. There is no room in this House for bigotry, racism, or anti-Semitism. I commend the Speaker for realizing his error, acting quickly, and firing his appointment.

The operation of this House, the recording of its history, should be nonpartisan. The House Administrator, the House Historian, these appointments should be made with the best interests of this House in mind, not the Speaker, not the Speaker or one political party.

Last week the American people were promised a new openness, a new way of doing business. But so far it looks like business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican House, this is not a Democratic House. This is the people's House. Mr. Speaker, the people deserve better.

□ 1120

H.R. 359

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to join 67 Members of the House in cosponsoring H.R. 359. This legislation will prevent a major rip-off of American inventors and investors by ensuring that Americans have the 17 years of patent protection which was their right prior to the passage of the GATT implementation legislation last year.

Hidden in that implementation legislation was a provision not required by GATT that was slipped into the implementation legislation. The provision dramatically reduces the number of years of patent protection for American citizens, permitting foreign nationals, foreign and international corporations to use American technology against us in the world competition without so much as paying royalties to American inventors and investors who created the technology.

H.R. 359 will stop the rip-off and perfect the GATT language by purging this provision from part of the GATT that should never have been part of it in the first place.

IS THE HOUSE MOVING TOO QUICKLY?

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, are we moving too fast without taking proper precautions that will be costly in the future?

The Speaker did the right thing to fire Christina Jeffrey, but what is shocking is that a person with these views could have been hired in the first place.

Are we moving ahead on unfunded mandates legislation without recognizing the impact it might have on clean air, on clean water, on civil rights, on disabilities, on health and safety? Am I correctly hearing that the new majority wants to exempt all Contract With America legislation in this legislation?

As we move ahead on the balanced budget amendment, which I have supported, does it not make sense to specify from where these cuts are coming? Do we really want to amend the Constitution to have a super majority on taxes? What if we are in a recession? What if we are in a war? Let us make this balanced budget amendment work.

Mr. Speaker, let us have open rules. Let us be offered alternatives. Let us participate in a bipartisan way to deal with these problems. Let us not make mistakes now that we will regret later.

WE MUST TAKE ACTION

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

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, recent polls indicate that some 80 percent of the American people favor the balanced budget amendment. The people have sent their message to the people's House. Now it is time for the people's House to respond.

My colleagues, if we are sincere in our desire to get big government off the back of middle income Americans, then we should vote yes on a balanced budget amendment.

The balanced budget amendment is designed to produce results. It forces us to take action. It forces us to be responsible with the taxpayers' dollars. It forces us to do what this House has not done in 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, the time for stalling is past. Nearly $5 trillion of debt placed upon our children and grandchildren demands a response. We must take action now. We must pass the balanced budget amendment.

WHITE HOUSE RESPONSE TO DISASTER IN CALIFORNIA

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

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring recognition to the White House response to my call and the call of other Members of this House who represent areas in California that have been egregiously affected by the continuous pounding of severe Pacific storms in California. The total now is at 17 counties that have been affected.

Even as we speak, Mr. Speaker, here on the House floor, we understand that there are more storms coming in from the West that are going to be affecting very deleteriously the counties in and throughout California.

My county, Los Angeles County, has been affected very, very much.

I just want to thank the White House for finally responding and declaring a Federal disaster, a declaration that will allow FEMA to come in and to provide additional help and additional provisions to the people in California who are suffering.

It seems just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that we had to sign $8.6 million for earthquake relief. Now we have floods in California.

We thank the White House for responding.

CHANGE IS HERE

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, change is here, and change is good.

After 40 years of one party's rule, last week, the new majority took the first critical steps to changing the House of Representatives.

More change is on the way. In the next month, we will vote on a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

We have heard gripes from some Members of the new minority about what is wrong with the balanced budget. We have heard excuses. We have heard complaints.

But after 40 years of Democrat leadership, we never had a true commitment to a balanced budget amendment. And we have not had a balanced budget in about 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want a new direction from the Congress. They want fiscal reponsibility; they do not want to pay higher taxes but they do want less Federal spending.

Mr. Speaker, change is here and change is good. That is why we must pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution before this Congress is adjourned.

IN FAVOR OF THE CDBG ANTIPIRACY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, thousands of workers in my community got a major slap in the face last year where their employer told them their jobs would be moved to other parts of the country.

If this was not bad enough, these loyal employees had salt rubbed in their wounds a short time later, when it was learned that Federal Community Development Block Grant funds would be used to help move these jobs to other States.

This is something that should not happen. Using Federal funds to move jobs from one area to another is a total waste of taxpayer money and an insult to the people who are losing their jobs.

Today I am introducing legislation that would add an antipiracy provision to the block grant law. It will prevent the use of these funds from being used to steal jobs.

As we look for ways to save Federal tax dollars and get a better bang for our buck, this is the perfect place to start.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this January, as we work for and with America, we will vote to put responsibility, accountability, and respectability back in the Congress by finally passing a balanced budget amendment.

Many on the Democrat side want us to specify budget cuts before they agree to it. I think they are just using this as an opportunity to invite their good friends, the special interests, to come in and save their favorite projects from elimination.

As we have seen in the past 40 years, we can debate all day about how to balance the budget and never actually do it.

We need to set the record straight. The balanced budget amendment is about discipline. We need a mechanism that forces the Congress to balance it every year.

For 40 years we tried it the other way. All we got was more spending and more taxes. Now it is time for Congress to live like everyone else in America, on a budget.

LINGERING QUESTIONS

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, there are lingering questions still unanswered in the controversy over the fired House historian.

First, what did Speaker GINGRICH know about her extreme views and when did he know it? The Speaker says he did not know Ms. Jeffrey once rejected a course on the Holocaust because it failed to present the Nazi point of view. Yet, Ms. Jeffrey's top aide claims he knew all along.

Second, Ms. Jeffrey has been outspoken on GOPAC. She says that GOPAC was founded as, and I quote, ''a way of getting around campaign finance disclosure laws.'' And she has called for repeal of those very laws.

I think the American people have a right to know: Do the Republicans agree? Do they agree that GOPAC was founded as a way of ducking campaign finance disclosure? Do they agree that

we need to bring more secrecy in the political process?

Mr. Speaker, this is a question of credibility. The Republicans talk a lot about rebuilding trust with the American people. If they really mean it, they should come clean and reveal the contributors and their expenses on GOPAC.

□ 1130

DISASTROUS SAFE DRINKING WATER ACT MUST BE FIXED

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, the current Safe Drinking Water Act is a disaster and must be fixed as it is reauthorized. This Member is committed to supporting legislation which will inject more common sense into the way that public drinking water supplies are tested, monitored, and treated.

It is certainly encouraging that the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY], the new chairman of the Commerce Committee, has indicated his intention to place a high priority on revising and improving Safe Drinking Water Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is a growing financial crisis for communities across the country that becomes more evident each year as new water testing and treatment deadlines are imposed. These unfunded mandates hit small communities especially hard. Not only are these mandates costly, they often do nothing to ensure safe drinking water. It is clear that States and communities must be allowed to identify and focus on those contaminants which present an actual health risk in their geographic area.

Without question, the safety of this Nation's drinking water must be vigorously protected. However, in these days of tightening budgets on the local, State, and Federal levels, it is more important than ever that this goal be reached in a realistic cost-effective, and efficient manner.

THE FRUITS OF EXTREME PARTISANSHIP

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

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my extreme concern over the judgment displayed by colleagues from the Sixth District of Georgia. His need to fire long-time friend and associate Christina Jeffrey from the office of House Historian only demonstrates his folly in trying to politicize every aspect of the administration of this House.

He first fired our bipartisan Historian in order to have a personal biographer. I wonder, had Ms. Jeffrey been retained, how she would have recorded the Ethics Committee investigation of GOPAC.

Well, it turns out Ms. Jeffrey feels that the Nazis and the Ku Klux Klan do not get to tell their side of the story to our children in their history classes.

Mr. Speaker, such are the fruits of extreme partisanship. It deserves no place in this House.

THE UNFUNDED MANDATES REFORM ACT OF 1995, THE FIRST STEP TOWARD REDUCING UNFUNDED MANDATES

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

Mr. MARTINI. Mr. Speaker, it has become clear over the last several years that the burden of unfunded Federal mandates placed on States and localities has risen to unacceptable levels. I am pleased to inform that yesterday, the Government Reform and Oversight Committee took the first step in addressing this problem by marking up H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995.

As a local official in New Jersey, I have felt the sting of unfunded mandates firsthand. Despite cutting discretionary county spending by 3 percent in 1994, the part of the State and county budget mandated by the Federal Government actually rose by 10 percent. Despite our best efforts, we were forced to raise county taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers are angry, not just because Federal taxes are too high, but because local property taxes are also skyrocketing due to unfunded mandates.

The voters spoke loudly on November 2. What they demanded was a government that was smaller, smarter, and less costly. Today we begin the process of accomplishing all three goals by putting an end to unfunded mandates and returning to the U.S. Government to its proper role in its relationship with the States.

ON THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., HOLIDAY EVERY AMERICAN CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE

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

Ms. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in anticipation of the 10th celebration of the Martin Luther King, Jr., holiday, which has been designated as a national day of service, to encourage my colleagues and all Americans to be mindful of the national theme: On the King holiday every American can make a difference.

The King holiday challenges Americans to remember and celebrate, but most importantly, to act to address the issues for which Dr. King and others gave of their lives, their energies, their talents. One of Dr. King's philosophies evolves around the promise that every individual can achieve his or her dream in America.

To accomplish this goal, the Government must be a partner with the people. In keeping the dream alive, we must address the unfinished agenda and direct our efforts to reduce violence, help youths at risk, promote interracial cooperation and economic stability. By doing so, we can make every American experience the land of opportunity once again.

LET US ENACT THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT NOW

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the historic opening day of the 104th Congress was the start of a new era in American politics. A majority of both Democrats and Republicans voted to reform the House of Representatives to make it more open and more accountable to the American people.

Now that we have changed the way business is done in the House, it is time to change the business that the House does, starting with a balanced budget amendment.

As I traveled through my district, I listened to the people I represent tell me that Congress should direct its finances the same way as the rest of America does. The message I have heard is that families wisely live within their monthly salaries, so why does Congress continually fail to do the same?

It is time for Congress to start living within its means by balancing the budget. It is time to change the business Congress does. Let us enact the balanced budget amendment now.

WHAT PROGRAMS WILL BE CUT TO ACHIEVE THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT?

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this country deserve to know what is really at stake when it comes to the balanced budget. Everybody agrees we have to reduce and ultimately eliminate the Federal budget deficit, but what will it really take to get a balanced budget in 7 years without touching the amount of money we now spend on defense as the Republican majority proposes, while at the same time offering a big cut in income taxes?

The Republican leadership is doing a real disservice to the American people by refusing to disclose what kinds of middle class programs we will probably have to get rid of in order to have to balance the budget by 2002.

Just a few minutes ago in the Committee on the Judiciary the Republican

majority defeated an amendment to exclude Social Security from cuts to balance the budget.

What about student assistance? Probably kiss it goodbye. Unemployment insurance? Major cuts. Medicare programs? Devastating cuts. What about cures for cancer? Our research institutions are facing massive cuts if this budget amendment passes.

These are just a few examples of the kinds of massive program cuts that will occur. It is time for this open Congress to be truly open and tell the people how it will balance the budget.

CONGRESSIONAL LAWMAKERS CAN COACH AMERICA TO FISCAL VICTORY

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1971, the Nebraska Cornhuskers won college football's national championship. One year later coach Tom Osborne became head coach, and over the last two decades has dedicated his life to challenging young athletes to achieve their very best.

Many times over this last quarter century the loyal fans of the Cornhuskers felt the ground swell of a pending national championship victory, only to know the disappointment as that victory slipped away.

Likewise, Mr. Speaker, since 1935 the American people have diligently petitioned this body for a balanced budget. Year after year they watched and waited, believing reform was within their grasp, only to see the national debt and government spending increase.

They have waited patiently for lawmakers to bring them relief from the increasing tax burdens, only to suffer the disappointment of another legislative year gone by with no visible victory won over the skyrocketing debt.

Mr. Speaker, as lawmakers we have a chance to coach America's team to a fiscal victory. We came here armed with a mandate to pass the balanced budget. I encourage it to happen this year.

PUBLIC HEARINGS IN COMMITTEES ARE CONSISTENT WITH OPENNESS, PARTICIPATION, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

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

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my concern over the bypassing of an important legislative process, public hearings in committees. I would suggest that this need not unduly delay the Republican's 100-day agenda, if each bill is appropriately scheduled.

I realize that some of the proposals on which you seek prompt legislative action were the subject of hearings in the last Congress. However, that does not provide an adequate legislative record.

We have many new Members to Congress and some who are new to committees. Without hearings, Members are being asked to vote on legislation without the benefit of input from constituents, interest groups, the administration, or their colleagues.

This seems inconsistent with the recent reform of House rules which are intended to increase openness, participation, and accountability.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD 2 letters which address the two committees which have planned or have markups without hearings this week or next week.

The letters referred to are as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1995.

Hon. ROBERT S. WALKER,
Chairman, Committee on Science,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the Committee begins its legislative work for the 104th Congress, we wanted to express our concern about reports that the Committee is considering marking up bills without the benefit of prior public hearings on legislative proposals.

Hearings are an indispensable part of the legislative process. They provide Committee Members the opportunity to learn about the legislation, to ask questions, and to understand the impact of the legislation on interested parties. We realize that some of the proposals on which you seek prompt legislative action were the subject of hearings in the last Congress. But hearings in prior Congresses cannot provide an adequate legislative record for several reasons. First of all, fully half of the Committee Members are new to the Committee. Without hearings, they would be asked to vote on legislation without the benefit of hearing from constituents, interest groups, the Administration, or their colleagues. Such a procedure would hardly be fair to the new Members on either side of the aisle.

In addition, even if the bills have not substantially changed, the context of those bills within the broader agenda has changed considerably. For example, in the light of expected cuts in DOE's energy R&D programs, it will be difficult for Members to assess the importance of increasing funding for hydrogen research without a better understanding of how the hydrogen program fits into overall energy research and development budget priorities.

Finally, moving legislation without public hearings would seem to be inconsistent with recent Republican reforms intended to increase openness and accountability. We do not believe that either the Members or the public will be well-served by legislating in the absence of a record.

We understand your desire to begin the Committee's work quickly. Holding hearings need not be inconsistent with moving legislation expeditiously. Indeed, markups are likely to be far smoother when Members have had an adequate opportunity to understand the measure before them.

We know that you share our hope that we can move Committee legislation in a bipartisan fashion. To foster this cooperation, it is essential that both Majority and Minority Members have the opportunity to participate in a thorough, open legislative process that includes formal hearings on legislation that will be reported from the Committee. We appreciate your consideration of these concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 1995.

DEAR CHAIRMAN CLINGER: We understand that you have scheduled a full committee mark-up of H.R. 5, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 for 10 a.m., January 10. We respectfully request that you honor the request of members of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee for a hearing on this important piece of legislation.

Under the leadership of Speaker Gingrich, your party has instituted a number of changes that are meant to ensure that Members of Congress and the citizens that they represent are fully informed about the legislation that is acted upon in the House of Representatives. We agree, and therefore, believe that a full committee mark-up of this legislation is premature. The hearing process allows interested constituent groups and Members of Congress an opportunity to express their views and familiarize themselves with the details of the legislative proposal under consideration. This is a fundamental and important step in the democratic process that should not be by-passed, especially in the case of legislation that addresses an issue as important as the relationship between federal, state, and local government.

We realize that hearings on unfunded mandates legislation have been held by the committee in previous Congresses. However, we understand that H.R. 5 contains new provisions. Returning members should have an opportunity to consider the new proposal prior to proceeding to the committee amending process. Also, there are many new members in the House who should be given an opportunity to examine the details of this proposal, to ask questions, and to hear the views of their colleagues and constituents through a formal hearing process.

Our hope is that we can work in a bipartisan fashion in the 104th Congress to develop sound legislation that will provide the greatest benefit to the American people. In order for this to occur, both majority and minority Members of Congress must be able to participate in a thorough, open legislative process which includes formal hearings on important legislation such as H.R. 5. We trust that you share our appreciation for the importance of maintaining an open, thorough democratic process within the House of Representatives and committees, and we thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Sincerely,

GEORGE E. BROWN, Jr.
JOHN D. DINGELL.
JOHN J. LAFALCE.
WILLIAM L. CLAY.
DAVID OBEY.
GEORGE MILLER.
JOE MOAKLEY.
HENRY B. GONZALEZ.
MARTIN O. SABO.
NORMAN Y. MINETA.
RONALD V. DELLUMS.
NORM DICKS.
VIC FAZIO.
DAVID BONIOR.

TIME FOR COMMITMENT TO A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the people of Iowa's

Fifth Congressional District for giving me the honor of representing them in the U.S. House of Representatives.

On the first day of this Congress, I was proud to help make a downpayment on restoring the public's faith in Congress by passing long overdue congressional reforms.

When the balanced budget amendment comes to the floor of the House this month, we will have an opportunity to make another installment on our contract with the American people.

As I ran for Congress, families stressed to me their fear that the enormous debt that the Federal Government has run up will destroy their children's and grandchildren's future. We have a moral imperative to bring an end to the deficit spending that has become a way of life in Washington. Congress has lacked this restraint to the tune of over $4 trillion. The time has come to commit to a common goal of a balanced budget amendment. It is for our children's and grandchildren's sake.

□ 1140

THE MEXICAN CRISIS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, just a few months ago Mexico was touted as the place to invest. NAFTA was passed to foster trade and economic integration with Mexico. Now Mexico is in crisis. The peso is dropping. Their stock market is falling. Interest rates are shooting upward, and the economy is facing collapse.

The implications for us are enormous. American investors in business face huge losses. The American taxpayer is liable for $9 billion in emergency loans and much more. Like it or not, our economy is linked to Mexico, because they are our largest trading partner.

But before we get in any deeper, the American people and this Congress must understand clearly what the situation is and what our liabilities are. As chairman of the International Committee on Policy subcommittee, my goal is to conduct a full-scale examination of this crisis and the United States role in rescuing the Mexican economy and its implications for the American taxpayer.

MILITARY MIGHT AND VITAL ECONOMY KEY

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, we in Congress face the very difficult task of reigning in the national debt and reducing the size and scope of an overgrown Federal bureaucracy. This was a message sent to Members in November and it is a task I take on gladly.

However, Mr. Speaker, as we head into this very difficult year of budget cuts and spending decisions, I would like to take this opportunity to recall to Members those qualities that have made this country the strongest Nation and longest-standing democracy the world has ever known, namely, military might and a vital economy.

The United States has shown time and time again that its military is second to none. It has turned back every challenge and the men and women who serve are the best trained and the most committed fighting force of any in the world. Let us be mindful of their commitment and renew our commitment to the strength that has contributed to the peace we enjoy today.

As for the economy, the engine that drives growth and creativity, we must never turn our backs on those who lie at the very heart of the economy, the American farmer.

CALL FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, for 40 years Congress has failed to do what middle-class Americans and State legislators across the country have done, and that is to balance the checkbook. Let the word go forth today that the checkbook has been passed for the first time in 40 years to a new generation of leaders that want to balance the budget and that want to balance the checkbook.

What do we hear? We hear nothing but smoke and mirrors from people that talk about GOPAC and try to create images of Nazi librarians where they do not exist. They are red herrings.

We are here to do a serious task and that is to balance the budget before it is too late. We need help from both sides of the aisle, because if we do not do it now, it is going to be late soon.

REVISITING THE REAGAN-BUSH YEARS

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

Mr. HOYER. Ladies and gentlemen, I was motivated by the previous speaker. We had a $945 billion debt in America in 1980. We changed the checkbook and one person could have stopped spending in its tracks from 1981 to 1989, one person, Ronald Reagan, President of the United States. We never overrode a veto of the President of the United States from 1981 to 1992 dealing with spending in America. Every nickel that was spent in America from 1981 to 1992 was because either Ronald Reagan or George Bush signed the bill allowing that expenditure to go forth.

I have voted for the balanced budget amendment the last two times. I am going to vote for it again. But spending got out of control in this country in 1981. We sustained more debt in the last 12 years than in all the years prior to that time.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT II

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support a balanced budget amendment. We have not balanced this country's budget since way before the birth of my son Kurt. Mr. Speaker, Kurt is 25 years old.

As we have heard here on the floor this week, the vast majority of States have balanced budget requirements. Our families balance their budgets, our businesses balance their books, and if many of our States must balance their budgets then there is no reason we cannot balance the books in Washington, DC.

What we have heard here from the other side of the aisle this week is an argument against the balanced budget amendment. What we have heard is an argument against balancing the budget. I think our country is too important, our children's future too precious and the next generation too vital to allow the burden of Federal debt to continue to pile up.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me and support the balanced budget amendment and once again gain control of runaway Federal spending.

BIPARTISAN SUPPORT FOR BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the balanced budget amendment is the single most important issue that this Congress will face this year or next. I believe it is important that Americans understand that this issue is supported on a bipartisan basis by many Democrats as well as Republicans. In fact, the leader of the balanced budget fight for many years has been Congressman CHARLIE STENHOLM of Texas, a Democrat.

This is not a Republican issue, it is not a Democratic issue. It is an issue about our children, an issue about our grandchildren and their future. The fundamental question we face is whether our Congress is going to continue to steal money from our grandchildren to pay for today's spending.

I hope this Congress will change that, and I hope the American people will understand that many Democrats will be at the forefront of fighting for this most important measure.

A PROGRESS REPORT ON HAITI?

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, today is day 115 of the U.S. occupation of Haiti. For almost 6,000 of our troops still there, the mission remains as open-ended and as ill-defined as it was when it started back in September. Still the White House is very vague about the time line for the withdrawal of our troops. They offer very little substantive commentary on what is the real situation in Haiti today where our troops are at risk.

Mr. Speaker, many Members have questions they would like answered, like:

What is the prognosis for an orderly withdrawal of our troops without a return to a climate of brutal vengeance in Haiti?

Where do Haitian moderates fit into White House plans?

How much is this costing American taxpayers as we talk about balancing the budget?

What is being done about shifting the aid emphasis from commitments for handouts for Haitians to support for investments and jobs that will actually make a real difference in that country's future?

Mr. Speaker, it is time for some accountability from the White House. It is our troops that are overseas.

ON WHOSE BACK?

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, the naysayers and doubters are out in full force scaring the American people about the balanced budget amendment. The question they ask is on whose back will the budget be balanced?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reverse that question and ask on whose back will the burden fall if we do not balance the budget?

□ 1150

If Congress does not act responsibly to control wasteful government spending and growth, the children of our country are the ones who will pay. We now have over $4 trillion in debt. How far in debt do we have to go before we realize what we are doing to the children of our Nation? The American people want action and they want action now.

They want a government that is smaller, less expensive and more efficient. They want a government that will control its spending habits. Let us not break the back of our children's future. Let us pass the balanced budget amendment and let us do it now.

BASE CLOSINGS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I stand here to talk to my colleagues about base closure. I think many of us realize we just went through a base closure operation not too long ago and I was involved with it. We are having another one in 1995. I want to point out to my colleagues we had a vote on the House floor to slow down this process and I think it is important we do that.

Now that Republicans are in control, I hope all of us will realize we have an opportunity to preserve some very important bases around this country, which brings me to my point about a very important base in my congressional district in Jacksonville, FL. It is a naval depot. My friends, it is creating a profit.

After all is said and done, here is a government operation that is creating profit every year, so why should we be shutting down something like that? The community is coming together very strongly to protect it. In fact on Monday the First Coast Manufacturing Association kicked off a campaign of 500,000 postcards in support of the Jacksonville depot.

CONTINUING PROCESS OF REFORMS

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, 1 week ago today we passed the most dramatic reforms of the way this institution does business in literally decades. It was done under the most open amendment process imaginable. We had votes up or down on eight different provisions that passed, not by a simple up-or-down vote as we have had in years past when the Congress has organized.

We right now up in the Rules Committee are holding a hearing on the unfunded mandates question so we will not see Congress continue to impose constraints on State and local government without providing the wherewithal to comply with those constraints. There are a wide range of things that are going to be going on during this 100-day period.

But I think it is very important for us to realize that while we did pass these eight major reforms a week ago today, the issue of reform did not end on January 4. We are continuing to review further opportunities to change and improve the operations of the U.S. Congress so that it can in fact become more accountable to the American people and once again be established as the greatest deliberative body known to man.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a critical issue that must be addressed as we address the balanced budget at the Federal level, it is very important that we also protect the taxpayer at the local level. So I wish to indicate my support for the unfunded mandates bill and the need for liberalizing the rules governing privatization of Federal infrastructure assets by State and local governments.

Yesterday, the House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight completed its markup of H.R. 5 the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995. Chairman BILL CLINGER showed tremendous leadership on the first day of committee business by moving the bill so quickly. I strongly support House passage of the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act.

The Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 is an important first step in right-sizing the Federal Government. The November 8 election sent Washington a clear message—the American people want smaller, less intrusive government. Unfunded Federal mandates is one costly example of Federal Government overreach.

The Federal Government taxes gasoline, cigarettes, payroll for Social Security, and of course, income. But that is not all. Washington also taxes the American people through costly regulations placed on State and local governments and the private sector. The cost of Federal regulations are hidden in increased property and sales taxes, higher fees on services that show up in water and sewer bills, and more expensive goods and services. In addition, these Federal mandates infringe upon the freedom of communities to order their public lives. In short, the Federal Government compels taxpayers of both State and local governments and the private sector, either by force of law or the power of the purse, to pay for its policies. The America people want relief.

The mayor of Richmond, IN, Steve Cornett has indicated that unfunded Federal mandates have prevented that municipality from improving vital public safety and infrastructure. The Environmental Protection Agency compels this community to fit its landfill with a $1 million liner, even though the landfill is clay and not prone to leeching. The city also had to use scarce resources to dig up empty storage tanks

in a remote area near the Richmond Municipal Airport. According to Mayor Cornett, the opportunity costs of this Federal meddling is high. The city wants to update fire department equipment, but is strapped for the funding. Curbs, sidewalks and streets need repairs, but the demands of the Federal regulations come first. The city of Richmond is not unique in this regard. The U.S. Conference of Mayors with the firm of Price Waterhouse assessed the cost of 10 unfunded Federal mandates and found that they consumed 11.7 percent of local revenue—(August and September 1993).

As I stated, the Unfunded Mandate Reform Act of 1995 is an important first step. To do the full work of rightsizing the Federal Government, this Congress must also: First, address existing unfunded mandates—H.R. 5 directly addresses only prospective mandates; Second, level the playing field between public and private entities—that is to say, private sector entities that provide services such as utilities should receive the same relief from regulation as publicly held entities; and third, reduce barriers to privatization. With regard to the last—privatization—I hope to introduce an amendment to H.R. 5 to reduce barriers to the privatization of federally financed infrastructure assets by State and local governments.

State and local governments should have greater control over infrastructure decisions, on roads, utilities, and airports. Current Federal policy greatly restricts the options available to those governments to manage infrastructure assets with little regard to local priorities.

My amendment would allow State and local governments to transfer Federal-aid facilities to the private sector—either by sale or long-term lease—without repayment of Federal grants, provided the facility continues to be used for its original purpose. This legislation is an extension of Executive Order 12803 on Privatization that President Bush signed in 1992. It would not interfere with any contractural obligations agreed to by local government owners in connection with previous grants.

In my home district, the Second Congressional District of Indiana, there are many examples of successful privatization efforts. Two in particular are the Muncie Youth Opportunity Center and the Anderson Community Hospital Pregnancy Plus Program. The Muncie Youth Opportunity Center is a home for disadvantaged young people privatized and supported by private donations under the very able leadership of Judge Steven Caldemeyer. The center was previously administered by Delaware County and since its privatization, the center has renovated its facilities and begun to serve more needy children in my hometown. The Anderson Community Hospital Pregnancy Plus Program offers prenatal care to women of limited means. Previously run by the Madison County Department of Health, since privatization, the program has nearly doubled the number of women who have access to prenatal care in this program and expanded to provide post-natal care.

Just adjacent to my district, the city of Indianapolis is a leader in privatization. Indianapolis Mayor Steve Goldsmith has moved 50 public services into the private sector by way of competitive bidding, at a savings of $115 million.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill and support for my amendment.

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

[Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINNIS 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 gentlewoman from New York [Ms. VELÁZQUEZ] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. VELÁZQUEZ addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BEREUTER 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 gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PROPOSED CHANGES TO H.R. 4, WELFARE REFORM LEGISLATION

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

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that in H.R. 4, the welfare reform legislation, as introduced, unjustly treats taxpaying legal immigrants the same as illegal aliens. The two are very different.

Therefore, today I am introducing legislation that will ensure that taxpaying legal immigrants are not discriminated against.

I am encouraged that the behind the scenes work I have already undertaken appears to have brought the Speaker's and other Republican leaders' attention to this problem. I very much welcome their willingness to fix their oversight. My intention in introducing this bill is to make readily available—to the appropriate committee and subcommittee chairmen—legislative language to fix this flaw. Having introduced this bill, I am hopeful it can be amended into H.R. 4 as soon as possible.

Legal immigrants should not be used as an excuse for a broken-down welfare system that has failed to bring people out of poverty.

The majority of those who receive benefits are either American citizens or illegal aliens.

The frustrations of this country's failed attempts to curb the illegal immigration crisis should not turn into a backlash on legal immigrants.

These law abiding immigrants patiently wait and study for 5 years to become U.S. citizens while illegal aliens have no regard for the law. Legal immigrants contribute to the national identity, whereas illegal immigrants can all too often become a burden to the Nation's taxpayer.

I was an immigrant who entered the United States lawfully. I worked hard for an education and I couldn't wait for the chance to become an American citizen. I still take personal pride knowing that I worked hard, paid my fair share of taxes, earned my way, and provided for my family.

I decided to enter public service so I could pay back my country for the opportunities that it gave me.

Where is the incentive for immigrants to pay taxes, and to enter the United States legally if they are cut off from the system?

With this kind of discrimination why not enter illegally? We should prevent that—not encourage it.

This is why I believe that saving money from denying legal, taxpaying immigrants the benefits for which they have paid and may need in the future, is not the answer.

Instead, Congress should focus on how to get people already on welfare off of it quickly. The Federal Government has spent billions of tax dollars on people who originally needed a temporary helping hand, but soon became accustomed to getting a free ride.

Over time, our country has created a permanent society dependent on the Federal Government. That must be changed.

H.R. 4—the Republican welfare reform bill—will be an effective first step in that process. With the changes I have proposed today, I believe the Republican efforts at welfare reform will be even fairer and more successful.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time out to talk about an issue which I raised briefly in the 1-minutes earlier, the question of congressional reform.

I would like to take time because today marks the 1-week point of the strongest and most dynamic reform of this institution that we have seen in decades, and there has been this sense

among many that January 4 brought about an end to the issue of congressional reform.

The new Members who are represented, among others, by the gentleman from California [Mr. BILBRAY] here on the floor insisted that we pass a resolution in the Republican conference which called for continued review of the issue of reform of this institution. Because while we have spent a couple of years in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress and in our Republican conference talking about the need to reform the Congress, we have not completed our job.

Now, on January 4 we did a number of things that were extraordinarily important, having Congress comply with laws that are imposed on every other American, very important; trying to reduce the number of committees and subcommittees in the Congress, very important; reducing the number of committee staff, very important. But we have not completed that effort.

I believe that it was really a first step on the road toward even further reform of the institution.

Now, as we look at some of the things that we would like to do, I believe that this review effort that the Republican conference has put together will have a great deal of input from new Members of this institution, and as they familiarize themselves with the workings of Congress, I am convinced that they will come up with a wide range of recommendations which will include, among other things, probably even more streamlining of the committee process. We, I believe, still need to look at changes that conceivably could be made throughout the 104th Congress.

Also, a number of the items that came up in our rules package need to be incorporated in statute, and we know that if we are going to have complete and full compliance of the laws imposed on every other American, we cannot simply do it with a rules change here. We are going to have to look at a statute.

So I think that what needs to be realized is that tremendous reforms were made with those votes that were cast 1 week ago today, but much work lies ahead. We, of course, during this 100-day period are focusing on the balanced budget amendment, unfunded mandates which we are discussing right now upstairs in the Committee on Rules, and a wide range of other items, and then following the first 100 days, we obviously are going to be addressing items which were actually included in that advertisement that appeared in TV Guide magazine, that pointing out things like health care reform. We have not ignored that, and there are other proposals that will be debated as we go on into the rest of the 104th Congress.

It is important to realize that the 104th Congress is not going to be 100 days long. It is a 2-year period. While we address issues beyond the 100 days, included among them will be further reform of this institution.

A TRIBUTE TO ED MADIGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLILEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to recognize a former colleague of ours, a Member who represented that part of central Illinois that I now have the privilege to represent, the gentleman who I followed here in these Halls of Congress in 1991, Mr. Ed Madigan.

I want to open this special order of recognition of the life of Ed Madigan with a few comments, a little background about this great individual, and a few personal comments.

Ed Madigan was born in central Illinois in January, on January 13, 1936. He graduated with a business degree from Lincoln College in Lincoln, IL, a community that was his home his entire life.

He was first elected to the Illinois House of Representatives in 1966, and he served there for 6 years until he was elected to Congress in 1972. While serving in Congress, he was the ranking Republican on the Committee on Agriculture the last 8 years in office, and he played a key part in both the 1985 and 1990 farm bills.

Ed Madigan received an honorary doctorate degree in 1974 from his alma mater, Lincoln College, and he received in 1977 honorary doctorate degrees from Millikin University and Illinois Wesleyan University.

Probably one of the great highlights of his career was when he left Congress to go and serve in the Bush Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture. He was the 24th Secretary of Agriculture of this great country, appointed in 1991, and he served there throughout the remainder of the Bush administration.

As I indicated before, he was a lifelong resident of Lincoln, IL. He was very proud of that. He never lost the roots from which he came.

He though and believed that his major accomplishments in the field of agriculture included the part that he played in the 1985 and the 1990 farm bills. He pushed for greater market orientation in our ag policies, and he was the father of our crop insurance program.

He also began the process of reorganizing the USDA, something that we have carried forward, and he was a major contributor to the GATT negotiations. Ed Madigan not only served agriculture when he was in this Congress, but he served as the ranking member on Energy and Commerce, and on the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment.

In the 97th Congress, he was chairman of the House Research and Planning Committee, and he was twice appointed chief deputy whip.

Ed Madigan was known as a consensus builder and at the time of his death he was quoted as having said when he first entered Congress, as he began his life in the Nation's Capital, he said that he had one goal: ''I have the ambition to be an influential Members of Congress and to use that influence to bring credit to myself and to help people.'' I think there is no doubt in all of our minds that Ed Madigan achieved that goal.

On a personal basis, Ed Madigan and I were both born within 6 months of each other in the same county, in Logan County, IL, and we both grew to manhood in that rural Illinois county. Our fathers were close friends, and Ed used to enjoy telling his somewhat long stories about how my father would try and outdo his father in some horse deal; but you know, when his story ended, his father always came out on top. But they were interesting, amusing stories.

Ed Madigan was a wonderful speaker, and he had so much charisma. He was a man of his word. He was an honorable person. Ed Madigan was loved by his constituents, respected by his constituents, and he is missed by his former constituents.

□ 1210

He is survived by his wife Evelyn, certainly one of the greatest ladies to ever serve as a spouse in the Washington scene; three daughters, Kimberly, Kellie, and Mary Elizabeth; three grandchildren, to whom he was devoted; and a brother, Senator Robert Madigan, who serves in the Illinois State Legislature, and also one sister, Sandra.

I know that everyone in Illinois joins with me, as do many of my colleagues here today, to remember Ed Madigan, to honor Ed Madigan, and to celebrate life and his service to this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Kansas, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, Chairman PAT ROBERTS.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman has indicated, Ed Madigan and the Madigan family come from Illinois, Lincoln, IL, as he has stated, to be exact. And to borrow from President Lincoln's famous address, it is altogether fitting and proper that we do this.

More especially, in regard to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], who is now so ably representing the 15th district, Mr. EWING, like Ed Madigan, serves on the House Agriculture Committee, and in many ways, I think, exemplifies Ed Madigan's legacy of positive attributes.

All of us who have admired and known and love Ed want to thank my colleague, more especially, for taking this special order.

In the House we have a parliamentary means that allows us to say, in essence, ''That was a mighty fine speech.'' Or, ''What you said certainly makes sense to me.'' And we put it this way: ''I thank the gentleman,'' or ''gentlewoman, and I associate myself with his remarks.''

Now today there are many, many of Ed's friends who share our sense of personal loss and love for this man and his family, who associate themselves with this special order.

In this regard I do want to make special mention of former Congressman Bob Smith of Oregon. It was Bob Smith and PAT ROBERTS, along with any farmer and rancher who knew Ed Madigan, who thought we should and fought to make Ed Secretary of Agriculture. We had been riding shotgun with him for a long time.

The same applies to the members of the ''team'' Madigan, if I may use that term, both on the Hill and at the Department of Agriculture, talking about Chuck Hilty, Bill O'Connor, Diane Liesman, Jackie Parke, Mary McGrane, Allie Devine, and Jim Waller.

I would also like to make special mention of former deputy secretary of agriculture Ann Veneman, who worked with Secretary Madigan in streamlining the USDA and certainly making it more cost-effective. I know this list could go on for many special orders in regards to Ed's many friends, but I also want to mention one person, Ed's special friend, Joe Quattrone, or ''Joe Q.,'' of the House barbershop. All of us miss him, and he is part of us.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, in reflecting on what I would like to say and should say during this special order, I came to one very obvious conclusion. Simply put, when our Republican leader Bob Michel spoke in giving the moving and very eloquent eulogy for Ed Madigan, he spoke for us all. And borrowing from Lincoln again, I believe we can neither add nor detract from what Bob Michel stated.

Mr. Michel's eulogy will follow my remarks. So in closing, let me say on behalf of Ed's family, his wife Evelyn—and what a source of strength and resolve and love she has been to us all and to Ed and the family: To Kim, Kellie, Mary Elizabeth, brother Bob, sister Sandra, and all of the grandchildren, that we share in your sense of personal loss and that you are in our prayers.

If Ed were with us today, in his true Irish wit, he would put his glasses down on his nose, sitting somewhere in the House, and as he has done many times in the House Committee on Agriculture, he would say, ''That is enough, Roberts.''

But I do want to repeat a quote from Helen Steiner Rice which I think pretty well sums up how we feel and how we should feel as we celebrate Ed's life. Helen Steiner Rice said the following:

When I must leave you for a little while,
Please go on bravely with a gallant smile
And for my sake and in my name,
Live on and do all things the same—
Spend not your life in empty days,
But fill each waking hour in useful ways—
Reach out your hand in comfort and in cheer,
And I in turn will comfort you and hold you near.

And that is the way that Ed would want us to conduct ourselves, to live our lives to the fullest, thankful that the Lord really gave us the opportunity to know him and to share this all too brief time in space.

I submit the eulogy of Mr. Michel for the RECORD.

EULOGY FOR THE HONORABLE EDWARD R. MADIGAN

(Offered by Republican Leader Robert H. Michel, Dec. 12, 1994)

Evelyn, Kim, Kellie, Mary Elizabeth, brother Bob, Sister Sandra and Grandchildren.

It's a most difficult task to be called upon to speak when you are overcome with grief in the passing of a loved one.

All the more so when it's your close friend and colleague who has been taken from you so suddenly.

We find it particularly hard to take when the last time we saw Ed, scarcely two months ago, he was in his usual good form speaking atop a couple of bales of straw at a Logan County Pig Roast he was hosting for Ray LaHood just before the election.

We simply can't fathom the speed with which the scourge of cancer can take its toll on what we all perceived as a very healthy, robust, tall and erect good-looking fellow like Ed Madigan.

Who are we to know what our fate will bring—the whys and wherefores—all we know and feel is that Ed was taken from us all too soon.

His was a life deeply steeped in politics, and devoted primarily to public service.

I knew him as a very able state legislator before he came to the Congress where he served for another 20 years prior to being selected by President Bush as his Secretary of Agriculture.

During the extended period we worked closely together and became fast friends.

He was not the flamboyant type, but rather one who prided himself in doing his homework, quietly going about his business, getting the facts, and being a stickler for detail.

In short, he was a legislator of the old school.

A legislative craftsman genuinely interested—and marvelously skilled—in forming good legislation out of the give-and-take of debate and discussion.

To legislate successfully in a democracy means not only being able to understand the problems, or articulate the problems, but also the rare ability to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to solve the problems.

Some political activists call such an approach ''compromise.'' Ed called it by its real name: democracy in action.

I can tell you from experience that not everyone is capable of enduring the long hours, the endless debates, the mixture of raging ego and intense ambition and partisan enmities that make up so much of the legislative process.

But Ed Madigan, with that sense of civility and reserve and decency which seemed inherent in him, went about his work patiently and proudly, always being the perfect gentleman.

He was proud to be a public servant at a time when public service has been getting bad press.

Well, Ed Madigan's life is the answer we give to those who doubt that a genuine sense of public service still live in this country.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and of the Agriculture Committee, Ed always brought to his duties that enviable but indefinable quality called class.

Ernest Hemingway once defined courage as ''grace under pressure.'' We might similarly define class as grace under the glaring spotlight of public life.

There was a sense of easy, good-humored charm about Ed, always tempered by that sense of reserve, that attractive reticence, that innate self-possession that is as rare as it is admirable in the rough and tumble world of politics.

And that is how we will remember him: his class, his sense of calm amidst the storm, the easy, comfortable charm of the born leader.

Again I thank the gentleman for yielding and reserving this special order.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his comments.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, regarding Ed Madigan, are there are lots of things that could be said; we could go through a litany of those things which he did as Secretary of Agriculture or as a Member of the House here for 10 years. But that is not what I want to talk about. In the few seconds that I have I would just like to mention a couple of things.

George Romney used to describe friends of his as ''a great human.'' Ed was a great human. He had an impact on all of us here; whether it was, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] mentioned, consensus building or whatever, he recognized and emulated those great human qualities which I would like to feel we all aspire to.

But another thing, President Eisenhower used to have on his desk a saying that said, ''Suaviter in modo fortiter in re.'' That means, ''Softly in manner, strongly in deed.'' That is what Ed represented. We talk, we show our emotion on a variety of different issues, but Ed was always interested in the deed rather than the emotion or the show. I would like to feel that as he was trying to build sort of a family-friendly Agriculture Department atmosphere, down here we are trying to build a citizen-friendly atmosphere. I hope he would be proud of us.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman. I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Texas, the former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, today we gather to pay tribute to one of our former colleagues and a former Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Ed Madigan. It is with great sadness at his death that I want to take this opportunity to say about

our recently departed colleague what an outstanding individual he was. I use that word earnestly, since Ed Madigan's life was nothing less than that. Ed Madigan came to these hallowed halls, as I did, from the statehouse. He made his decision to run for congressional office in order to be more involved with the political process on a national level, wanting to make a real difference to the people of Illinois who had elected him to Congress, and he did. With great enthusiasm, knowledge, and legislative prowess, that is exactly what he did in his years here as part of this illustrious body. I had the honor and privilege to have him as my ranking minority member of the Agriculture Committee when I was chairman.

He was a self-confident man, a natural leader, and it was only fitting for him to cap his career in 1991 by being appointed as the Secretary of Agriculture. I say this because his qualifications for this job were superb.

Once in this position, he exercised them skillfully, overseeing the Nation's agricultural needs and drawing upon his knowledge and expertise as a former member of the House Agriculture Committee to do so.

We worked together for things agriculture; as colleagues and as friends, we traveled together for American agriculture to different parts of the world; we worked with the leaders of the major countries of the world and also with the less-developed countries, and many of these areas that he worked on are now coming to fruition. He worked on or started so many things that now we are finalizing.

To me it will always be an honor to have had the privilege of working with Ed Madigan. To have been his friend meant even more. His loss is a personal one, and I will miss him greatly.

□ 1220

I extend my condolences to his wife, Evelyn, and to his family.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY].

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] for this special order for Ed Madigan, and I have some prepared remarks, but I just would like to make a couple of personal comments.

Ed was a long-time friend and mentor, and I know a lot of the members of the Ag Committee talked about his service on the Ag Committee, but he also had distinguished service for many years on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and I considered him one of my mentors when I came to the committee back in 1984. I found him to be truly the embodiment of what a public servant ought to be, one who did not take himself too seriously, but took his job very seriously, one who could spin a good story as well as anybody.

I remember in one particular case we were asked to go to Camp David to be lobbied very heavily by the Reagan administration for the TEFRA bill. That was the bill that was going to try to restore some tax revenue after the big tax cut in 1981, and after we returned from Camp David that afternoon, the news media asked a lot of us there what was it all about, and they asked Ed Madigan. Particularly they said:

''We understand you're already in favor of TEFRA. Why did you go up to Camp David with all of these other folks who were allegedly undecided?''

And Ed, with that wry smile of his, said, ''I suspect I was a shill,'' and that was really the embodiment of his personality.

I valued his friendship; I valued our service together on the committee. We will dearly miss Ed. Our best to Evelyn and the entire family. Our condolences, but with strong memories of Ed as a great personality here in this House who was well respected and well liked by everyone he served with.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the name of Ed Madigan's hometown can give you an idea of the type of leadership qualities and personal attributes he possessed. As a native of Lincoln, IL, Ed had become an influential member of the State in just 6 years. He made the move from the Illinois House of Representatives, where he had served since 1966, to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972.

Ed embodied all of the characteristics of an admirable Republican leader. His honesty and integrity made him a devoted public servant. His shrewdness and enthusiasm made him effective. His qualities are at the foundation of Republican ideals, and by using these attributes, Ed earned the trust of his colleagues as well as our respect.

Ed was a great legislative strategist. His behind the scenes style of compromise earned him the position of U.S. Agriculture Secretary under President Bush. Prior to becoming secretary, Ed was selected to 10 terms in the U.S. House where he served in several leadership positions, including chief deputy minority whip and chairman of the House Republican Research Committee.

Over the course of his political years, Ed used his influence to promote the vast interests of his Illinois constituents through service on the Youth and Families Committee and the Veterans' Affairs Committee. As the agriculture committee's ranking Republican, he was one of the few farm-state Republicans willing to apply free market principles to crops that grew in his district. Also, he was instrumental in many decisions concerning health and environmental issues, as well as transportation issues.

When Ed began his life in the Nation's Capital, he said he had but one goal: ''I have the ambition to be an influential Member of Congress and to use that influence to bring credit to myself and to help people.''

I think we can all agree that his goal was achieved.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] for the time that he has taken for this special order because I think it is most appropriate for one of the finest gentlemen who ever served in this body, and I am glad to follow people like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] with whom I sat side by side while Ed Madigan was our ranking member, and he always said, ''It's time for the authorizers and appropriators to be getting together,'' and we are doing exactly that. It is a good combination, and, under that tutelage, I think it is a stamp of the kind of individual that Mr. Madigan was, that he imbued within people who come to Congress a sense of service with great dignity and always with a very reserved, never overexcited or a grenade thrower, but just one who had a simple approach to the thing of ''Let's get the job done.''

Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor of the House with a number of my colleagues of the House today to express our deepest sympathies to the family and friends of Ed Madigan who passed away on December 7, 1994. He is a close friend of mine, and I know that I join many others in saying that we will all miss him greatly. I always enjoyed getting together with Ed, no matter what the task was that we had at hand, because I valued our friendship and mostly because he was a gentleman's gentleman, and I always appreciated his quiet, sincere but enthusiastic, manner.

Ed Madigan embodied what makes this town and this institution the special place that it is. His good nature and talent for knowing how to get things done in Washington served him, his constituency and this country well. The farmers and ranchers in Illinois and rural areas around the country owe a special debt of gratitude to Ed Madigan, his family, and his supporters. Ed could discuss the intricacies of agricultural policy in a way that spoke directly to agricultural producers, and he initiated a number of revolutionary ideas in Congress and at the Department of Agriculture, and many of these policies continue through the current administration. His plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture will save taxpayers millions of dollars while providing agricultural producers with a much more efficient and effective Department of Agriculture.

When I first came to Congress in 1980, Mr. Speaker, Ed and I immediately became friends, and I often looked to him for advice and counsel. He was my first ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture, and we continued to stay in touch over the years as I went up to the Committee on Appropriations and he went on to the Bush administration.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that he is not here today to share this wonderful change of positions and thus acquiring the majority status in this body because he was a very much majority-oriented individual.

I say to my colleagues, ''I know Ed's legacy and memory will live for years to come, and I feel very fortunate to have known Ed, as many of you have as well, and I again appreciate that kind of friendship because, when it's all

over, that's what you take with you when you go.''

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] for reserving this time.

I rise today to join my colleagues in marking a passing of a former Member of the House, a person that is certainly unique. Ed Madigan of the 15th District of Illinois was not only a friend and a colleague, but certainly a mentor.

Ed serve in this House, in this Nation, over a period of two decades. He was first elected to this House in 1972 following three terms in the Illinois legislature, and served ably, both as a representative of his district in central Illinois and later as Secretary of Agriculture during the Bush administration.

I remember the gentleman from Lincoln as both a friend as a mentor. We both served for 6 years in the Illinois House prior to coming to Washington and we both served on the House Energy and Commerce Committee. In fact, I remember just coming on the House Committee on Agriculture or House Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Ed was kind of giving me advice all the way along, and finally one day he said, ''Well, what are your subcommittees going be,'' and I said, ''Well, Ed, I wanted to be on the Telecommunication Subcommittee,'' and I thought it was important to be on the Energy Subcommittee, and he said, ''I'm a ranking member on the Health and Environment Subcommittee,'' and he said, ''You know it would serve you well to get on that subcommittee because,'' he said, ''you know it's going to be a lot of things happening in health and environment in the next year or two.'' And, sure enough, I put in to get on the Health Subcommittee, and within 3 weeks Ed Madigan was Secretary of Agriculture, and I sat on that committee being the only Illinois person on it and later taking on all the health issues, and Ed would call me from time to time and lend me some good advice.

Ed, when I think of his time in both agriculture, and in science issues, and the energy issues, and telephone issues, I also think of his time, as my colleagues know, that Ed was not a professional politician. He had came from Lincoln, IL, and he ran the local taxi company in Lincoln, IL.

□ 1230

Prior to that his dad and he ran a livery company, a horse-trading and service company in Lincoln, IL. So the stories and the humor that Ed pulled out from time to time go back to those earthy times back in Illinois dealing with Illinois farmers. He was never a farmer, but he knew the farmers and the people that he dealt with there almost on the same hustings that another Illinoisan served on—Abraham Lincoln.

One of the things I always remembered that I shared particularly with Ed, Ed, I guess coming from the taxi business, loved old automobiles, and he could talk about old Lincolns and old Packards. You could see his eyes light up with the love of those cars, and he actually collected a few.

We have to look back on Ed Madigan with a smile and a tear for his loss, but, Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that I take the well today because Ed was a friend. He was also a leader of this House, and he represented the best that this House stands for. He certainly was a person who could cut through a lot of nonsense. He was a person who cut to the quick of what the issues were.

We remember him fondly today as a friend and a fellow Member of this Congress and as a man who did his best to serve the people he loved. For a Member of the House of Representatives, I guess we can ask no greater honor.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, my tribute to Ed Madigan is on behalf of myself, because I lost a friend, and my father, who had the pleasure of serving with Ed Madigan in this House a little over a decade ago, and who indeed, also, has lost a friend. Because it is true that if you ever served with Ed, you probably ended up his friend.

In the tradition of Irish stock who emigrated to America to fill positions in civic duty, some of Ed Madigan's ancestors were in law enforcement. His father was a sheriff, of which Ed was very proud. A strapping man, handsome and smiling, Ed Madigan was a powerful figure who could tell a good story, who had a sense of humor.

After I was first elected to the House, before I got down here, my father told me about Ed Madigan, suggested I look him up. When I did, the man took me under his wing as if a self-appointed mentor. I had requested a seat on the Agriculture Committee and of course Ed was the ranking member in those days when we were in the minority. At the same time, by the way, he was ranking member of Energy and Commerce, just to give you an idea of what he could accomplish.

What I learned from him on the Agriculture Committee was invaluable. I learned about some things from him about farming, for sure, and about politics. But mostly I learned that a thoughtful, sincere approach in a distinguished and respectable manner can accomplish as much, if not more, than bluster.

Soon after I was here, he got involved in the race for whip, and I was happy to work for him. He lost the race, a very close race to a brilliant and rising star in Republican House politics, our current Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. Ed showed strength and character in defeat as he did in victory. Ed Madigan impressed me as a man who had real class. He was gracious and fair-minded, and I gained respect for him on my own, with fresh realization of what my father's earlier praise really meant.

In public service, if we are lucky, we form many friendships with colleagues, and when it comes to remembering them under these circumstances we may tend to recall personal traits over actual accomplishment. So I want to end my tribute to Ed Madigan today by relating what people who know agriculture saw as a true labor of love by Ed and a victory by anyone's standards.

When the 1985 farm bill was being written, of vital importance to farm families and related businesses and their employees, a tangle of legislation banded together for full House consideration made its way to the floor but for all intents and purposes was doomed.

The effort to mold a planning document, on which so many people and so much commerce would depend, was in disarray. It was headed for defeat, but Ed Madigan's amendments saved it.

Ed Madigan, who honored the memory of Abraham Lincoln and modeled himself in some ways after his fellow Illinois Representative, virtually rewrote the farm bill on the floor in a way that not only accomplished the short-term goal—but, amazingly, was so cohesive and comprehensive that it served as a blueprint for the farms bills to follow.

I said I lost a friend, and for that I am sad. But I am happy now to recall his work and honor his memory. Thank you.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] for arranging this special order and for providing us with this opportunity to pay tribute to an outstanding figure in American Government; Edward Madigan.

Former Congressman and Secretary of Agriculture, Edward Madigan, passed away on December 7 after battling lung cancer. Ed Madigan served as our Nation's 24th Secretary of Agriculture under President Bush. Prior to becoming our Agriculture Secretary, Ed was my classmate, the class of 1972. He was elected to 10 terms in the House where he meritoriously served in several leadership positions, including the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, the chief deputy minority whip, and as the chairman of the Republican Research Committee.

In our House Chamber where, during Ed's tenure, Democrats outnumbered Republicans, Ed was highly effective in garnering wide support from both sides of the aisle. As the senior Republican on the Agriculture and Energy and Commerce Committees, Ed had as

much impact on public policy over the last decade as all but a few senior Democrats.

Ed seized the opportunity for leaving a significant imprint on the 1985 farm bill, winning approval of an amendment that in effect determined the measure's main thrust. His expertise, willingness, and proficiency will be sorely missed when the 104th Congress gathers again to discuss and debate farm issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to associate myself with the remarks of our colleagues praising one of the most remarkable countrymen of our time. Most importantly, Ed was a good friend and a dear colleague who personally assisted my constituency. He was sincerely helpful and supportive of the farmers in my congressional district, especially Orange County. Ed graciously and eloquently addressed my constituents during one of our Chamber days.

To Ed's gracious wife, Evelyn, and his three wonderful children, our thoughts and our condolences are with you. The Congress of the United States has lost a true statesman and to many a good friend. Ed Madigan brought a sense of leadership, of dignity, and experience that was unparalleled. He made his mark and will be sorely missed by his colleagues.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to a new Member of the Illinois delegation, an old friend of Ed Madigan, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAHOOD].

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to stand in the well of the House, and I take it very seriously because I am pleased to participate in a special order to honor our former colleague, Ed Madigan. My special thanks to you, TOM EWING, a friend and a neighbor, for setting aside this time to honor Ed Madigan, who obviously was a dear friend of yours and of many others.

While Ed was a Member of Congress he represented a large part of the district which I currently represent. Ed and his lovely wife, Evelyn, resided in their hometown of Lincoln, where he was finally laid to rest.

I have known Ed for a long time, but my fondest memories will always be his knack of telling great stories. He had a very dry sense of humor, and he used his tale-spinning ability to entertain audiences with one funny story after another. Because of this talent, I will always remember Ed Madigan as the ''Will Rogers of central Illinois.''

He was an astute politician who could draw a congressional map to favor those of his own party. He was a talented legislator and craftsman who helped to write an 800-page farm bill in 1990, and he was a statesman, as evidenced by his tenure as Secretary of Agriculture during the Bush administration.

As is demonstrated by those who participate today in this special order, Ed Madigan was loved and admired by Members of both sides of the aisle.

□ 1240

On a very personal note, I must take special note of the fact that the last public event that Ed Madigan participated in was a fund raising hog roast for me in his home county on October 3. I knew he was not feeling well, but he never complained. He stood before a group of 300 of his neighbors and friends to spin tales and offer supportive comments on my behalf, for which I will forever be grateful.

In conclusion, I want to quote from a column by Alan Guebert, an agricultural writer, which I will enter into the RECORD: ''There are two kinds of politicians, show horses and work horses.'' He was by his own admission the latter, a work horse; a man who sought fairness, not fame. He never sought the television lights.

When Edward R. Madigan was lowered into the deep black prairie on the afternoon of December 12, 8 straight days of dismal winter weather broke, and stunning sunshine flooded the Illinois farm country.

I would like to conclude today by asking to have entered into the RECORD the heartfelt eulogies delivered by Illinois Gov. Jim Edgar and my former boss and former Republican leader, Congressman Bob Michel.

Again to you, Tom, thank you so much for arranging this special order.

ED MADIGAN: HE LED QUIETLY AND SOUGHT FAIRNESS, NOT FAME

(By Alan Guebert)

There are only two types of politicians, he liked to say: show horses and workhouses. He was, by his own admission, the latter; a man who sought fairness, not fame or television lights.

Yet fame finally found him. And when it did, he glided through glittering Washington in limousines. His friends all knew, however, that he was more comfortable exploring junkyards for vintage jalopies.

His predecessors at the U.S. Department of Agriculture possessed farm backgrounds and walls full of postgraduate degrees. But he grew up driving his father's taxi, not tractors, around Lincoln. The only advanced degree he earned—other than honorary—came from the Knights of Columbus.

He served in the Illinois House of Representatives for six years, the U.S. House of Representatives for 18 years and USDA for two years. But before he served Central Illinois, the nation and farmers, he first served his church as an altar boy for 12 years.

After he stepped into public service in early 1966, he won an enviable string of 13 consecutive races in 26 years. After he left public office in 1992, he lost his biggest race of all Dec. 7.

He pushed, cajoled, jawbound and jostled negotiators of the European Union into accepting the first-ever global trade treaty for agriculture. But he passed away one day before President Bill Clinton signed the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

He devoted his life to the Republican Party, just as his father, ''Red,'' had done as a GOP stalwart for 40 years. But the first big vote he faced as a freshman congressman in 1973 was the potential impeachment of a Republican president, Richard Nixon.

''I would have voted to impeach, too,'' he once told me, ''because not even the president is above the law.''

He fought to restrict the growth of government, but spent a legislative career powerlessly watching it multiply. In his congressional district, the very center of Illinois' abundant agriculture, government employees outnumber farmers by a 5-to-1 ratio.

The irony contained in that unbalanced equation was not lost on him in farm policy writing, either.

As a rookie Republican on the House Agriculture Committee, he voted for the 29-page, 1973 Farm Bill. The last Farm Bill he helped craft as the ranking minority member in 1990 totaled a staggering 719 pages.

Despite being viewed as a moderate, he was often staunchly partisan. When he preached the party line, however, it usually was in private and it always was with unfailing politeness.

He disliked the take-no-prisoners politics of today's Republican leadership. He saw its rise and tried to stop it by challenging Newt Gingrich for the Republican whip's job in 1989. He lost that intraparty fight by two votes—87 to 85—and confrontation replaced compromise in his beloved House.

Weary of always being in the minority—and, having seen the Republicans snare the presidency four times during his Washington tenure without making a dent in the Democratic majority in the House—he lost faith in early 1991 and opted out.

When he notified the White House in January 1991 of his interest in the vacant secretary of agriculture post—indirectly and very discreetly, of course—the job looked safe for six years. George Bush was cruising toward re-election with a sparkling voter approval rating of 87 percent.

But Bush stumbled in 1992 and the man who had trained 18 years to lead American agriculture silently left USDA after just 18 months as secretary. It was the one time his political instinct had failed him.

But he did not complain. He never complained. He led. And he led quietly. Like a workhorse.

When Edward R. Madigan was lowered into the deep, black prairie on the afternoon of Dec. 12, eight straight days of dismal winter weather broke and stunning sunshine flooded the Illinois farm country.

EULOGY OF HON. ROBERT MICHEL FOR ED MADIGAN

Evelyn, Kim, Kellie, Mary Elizabeth, brother Bob, Sister Sandra and Grandchildren.

It's a most difficult task to be called upon to speak when you are overcome with grief in the passing of a loved one.

All the more so when it's your close friend and colleague who has been taken from you so suddenly.

We find it particularly hard to take when the last time we saw Ed, scarcely two months ago, he was in his usual good form speaking atop a couple of bales of straw at a Logan County Pig Roast he was hosting for Ray LaHood just before the election.

We simply can't fathom the speed with which the scourge of cancer can take its toll on what we all perceived as a very healthy, robust, tall and erect good-looking fellow like Ed Madigan.

Who are we to know what our fate will bring—the whys and wherefores—all we know and feel is that Ed was taken from us all too soon.

His was a life deeply steeped in politics, and devoted primarily to public service.

I knew him as a very able state legislator before he came to the Congress where he

served for another 20 years prior to being selected by President Bush as his Secretary of Agriculture.

During the extended period we worked closely together and became fast friends.

He was not the flamboyant type, but rather one who prided himself in doing his homework, quietly going about his business, getting the facts, and being a stickler for detail.

In short, he was a legislator of the old school.

A legislative craftsman genuinely interested—and marvelously skilled—in forming good legislation out of the give-and-take of debate and discussion.

To legislate successfully in a democracy means not only being able to understand the problems, or articulate the problems, but also the rare ability to work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to solve the problems.

Some political activists call such an approach ''compromise.'' Ed called it by its real name: democracy in action.

I can tell you from experience that not everyone is capable of enduring the long hours, the endless debates, the mixture of raging ego and intense ambition and partisan enmities that make up so much of the legislative process.

But Ed Madigan, with that sense of civility and reserve and decency which seemed inherent in him, went about his work patiently and proudly, always being the perfect gentleman.

He was proud to be a public servant at a time when public service has been getting bad press.

Well, Ed Madigan's life is the answer we give to those who doubt that a genuine sense of public service still lives in this country.

As a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and of the Agriculture Committee, Ed always brought to his duties that enviable but indefinable quality called class.

Ernest Hemingway once defined courage as ''grace under pressure.'' We might similarly define class as grace under the glaring spotlight of public life.

There was a sense of easy, good-humored charm about Ed, always tempered by that sense of reserve, that attractive reticence, that innate self-possessiony that is as rare as it is admirable in the rough and tumble world of politics.

And that is how we will remember him: his class, his sense of calm amidst the storm, the easy, comfortable charm of the born leader.

JIM EDGAR EULOGY ED MADIGAN FUNERAL

Reverend Clergy, Eveline and members of the family, to my colleagues in government and to friends and neighbors of Ed Madigan * * * I consider it a great honor to be asked to say a few words about my good friend. But first, on behalf of Brenda and myself and all the people of Illinois, Eveline, to you, and members of the family, let us express our sympathy and best wishes.

Ed Madigan is without doubt, one of the most effective and competent public officials I ever had the pleasure of knowing or working with. As a legislator, he was second to none. Particularly when you consider the 24 years he spent in the legislative branch of government, only six of those years, the first six, when he was a member of the Illinois House, he was in the majority party. All the time he served in the United States Congress, he was in the minority party. but throughout his legislative career, he was extremely effective. As politics in America * * * said of Ed, no one seems to have told Madigan that Republican's are at a disadvantage when it comes to writing legislation in a heavily Democratic House.

Over the past decade, he has had as much impact on public policy as all but a few senior democrats. As Secretary of Agriculture, he was equally as effective though unfortunately he didn't serve in that position as long as he did in Congress. I well remember in the closing days of the bush Administration, talking to Ed by phones and saying ''are you kind of winding down?'' * * * he says ''No, I have to go back and forth to Europe as I am trying to negotiate part of the Gatt Treaty'' * * * and I thought to myself at that time, how fortunate the farmers of this country and all of us were to have someone with the ability to negotiate like Ed Madigan representing us. And that reminded me the other day when one of the newspaper stories told of a Democratic Congressman who commented about Ed that he was a person when you negotiated with him and you all got done, you realized you had all bought the same horse a couple of times. And he meant that as a highest compliment.

Ed Madigan had many outstanding characteristics. Those of you would attended Republican functions during the year knew that whenever Ed Madigan was going to speak, you could count on a good story. He learned that well from the namesake of his hometown, Lincoln. In fact, the only fear I had when he started to tell those stories * * * that I might be the object of one of those stories.

Ed Madigan also had the characteristic of loyalty. In fact, that was something I always admired * * * he was very loyal—loyal to family. In fact, I don't know of any time I journeyed out to Washington or he was back in Springfield, we sat down and talked about things, that he didn't bring up a member of the family.

To his community, even though he went far in Washington, he never forgot his roots. He never forgot particularly, his hometown of Lincoln and the many people he grew up with and represented there so well. The mayor was quoted in the paper the other day saying ''the day he became Secretary of Agriculture, Ed Madigan traced him down—tracked him down (I think) on vacation, and said, ''oh, by the way, you need to know about this grant that could help Lincoln.''

That's the way he was, very loyal to family, to community, and to friends. I consider Ed Madigan one of the closest friends I've had in politics.

We first met in 1971. He was a young member of the Illinois House and I was a young staffer in the Illinois State Senate. And we worked on reapportionment. Now, those of you who knew Ed, knew that there was nothing more important than politics and particularly, reapportionment. He was a very skilled negotiator at an early age. And from that point in 1971, we became close friends. And no matter when I needed help or needed advice, and I would turn to Ed, he was always available. Whether I was just a staffer or later a State Legislator, or Secretary of State, or then as Governor, he always had time no matter what he was doing in Washington, to set aside part of his day to meet with me.

Ed Madigan was truly a good friend and I am sure I speak for many many in this church today who felt that way about Ed. Much can be said about Ed, but to me, I guess the most important thing was he was someone you could always could on. Someone who in his quiet and effective way, made a difference. We will all miss Ed. But more importantly, no matter how long we live, we will always be very appreciative that we had a chance to know Ed and we will never forget Ed Madigan.

Mr. EWING. Thank you for your comments. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our friend and colleague from Illinois, like everyone else has, for doing this, because I think it is only appropriate that we take time to remember someone who was such a valuable part, both of this institution, of service to this country in many different facets, and to us personally.

I had the privilege of working with Ed Madigan on the House Committee on Agriculture for much of the past 12 years, until he went down to the Department. Ed and I had this affection for each other. We called each other Mr. Leader. He had reason to be called leader, and I think he did it for me just out of friendship and in response. But, of course, he then became our leader. He became our leader on the House Committee on Agriculture, and, as others have said, astutely, in different times, managed the farm bill.

I think many people remember him as well with his leadership on the Subcommittee of Health over in Energy and Commerce. I told the press when he became Secretary of Agriculture that Ed Madigan was the best agricultural strategist I have every known, and I suspect he will continue to be that for some time.

He was able to quietly and carefully, and yet all knowingly, listen to his colleagues, listen to his constituency, whether it be in Illinois or in agriculture communities across this country, and design within the realm of the possible the best possible package.

Finally, I think Ed Madigan should be remembered not only as a leader and a strategist, but he should be remembered as one committed to public service. Ed Madigan took over the leadership of the House Committee on Agriculture because he was the right man for the right time to do that. He became Secretary of Agriculture under George Bush because he was the right man to take that job at that time. Neither of these were appointments that were necessarily looked upon and sought by Ed Madigan for a long period of time and yet he recognized that there comes a time and place when you can make a special contribution, and as the gentleman before me said, not with the fanfare of the press, not with the glare of the lights, and the publicity that follows with it, but rather with the sincere commitment that he had an opportunity and ability to make a great contribution to this country.

He did it in this Congress, he did it as Secretary of Agriculture, he has done it for this country. We are all better because of that.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman for those comments. I now yield to the distinguished Member from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

Mr. WAXMAN. I thank you very much for yielding to me, and I want to join in this memorial service and commemorate the relationship that so many of us had with our colleague, Ed Madigan. Ed and I served together on the Commerce Committee, and for a number of years he was the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Health and Environment during the time that I served as chairman.

It was a honor to have worked with him. He was a man who was dedicated to solving problems, to trying to figure out what the issues were, how can we resolve philosophical differences, which we obviously had, but how do you solve real world problems to make this a better country.

We worked together on a number of issues. One was the breast cancer legislation. That legislation provided additional funds to combat this disease, to get screening so women would have mammographies to try to find the cancer early and be able to totally eradicate it.

He was very much in support of giving information to consumers about nutrition and foods so that consumers could make their own choices, and he and I worked very closely on that legislation.

We worked on environmental issues like the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Clear Air Act, where we had to struggle for many years trying to figure out exactly the best formula to protect the environment, but also to recognize the economic needs of the country.

Then one of the things he was very proud of and was a genuine contribution, was to have the nursing professions, which make such an important contribution to patient care, get a status at the National Institutes of Health so that the research money there that would improve health care for all Americans would recognize the unique role of nurses.

He typified the view that you need to work together to find solutions to problems. Even though you may have differences you to keep those differences in perspective. He was a wonderful human being. He cared deeply about people. He will be sorely missed.

I regret that I wasn't able to get to the funeral, that the House of Representatives did not make provisions for us to travel to that occasion. Had I been there, I would have liked to see Evelyn and his daughters and the rest of his family and to express to them personally my feelings. I was able to communicate them on the phone and in writing. But I hope that they will see this tape or read the transcript and know that those of us who worked with Ed Madigan will miss him greatly. He was a wonderful human being and made an enormous contribution to this institution and to the betterment of our country.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman for those comments. Now the gentleman from California, JERRY LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of California. TOM EWING, I very much appreciate your yielding me this time, and especially appreciate having this special order in memory of Ed Madigan.

Ed Madigan was one of the greatest Secretaries of Agriculture that this country will ever have. Ed Madigan was one of the finest human beings that one could ever hope to meet.

Much has been said about his hometown of Lincoln, IL, and the parallel between Ed and other great leaders from his State. Ed Madigan was, first and foremost a member of the House. Nobody, but nobody, in my experience reflected more the qualities and the mix of talent and personality that makes a great Congressman than Ed Madigan.

I must say that my picture of him at this moment was back there behind the rail off the House floor. I was a new Member coming from California, frustrated by the longstanding minority status that we experienced in the House. New Members, who served in their own State legislature as Ed did, quickly learned that you didn't have much to say around this place being in the minority.

□ 1250

Ed saw my frustration, came up to me one day, and suggested that I spend some time working within his circle, within the leadership. He took me to the Research Committee and to other jobs and together we worked for almost a decade on the Republican side of the aisle within the Republican leadership.

Most importantly, Ed Madigan was a leader in the House who recognized that beyond the responsibilities we had in terms of partisan battle, most of our challenges had little to do with partisan politics. For he was a policymaker, a guy who wanted to make a difference in people's lives by way of shaping public policy.

Because of that, he had great respect on both sides of the aisle. As has been indicated, he was a workhorse, not a show horse. Rarely did Ed Madigan just quickly get up to speak on an issue. But because he seldom spoke, he was always listened to with great care by those Members who knew of his talent and his background and the seriousness with which he took issues that he chose to speak about.

In California, there is on the front of one of our buildings a statement that we should bring men to match our mountains. In Ed Madigan, we saw the greatest of leaders. He will be greatly missed by his friends. I hope there are friends beyond his work that will remember that Ed had a great sense of humor. It was wry and quiet, but a real sense of humor. The part of that that strikes me most and that I would like to leave my colleagues with is that Ed Madigan was one of those great leaders who understood the value and very much appreciated the importance of our being willing to laugh at ourselves. His stories, his jokes, his humor often centered around all of us needing to recognize how important it is that we take time out and appreciate laughing at ourselves.

We will miss you, Ed.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY].

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

When I came to this body, in 1980, the minority leader and the Committee on Committees assigned me to the Commerce Committee. And once arriving there, the then ranking member, Jim Broyhill from North Carolina, assigned me to the Health and Environment Subcommittee where I first met Ed Madigan, who at that time was ranking member and, indeed, remained ranking member on the Health Subcommittee on Commerce until President Bush asked him to take over the Agriculture Department in his Cabinet.

He was a great help to me. I had not come from State government. I had come from local government, city council, and mayor. He helped me immeasurably in my first term and, indeed, in all the terms when he was ranking member.

As has been said before, he achieved a lot, through charm, wit, and great intellect. He was, indeed, a giant.

We all miss him. To Evelyn and the family, know that you are in our prayers.

And I hope, Ed, wherever he is, is watching as we do this today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember not only a dear colleague but also a great friend—the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Ed Madigan.

A recent Illinois newspaper quite accurately described the man I knew—honest, effective, insightful, and sincere. Ed Madigan not only portrayed these attributes in his professional life, but in his personal life as well. He was a straight shooter who told it like it was. If some called Ed old fashioned—because of his preference for calm deliberations instead of heated, partisan confrontations—then so be it. For if old fashioned meant accomplishing great things while earning the respect of Members from both sides of the aisle, then Ed was pleased to wear that label.

With a steady hand guiding the wants and needs of his constituents, Ed steered many a debate in the House through the smooth waters of agreement and the stormy seas of dissent. But, through it all, this loyal public servant stayed the course—offering guidance and good humor to all along the way.

However, Mr. Speaker what has distinguished this gentleman the most in his years of service is his devotion—his devotion to see the good in his fellow man and woman, while others only would see the bad; his devotion to guard not only for the things that would be good for the land of Lincoln, but also for the things that would help all American families; and finally, his devotion to his party and this

institution has been a constant source of inspiration to all those who may have forgotten the true meaning of public service.

It was a distinct pleasure and privilege to serve in the U.S. House with Ed Madigan. While his presence in this body will be greatly missed, there are plenty of us who will remember him well. Thank you, my friend, for your tireless efforts and your loyal commitment to your party and to your Nation—your hard work certainly did not go unnoticed.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and congratulate him for taking out this special order.

I would like to follow on the line that was raised by my friend, the gentleman from Redlands, CA [Mr. LEWIS], who referred to the fact that Ed Madigan was able to match the mountains that we have in California. I was extraordinarily saddened and shocked, as everyone was, at Ed's passing, because we have all known Ed to be an extraordinarily vigorous and impressive human being. It is difficult to imagine that he is gone.

But when JERRY LEWIS mentioned the fact that Ed Madigan was one who could match those mountains, I could not help but think about a great opportunity that I had with Ed, when he come to southern California to visit with some former constituents of Mr. LEWIS, our mutual friend, Howard Margolies from the Coachella Valley. Mr. Madigan had not had the chance to, since he had become Secretary of Agriculture, focus on what is the largest industry in our State of California, that being agriculture. We all know how devastated so much of the State is now because of the terrible floods that have hit us.

But Ed came to southern California and spent a couple of days traveling around the State, familiarizing himself even more with our specific concerns in the area of agriculture. And it was a great honor that I had to be able to spend that couple of day period with him when he visited California for his first time after having been named Secretary of Agriculture.

One other experience that I had that I would like to mention very briefly was that, in 1986, I had the chance to travel with Ed and Evelyn and a rather large delegation to the Pacific Rim, and Ed was the leader of that delegation. And we had a tremendous time looking at some of the trade and agricultural issues that affected the relationship between the United States and nations in the Pacific Rim.

I thank my friend for yielding me this time. I know I was given 1 minute. I would simply like to say that, along with every other Member of this institution, we extend our condolences to Evelyn and other members of the Madigan family. We certainly do miss the presence of this extraordinary human being.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I was struck, as I was watching this conversation that we are having this eulogy, this presentation that we are having today, how many people mentioned the words ''help'' and ''assistance'' that Ed Madigan provided them along the way. I thought it was only me. I have to say that I am not, as many others who served with Ed Madigan and knew him so very personally, I did not have that kind of experience with Ed. I did not know him that well. And that is why, if for no other reason, I am struck by the two instances that I recall the most about Ed and my very brief relationship.

One was when I was a candidate. I got a call out of the blue from Ed Madigan. I really did not even know who he was, I have to confess. He called me up and he said, ''I am a representative from Illinois and just wanted to know if you had any questions or concerns about ag policy. I would be glad to try and answer them.''

I made up a couple of questions real quick, wishing that I had been better briefed to even ask the questions. I went on from that experience thinking, why in the world, this guy must have nothing better to do than to call me up. Obviously, we all know he did.

But then when I got to Washington, I was told that I had a big brother for my orientation, and I was honored to discover it was this same Ed Madigan. I discovered who he was and what he did, and when I went to my first meeting and our first discussion was about committee assignments, he came prepared with a sheet of paper of ideas for me, which I know now, having been a representative for 4 years, how difficult it was or how time-consuming it was to put that together. Yet how much time he thought. It was not just off the cuff with Ed. It was not just a spur of the moment. He put some thought into it. I have to say that it is something that I learned from and I hope to emulate. I have tried to.

If there was any effect that Ed had on me, it was that we have to be willing to take time to teach and inspire other people who come after us to do good things and to be proper participants in this process. And he gave me that inspiration. I am not sure if it took, but I want to thank him for being a brother and being an inspiration and being a mentor. It is something that I hope I can pass on to someone else in the spirit that Ed Madigan passed it on to me.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman very much for those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

□ 1300

Mr. DURBIN. I thank my colleague and friend, Mr. EWING, for giving me the opportunity to speak today, and also for sponsoring this important special order.

I would also like to acknowledge to the Speaker that on the floor today we have a former colleague from our State of Illinois, Terry Bruce, who served in this House of Representatives for many years with Ed Madigan, and wanted to be here as part of the audience, at least, in this special order. I am glad that he could attend. He and I both counted Ed Madigan, a Republican, a good Republican, as a good friend of our party and our side of the aisle, particularly when it came to issues of importance to Illinois.

It is hard to believe, I still cannot believe, that Ed has passed away. Only 10 weeks passed between the announcement of his serious illness, the lung cancer that he faced, and our attendance at a memorable funeral in Lincoln, IL, paying tribute to him as a man and as a public servant.

One of the people in the crowd whose name should be mentioned today is Chuck Hilty. Chuck I think was at Ed's side forever. I never saw the two of them apart. From Ed's service in the House of Representatives, on the Agriculture Committee, and the Department of Agriculture, Chick Hilty was always at his side, not only as his trusted assistant but as his close friend. He was one of his pallbearers on that day of the funeral in Lincoln.

I saw Bob Michel here earlier, and I am sure he has been acknowledged, but as our former minority leader, I know he wanted to be on the floor as part of this special order. His eulogy for Ed Madigan was memorable. He brought to it a vision of the man and a level of emotion that was truly genuine, and I think each of us in the church that day felt that Bob Michel represented all of us in public life who had known Ed Madigan so well.

The term and phrase ''gentleman'' is used so often in our country and in our society and in this Chamber, ''Will the gentleman yield?'' and so forth. But when I think of Ed Madigan, I think he was truly a gentle man, soft spoken.

In a business where a lot of politicians will roar, Ed Madigan never raised his voice. In a business where a lot of people get red in the face and waive their arms to try to get something done, Ed Madigan never stooped to that, and yet was probably one of the most effective Congressmen whom I have known in this Chamber.

He used the art of gentle persuasion. How many times he would call me from the Agriculture Committee and ask me to make a tough vote, never suggesting to me what the politics were, but just saying ''I think this is a good thing to do,'' and it made its impression.

Then serving in the Illinois delegation, as Mr. EWING and I have the honor to do, we have had an unusual tradition of bipartisan delegation meetings. We meet each month, hang our hats at the door, Democrats and Republicans come in and gather in the room as residents

of Illinois to try to solve problems. Ed was always there, not only as a member of the delegation, but also as Secretary of Agriculture.

When the time came, and I think the suggestion was originally from Mr. Michel, that we as a delegation join in writing a letter to President Bush encouraging him to name Ed Madigan as Secretary of Agriculture, it was unanimous. Every member of the delegation, Democrat and Republican, came forward and stated, ''He is the right choice for the job,'' and boy, was he. What a great Secretary of Agriculture.

A lot of my friends who are farmers back in Illinois often wonder about whether Ed was raised on a farm. Well, he wasn't, but you would never have known it. He had spent a lifetime here becoming more familiar with agricultural issues and policies than any person who was born on a farm might be. He brought that knowledge and understanding to the job as Secretary of Agriculture.

My Friend, Congressman LEWIS from California, referred to his sense of honor. I recall visiting him at the Department of Agriculture in this beautiful office reserved for the Secretary. I was complimenting him on his wonderful office. He said, ''You know, Dick, I have been here a long time and I still haven't figured out how to get the heat on in this office. I have called a number of people in. You can just understand what kind of bureaucracy I have to go through just to get the heat on in my office.''

Ed was always taking things lightly when it came to himself personally, but taking his job very, very seriously.

I liked him, too, because you could come to him and deal in honest terms with him. You could talk to him about things that were important to you and know that the message would go no further. You could talk to him about political concerns and know that he would be honest, and would try to deal with you in an honest fashion.

I really respected him for that, and time and time again I came to value his judgment and his friendship.

The last time I saw him alive was in the runway of the Rayburn Building near the subway. We just chanced across one another. He said, ''You know, now that I am out of politics, I can come in and campaign for you.'' I said, ''I would be glad to have you and honored to have you support my candidacy.''

I dropped him a note and said, ''You have to hang on. I may not need you in this election, but I may need you later on.'' He was a wonderful man. He was that kind of guy. You knew his friendship meant a lot.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for bringing this special order. I think the number of people who have come together to the floor this afternoon are evidence of the kind of legacy which Ed Madigan has left in this Chamber; certainly in our State of Illinois, and definitely in his beloved home town of Lincoln, IL.

I will miss him. I wish there were more like him around here. He has left a good lesson in his life for those of us who follow, that we should try to lead our lives a little more closely to his model.

Mr. EWING. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for those very appropriate comments.

Let me say that the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WELLER], were both here and wanted to speak on behalf of this special order for Ed Madigan, but because of the long list of Members who have come out today, they had to go on to other business. They will submit their remarks, along with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. POSHARD].

I, too, want to recognize former Congressman Terry Bruce from Illinois, who I know from my conversations with Ed and his family was one of his very closest friends in this body, and who has been so good to the Madigan family.

I hope, in closing, that all the viewers, all those who are back in Illinois, will recognize the very high esteem, and particularly the family of Ed Madigan and Evelyn Madigan, will recognize the very high esteem in which he was held by this body, and the great loss that his passing is to all of us, but the great joy we take in the life that he lived and the service that he gave to his country.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today to celebrate the remarkable life of Ed Madigan. Ed's untimely death last month has robbed our Nation of a great American and great public servant.

Throughout his distinguished service in the Illinois State Legislature, the U.S. House of Representatives and, finally, as Secretary of Agriculture, Ed Madigan never lost touch of his roots. He always exhibited deep concern for the problems confronting main street America. Ed dedicated his life to helping people which is a legacy that his family can be proud of.

Ed cherished this institution, earning the respect and admiration of his colleagues. While a soft-spoken man, Ed was both persuasive and tireless in pursuing the interests of his district and country. He served the people of Illinois and the Nation with dignity and honor.

Even though Ed and I served on opposite sides of the aisle in the House, I considered him a friend and a man of impeccable integrity. His death represents not only a tragic loss for his family but for our country he loved and served so well.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, last month the people of the 15th Congressional District of Illinois lost one of their strongest allies and advocates, Edward Rell Madigan. A man of his word and a man of the people, Ed Madigan served in the Illinois State Legislature for 6 years in the late 1960's before being elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972, where he served central Illinois for 18 years. Ed Madigan then served as the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture under President Bush.

Ed Madigan was a master political strategist and a fighter. He was tough, but his wide respect from Members of both parties gave testament to his fairness. He was a good man, and I know we were all saddened to learn of his passing. Ed will certainly be missed by those who had the privilege of working with him.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Madigan epitomized what a public servant should be and his unselfish devotion to the challenge of public service was reflected in his commitment to meeting the needs of his constituents. He devoted many long years to hard work to crafting legislative policy that served not only his district, but the Nation as a whole. He never forgot where he came from, and he never forgot the people of Lincoln, IL.

Ed's devotion to the Nation's heartland blazed the path for his ascension to ranking Republican on the House Agriculture Committee for 8 years. He also served on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, where any of his colleagues would attest to the quality of his work and his sense of fairness and dedication. He was a statesman of the highest caliber.

I always admired Ed and the dignified manner in which he held forth on the floor. He was articulate, and his deep, resonant voice commanded respect for all within the range of his voice. But more than that he was a gentleman, and though we were in different parties we were good friends.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the distinguished career of an outstanding Member, let us also give our thoughts to his family that he loved so dearly. His wife, Evelyn, was often credited by Ed with truly holding the ship together, and his three daughters—Kimberly, Kellie, and Mary Elizabeth—were a source of true pride. Ed Madigan knew what was important to him, and where his bedrock strength lay in this sometimes tumultuous atmosphere—that strength was his family.

Mr. Speaker, Ed Madigan was a special breed of public servant. He worked quietly and effectively within the system, he worked with his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and he helped raise the public's respect for the House of Representatives by dutifully serving as a man of whom we could all be proud. He will be missed, but never forgotten.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, over the recess I was greatly saddened to learn of the death of my good friend Ed Madigan, whom I served alongside in this body for almost 20 years. For that time period, the 15th Congressional District of Illinois could not have had a more conscientious or hard-working Representative in the U.S. Congress.

Ed Madigan was one of the quiet workhorses that make it possible for the House to do its business. I come from an area where agriculture dominates the economy, and all of my constituents, as well as millions of others across this Nation, owe him a great debt of thanks for the way in which he served as ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. Passing a 5-year farm bill is an ardous process, and Ed's mastery of the issues involved made it possible to craft legislation that helped make American agriculture the most productive in the world.

On the Energy and Commerce Committee, Ed held the line against excessive Government regulations, and it is unfortunate that he is not here to witness the new congressional

majority fulfill his vision of rolling back the tide of Government redtape. As the lead Republican on the most active subcommittee of Energy and Commerce, Ed was a voice of common sense that we all heeded.

Mr. Speaker, President Bush recognized Ed's leadership when he selected him to be Secretary of Agriculture, a job at which Ed performed admirably. I was sad to hear of his passing, and my wide, Cecile, and I send our deepest condolences to Ed's family and friends.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in saluting and paying tribute to our esteemed former colleague, the late Edward Madigan.

For almost 20 years, Ed Madigan ably served his constituents as the representative for the 15th Congressional District of Illinois. A native of Lincoln, IL, Ed came to the House in 1972 following 6 years in the Illinois House. He quickly earned the respect and admiration of his constituents and colleagues with his devoted service and principled manner.

As a member of the House Agriculture and Energy and Commerce Committees, Ed played a key role in formulating public policy, including the crafting of the house-version 1985 farm bill, and health legislation. Ed deservedly earned the reputation as an informed, hard-working Member of Congress who would protect the interests not only of his constituents but the Nation as a whole.

Ed was also an active member of the House Republican leadership, serving his colleagues as the ranking member of the House Agriculture Committee, chairman of the Republican Research Committee, and chief deputy Republican whip. His expertise and knowledge about agriculture and farm programs was renowned, and led to his appointment by President Bush to serve as the Secretary of Agriculture in 1990. As Secretary, Ed continued to work hard on behalf of America, and was instrumental in formulating early plans for the reorganization of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

As a friend of Ed's, and having served as his colleague since 1981, I was saddened to learn of his death, and would like to join with my colleagues in expressing my sincerest sympathy to the entire Madigan family. Ed Madigan, however, will always be remembered by those with whom he served, as well as his constituents in the 15th Congressional District of Illinois. Ed was a model legislator and a tireless worker, and his service to our nation is greatly appreciated.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my colleague and dear friend, Ed Madigan. Ed served in this chamber for 18 years, and I, along with the entire Illinois congressional delegation, am saddened to lose him. As a member of the House of Representatives, Ed served the people of the 15th Congressional District with great pride and vigor. He never lost touch with the people back home, and it was evident in his work and friendships.

As Secretary of Agriculture under President Bush and during his 16 years on the House Agriculture Committee, Ed was a champion for farmers in Illinois and across the Nation. It was Ed who worked diligently to support the use of ethanol and to shape the agriculture provisions in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that I believe will greatly increase the income and flexibility of American farmers.

Ed Madigan dedicated his entire life to the people and state of Illinois, and for that we are grateful. His sincere and unselfish manner put him above the rest. I truly believe the spirit and convictions of Ed Madigan will live for years to come in the hearts of all of us and all those in Illinois and across this great Nation whom he helped and represented. We extend to the entire Madigan family our condolences, and I am grateful to them for the continuous support they gave Ed during his many years in public office. Ed will truly be missed, but always remembered by those he touched over the years.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a good friend and former colleague, Ed Madigan, who passed away in December. Ed Madigan served his constituents in the State of Illinois with dignity and competence in the U.S. Congress, and served the Nation ably as the 24th U.S. Secretary of Agriculture under President George Bush.

Ed Madigan, as a Member of Congress, fought hard to protect the agricultural way of life in Illinois. As a long-serving member of both the House Agriculture and Energy and Commerce Committees, he fought hard to speak on behalf of small business owners in the Midwest and those needing quality health care.

In his 10 terms in the U.S. House, Ed Madigan distinguished himself as a Member who worked diligently but quietly, with a friendly bipartisanship but a solid belief in those issues he considered important. His battle with lung cancer went all but unknown to the public until he was near the end of his life, a testimony to his grace and demeanor.

I join my colleagues today in honoring his memory. I considered Ed Madigan a very good friend, and his work here in the House and his legacy as a fellow human will be long remembered.

[From the Pantagraph (Bloomington, IL), Dec. 9, 1994]

ED MADIGAN'S LEADERSHIP EMPHASIZED PERSONAL TOUCH

Ed Madigan was a leader who didn't have to shout.

His actions spoke for him.

The adjectives describing Mr. Madigan, who served as state and U.S. representative and U.S. secretary of agriculture, will be numerous in the days to come: honest, charming, low-key, consensus maker, skilled player, quiet, effective, insightful, sincere, enthusiastic to serve, politician's politician, tactful and master strategist.

Most people saw Ed Madigan the same way. He was not a politician of many faces.

He knew the art of compromise, but wouldn't cave in. Just as he didn't cave in without a struggle to lung cancer, whose complications eventually took his life Wednesday.

He was also a man who had a knack for putting things into perspective. You didn't have to know him well to know that at the top of his list was family. He loved to talk politics, but he could also spend considerable time talking about how his wife, Evelyn, gave him the support that was really important.

That was especially true when he made the move from the Illinois House of Representatives, where he had served since 1966, to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1972. He had become an influential member of the state House in just six years, but he passed on a chance to run for lieutenant governor to seek the U.S. House seat because he wanted to be more involved with people.

His initial comments to a Pantagraph reporter who visited him in Washington, D.C., a few months after he was elected weren't so much about the nation's capital and all of the political power.

He talked more about making sure he would be known as a man of his word and not a ''flapmouth''; the high price of housing; and how his family would have to adjust. It said something about his roots.

Mr. Madigan memorized a book containing the names and pictures of his colleagues so he could call them by their first names. By calling them by their first names, he said it forced them to find out who he was.

But Central Illinois was first and foremost for the Lincoln native, even coming home to fight the biggest challenge of his life.

He remembered the farmers of Illinois in one of his more significant roles in Washington, D.C., as he helped amend the 1985 farm bill to ensure that it favored the free-market approach instead of imposing production limits. He also helped craft the final compromise on clean-air legislation that encouraged the use of ethanol.

Challenges were what Mr. Madigan seemed to thrive on. With a few exceptions, he used his soft-spoken, behind-the-scenes style of compromise to get things done, rising to become the fifth-ranking Republican in the House as chairman of the House Republican Research Committee.

Perhaps one of Mr. Madigan's more disappointing times in Washington came when he lost the race for House Republican whip to Newt Gingrich of Georgia in 1989. He would not change his approach to match the fire-brand, confrontational ways of Gingrich.

He carried that same style into his job as U.S. agriculture secretary when he was appointed by President Bush in March 1991. He served until Bush was defeated the following year.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the death of our friend Ed Madigan is a profound loss for the Congress, the citizens of Illinois, and our entire Nation. One of America's most respected and influential leaders has been taken from us much too soon, and together with Ed's family, we are deeply saddened.

Throughout his service in public office, Ed distinguished himself as a hard-working legislator and gained the respect, admiration, and friendship of members on both sides of the aisle. Those of us in the Illinois delegation are especially proud to have worked with Ed, who set an example for all of us with his quietly effective and thoughtful leadership.

Ed has left his mark on this institution and on our Nation, especially in the area of agriculture. 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 sound policy in this area. In particular, he played a vital role in shaping the 1985 farm bill, urging a free-market approach and cautioning against production limits.

When I came to the House 15 years ago, the first thing I learned was that Ed Madigan was our Illinois farm expert, and since I had almost no farms in my district, and little knowledge of farm policy and law—one of the most complex of all—I would invariably follow Ed's lead in voting on farm matters. You knew Ed has done his homework and had made a sound judgment for our country and our state.

But beyond his wise judgment, we most of all will 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

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.

As one editorial noted of Ed:

> You didn't have to know him well to know that at the top of his list was family. He loved to talk politics but he could also spend considerably time talking about how his wife, Evelyn, gave him the support that was really important.

The writer goes on to observe that after his election to the House, in the face of overwhelming new responsibilities and challenges, Ed's principal concern was how his family would adjust to life in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, in his all too short life, Ed Madigan contributed great intelligence and insight to the public policy debates in this country, and we will long cherish his memory. He showed us all what distinguished public service really means and we will miss him more than words can say.

I join my colleagues in expressing our deepest condolences to Ed's wife, Evelyn, and to his entire family. All Americans share in your great loss, and our thoughts and prayers are with you.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the late Ed Madigan, a thoughtful, consensus-seeking public servant who carved out a great career in Washington, first as a 10-term Member of this body and later as Secretary of Agriculture under President Bush.

In the House, Ed's leadership skills were demonstrated by his rise to the fifth-ranking position in the Republican hierarchy: Chairman of the party's Research and Planning Committee. He was also appointed twice as chief deputy whip.

Later, the Illinois Representative gave up his leadership post to assume the ranking Republican position on the Agriculture Committee, playing a key role for 8 years on farm legislation. He was especially instrumental in shaping the 1985 farm bill.

In addition to serving as Secretary of Agriculture at a time when the Department had a high profile, Ed was named by President Bush to serve as lead negotiator on the agriculture section of the trade negotiations under GATT.

Since leaving Government service, and until his untimely death last month, Ed had been associated with a major Illinois-based insurance company and had served on the board of a number of corporations.

Ed was a soft-spoken, generous individual who let his achievements speak for themselves. He leaves a great legacy in this body, where so many of us counted him as a good friend.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Ed Madigan's unexpected passing away came as a shock to all of us who regarded him as our friend. Had he lived, he would have celebrated his 59th birthday the day after tomorrow.

Ed Madigan served the citizens of his district in north-central Illinois for almost two decades. And he served them well.

His legislative career began in 1967 in Springfield where he served in the Illinois State House of Representatives.

He brought his many talents to Congress in 1973 after 6 years in the Illinois General Assembly. Ed's many Springfield honors included being named Outstanding State Legislator.

His legislative abilities became apparent to those of us in this Chamber shortly after his arrival in Washington. He was a master of working out compromises where others failed to make progress.

Ed was ranking Republican on the House Committee on Agriculture at the time of his resignation. He was also serving at that time as Chief Deputy Minority Whip. Ed Madigan willingly sacrificed the position he loved so much in this House of Representatives to heed the call of President George Bush to become a member of the President's Cabinet. He was the Nation's 24th Secretary of Agriculture.

Ed Madigan was a fine son of the State of Illinois. He was our colleague, and most important, he was our friend. Ed Madigan will be missed.

In closing, I would like to extend our sympathies to his wife, Evelyn.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES UNDER DEBATE ON CAPITOL HILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I will be joined by several of my colleagues to discuss some of the legislative issues that are being debated on Capitol Hill at this time.

I would like to start off by noting this Los Angeles Times story this morning, the devastation that is shown here from the flooding in California. I can certainly identify with this. Mine was one of the districts in the Midwest which was flooded in 1993. I worked the sandbag lines, and did my best as a Congressman to try to help many of the families, farmers, and businesses get back on their feet.

It was a devastating loss. I can certainly understand what many families and people in California are facing today.

Let me say that it has been my honor to serve in this Chamber for 12 years. I have at various times been asked by people from across the country to come to their assistance in the midst of a disaster. I have tried to do that. In fact, I have done that every time, whether it was the Loma Prieta earthquake near San Francisco or the Northridge earthquake near Los Angeles, or these floods.

I am sure they will all result in requests for assistance by the Federal Government. I will be there, because I think that is one of my responsibilities, not just to represent the 20th District of Illinois, but to serve our Nation. When some people in our Nation are in need, it is important that this Federal Government, this National Government, rally to their assistance.

Having said that, though, I would like to put into context some of the debate which is going on today on Capitol Hill as part of the Contract with America, and to give the perspective of the Contract with America on which it means to the flood victims of California and victims of future disasters.

First, if you search the Constitution of the United States, you will find no reference to a Federal obligation to pay for natural disaster assistance. It is an obligation assumed by the Federal Government, and an expensive one. In the 1950's, the Federal Government paid about 5 percent of the cost of natural disaster problems and damages across America. Today the Federal Government pays over 95 percent of the cost. We are on the hook.

In the Northridge earthquake near Los Angeles we have already spent more than $5 billion. The Federal Government came to the assistance of the State of California, a deficit-ridden Federal Government rallied to the assistance of the State of California, because the people needed help. More money will be needed because of that earthquake. More money will be needed because of these floods.

Let us talk about two issues we are debating in Congress right now. One is unfunded mandates. Let me give you an example of an unfunded mandate from the Federal Government. The Federal Energy Management Agency [FEMA] which has the responsibility to come in and pay for disasters, establishes guidelines for communities that they should follow to try to reduce flood damage.

For example, they suggest that people should not build in a flood plain if they want to qualify for Federal flood insurance. Is that a Federal mandate? Yes. Does the Federal Government pay for it? No. If the communities follow the mandate, what happens? It lessens the damage that might occur because of flooding or other natural disasters.

□ 1310

Why is that Federal mandate important? Because ultimately Federal taxpayers will be left holding the bag when the flood hits the community. And if the community has not lived up to the Federal-mandated guidelines, that cost to Federal taxpayers is higher.

Many people will get up and condemn Federal mandates but they do not look at this perspective, that many of these mandates are necessary to make sure that we lessen the ultimate liability of Federal taxpayers.

The Governor of the State of California, Mr. Wilson, as I understand it, gave his State of the State message yesterday and in the course of that State of the State message, he said, and I quote, that he as the Governor of

the State was proceeding with his lawsuit to sue the Federal Government because we were not paying for things that we were mandating. In the words of the Governor, he said, ''We are going to sue their butts off.'' In a day or two we will be hearing from this same Governor who is going to ''sue our butts off'' because all the things the Federal Government is not paying for that he is going to need Federal disaster assistance because of his flood in California.

I would suggest that Governor Wilson should pause and reflect that the same Federal Government which he is complaining about, he is now going to turn to, despite our deficit, for assistance badly needed by the people of California. Does the word ''ingrate'' come to mind?

I would submit that the Governor should reflect as every Governor should on the fact that the Federal Government comes to their assistance time and time again in disasters and tries to make up for the losses which States and local governments could never absorb.

We may have debated a few days on next week on eliminating Federal mandates. Will we eliminate the requirement that States like California and my home State of Illinois in the future do things to mitigate disaster damage so that Federal taxpayers will not be holding a bag that is much larger?

Then the next week we will debate the balanced budget amendment. The balanced budget amendment says ultimately we are going to reduce the amount of money available for the Federal Government to come to the assistance of any State that suffers a disaster.

One of the things we as Democrats are insisting on is if the Republicans under their contract want to move a balanced budget amendment, they should in fact tell us where these cuts are going to take place to balance the budget. I do not think that is unreasonable.

Former President Ronald Reagan in dealing with the Soviet Union in terms of disarmament said ''trust but verify.'' I think the same thing is true when the American people look at the Federal Government.

If the Republican leadership in the House can be trusted to bring us a balanced budget amendment, we should ask them to verify the actual cuts that will be necessary to reach that balance.

The new majority leader of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], said on a television show over the weekend that he did not want to do that because he was afraid that the knees of Congressmen would buckle when they saw the kind of cuts necessary to reach a balanced budget. I would suggest to my friend from Texas that if our knees would buckle, so would the knees of our constituents. They need to be told what is involved in this decision, that it is going to be tough, that it may mean for Governor Wilson after he has ''sued our butts off'' that when he comes to the Federal Government with his hand out for billions of dollars for disaster aid, we are going to say, ''Unfortunately, Mr. Governor, we don't have that money anymore. We now have a balanced budget amendment which lessens discretionary funds available to come to your assistance.''

This is part of the real debate that has to take place. We have got to move beyond the bumper strip slogans of ''End Federal Mandates, Give Us a Balanced Budget Amendment,'' and talk about the real world that will result. What cuts will there be in disaster assistance, money for education, Social Security, Medicare, things which families hold near and dear in this country?

I concede we have to move toward a balanced budget amendment. From my personal point of view, it is not our highest priority. The highest priority in this Nation is sound economic growth. Moving toward a balanced budget amendment is part of it, but only part of it. Equally if not more important is economic growth and economic development, creating more jobs, more opportunities and more capital formation. Insidiously a balanced budget amendment could work against that.

In times of recession when Federal revenues are down and people need help with unemployment insurance, for example, and things to get by that their families can live on, we may not have the money to pay for it, and that I think would frankly deepen the recession, would not bring us out, would not get families back on their feet.

What we are talking about in a balanced budget amendment debate is more veracity, more truth, more frankness. If our knees are going to buckle here on the floor, I say to the majority leader the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] and others, ''So be it. That's the job we accepted. We're supposed to face the tough decisions.''

I think it is critically important that the Republicans in their rush to move these things through in the next 80 or 90 days take the time to do it right. Use common sense. The American people demand that of us. Be honest with the American people. ''Don't be afraid that their knees are going to buckle,'' I say to the Republican party. Tell them honestly what it means to California and Illinois and all across the country.

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

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I want to say that over the last couple of years, time and again we heard Members of the other party, the Republican Party, take the well and talk about the arrogant Congress.

I find it rather interesting now that as the Republicans get ready to present to the Congress a balanced budget amendment, a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, that they seek to deny our constituents the kind of information so they can make an informed decision about whether or not they want us to vote for or against the balanced budget amendment.

I find it rather interesting as you quoted the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] saying that if the public knew the cuts that would be necessary, that their knees would buckle, or our knees would buckle.

I really find it interesting when it comes from individuals that profess a great belief in democracy, that herald governments that turn toward democracy, we have spent billions of dollars to spread democracy throughout the world at a time when the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr GINGRICH] says that he is going to put every bill on the Internet so that the American people will have greater access, be able to make decisions, but what he is not going to put on the Internet are the ramifications of the bill.

He is going to tell people that we are going to balance the budget by the year 2002 but, like President Nixon who had a secret plan to end the war, only after people vote or after that becomes a law, he will then display what is necessary to meet the balanced budget. That is arrogance. That is the height of arrogance. Because the balanced budget amendment, unlike a lot of other legislation that we deal with on the floor of the Congress that the various sessions does not affect one particular part of American society or some narrow special interest group, it affects every citizen in this country, because of the ramifications.

We have seen proposals where different people from the right or from the left have suggested what would or would not take place under a balanced budget. Every segment of our society is impacted, from our national security to the security of our retirement systems, to the education of our children, to our ability to meet the natural disasters that beset my State at this very moment. Everybody has a stake in this debate. But it is the intention of the leadership of this House to preclude everybody from participating in this debate.

What should be done is they should spread upon the ledger those cuts that are necessary to meet the target of a balanced budget in the year 2002, and they should be required to do that now so that there is truth-in-budgeting, so there is full disclosure, so that the public interest is protected, and the people who live in the greatest democracy on the face of the Earth will have an opportunity to exercise those rights under that democracy, and that is to pick up the phone, or the pen or pencil, and call their Member of Congress and say, ''I like this, I don't like this, change this, change that.'' That is about the empowerment of people.

That is supposedly what putting the legislation on the Internet is about.

If you put nothing more on the Internet than a piece of legislation that says the budget shall be balanced by the year 2002, you have told the people nothing. You have told them nothing. You have not told them whether or not you are going to gradually make those exchanges over that 7-year period of time or whether you are going to run to the political necessity of doing it in the last 2 of 3 years, where the impact is much greater and people are not able to prepare for it.

If we give this country notice and if we give them a plan, clearly a balanced budget is within our grasp.

□ 1320

But if we do not do that, then in fact we cannot expect to reach that star target. So what we are talking about here is very fundamental notions, fundamental notions about the arrogance of the leadership of this Congress as to whether or not they will fully inform people about the hypocrisy of the leadership of this Congress that says whether or not they want to, they want to truly let people know what is going on inside the halls of Congress or whether they want to hide it from them, and right now what they are engaged in is one of the great coverups.

They will not tell us what they are going to do because apparently they do not have the courage of their convictions. They have the courage of their bumper stickers, they have the courage of their campaign slogans. They simply do not have the courage of their convictions to look the American people in the eye and say these are the ramifications, this is what is required to engage in a balanced budget by this time.

I also think that they give the American people far too little credit for their willingness to participate, because we know there is an overwhelming desire among the American people to see us get our financial house in order. But we ought to invite them in as partners, we ought to recognize their dignity and intelligence and make them, if you will, partners in this process.

For the Republicans to suggest that we are going to take it on a whim and a promise is the height of arrogance, and I want to thank the gentleman for raising this point at this time. I hope that they will yield to the will of the American people and not to the politics of the majority in this Congress.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I am delighted to join my colleagues here this afternoon. This I think is one of the most important debates that we are going to have in the next several days and in the next several weeks.

I would like to add to what my colleagues have said in this respect, that we all do want to have a balanced budget. Members of Congress want to do that, the public wants to do that, we want to erase the debt that threatens our children's future. That is what we are about.

To add to what the majority leader said over the weekend on the television shows, Mr. ARMEY said not only would Congress' knees buckle, but that he feared that if you spelled it out for the American public they could not deal with the pain.

Now is that not a terrible indictment of the American public? As far as I know we are still a representative democracy. We did not come back here to impose a secret exclusive policy on the public and the people that we represent but, in fact, rather to open up an exclusive debate on where this Nation should go. That is what this is about. Quite frankly, that is what Republicans campaigned on with the bumper stickers you were talking about. In fact, we need to have open government.

But I tell you, we do have some general idea of the Republican plan and what it would require. According to the Congressional Budget Office it would require $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction, revenue increases, or spending cuts, or a combination of the two to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Since Republicans have indicated that the revenue increases will not be used to balance the budget, a constitutional amendment would then require $1.2 trillion in spending cuts alone to balance the budget. This estimate does not even take into account the $193 billion in tax cuts over the next 5 years that are contained in the Republican contract, nor does it talk about what the increase in defense spending on star wars would mean in terms of the cuts.

Let me just give a couple of examples which I think are very critical, and this not by Democratic standards but by a Republican Senate and Republican House staff which says that this would require a 24-percent increase across the board. That is what their notions are in terms of a cut.

If you talk about Medicare, let us take a look at that. In the last week the Speaker of the House, Mr. GINGRICH, suggested transforming the Medicare system into another system. Is this in the balanced budget, which is the truth that we need to know and that the public needs to know. Is that in there? What does it mean to seniors in this Nation if we are going to talk about a 24-percent increase in their premiums for Medicare beneficiaries? What services are no longer going to be covered by Medicare? Could it be worse?

Also, according to a Republican Senate Budget Committee staff analysis, you would have to cut almost $1 trillion over the next 7 years to pay for the Republican contract.

Further examples of what this 24-percent across-the-board cut means is that one out of every four college students now receiving Pell grants would be forced out of school. These young people and their families have a right to know what is in that balanced budget amendment.

Twenty-four percent across the board would mean one of every four high school graduates currently in apprenticeship programs would be denied the job training that would allow them to get ahead and to earn a living. They have a right to know what is in this balanced budget amendment.

Would 24 percent across the board mean that one of every four children enrolled in the Head Start Program would lose also the help that they need to start each day and enter school ready to learn?

Essentially what we are saying, the long and the short of it is you cannot talk about and run for office on open government and then decide to shut it down when you are in charge. We are just asking the Republicans to come clean. We all know that balancing the budget is going to require sacrifice. The public knows that, Members of this body know that, and if they do not they should know that because it is going to be difficult. We have to make the tough choices. That is all we are asking here.

I joined my colleagues last year in supporting the Democratic balanced budget amendment that sought to achieve a balanced budget while trying to keep Social Security intact. Does the Republicans' balanced budget put Social Security on that chopping block? In fact it does.

Today in the Judiciary Committee, Republican members of the committee voted not to exclude and exempt Social Security from the balanced budget cuts. What does that mean? Seniors in this Nation have a right to know what this is about.

The fact is that the Republicans fear opening the debate on their ideas to the American public. They are afraid of letting people participate in this decisionmaking process that is critical to our Nation's future.

I am delighted to join my colleagues this afternoon in this discussion because as I said at the outset, nothing can be more important than this debate. Members of Congress have to know what is in that balanced budget amendment, the American public has got to know what is in that balanced budget amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman will yield, I want to thank the gentlewoman for her remarks and point out she makes a very important point. There is more than one way to a balanced budget, and there are those who believe that the way to a balanced budget is simply to cut until you have arrived at that point by doing away with many, many programs of the Federal Government. There are others who believe you should tax and you should cut. Others believe, as the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board told the Senate yesterday, that if you simply adjust the inflation factor by a point or

a point and a quarter, you could arrive and would not have to make those cuts.

There are all of these options available, but I think the gentlewoman makes an interesting point. Some of the options have different ramifications for different people. If, as the Republican plan anticipates there is a tax cut, both capital gains and some kind of middle-income tax cut, it may very well be that when middle-income Americans look at that option they may say forget the tax cut, make the down payment on the deficit. Keep the interest rate on my adjustable home loan down, keep the interest rate on my child's student loan down, and make sure that I can pay off my credit card debt, because if you are going to give me back a $1.25 a day, then why not just make sure that the interest rates are lower because I will lose more than that in 1 month if the Federal Reserve raises the interest rates and my home mortgage goes up.

We ought to let the American people decide which course they want to take. A lot of people have come up to me, as hungry as they are for tax relief, and say geez, if you could really make an additional dent in the deficit beyond what you did over the $500 billion or $600 billion that have already been made, I am for that, and I will forgo the tax cut because I want to make sure that the interest rates are low, that we can continue to create jobs, that my business can continue to thrive. That is what we are asking for.

We are saying to the Republicans, let the American public participate and choose how they would like to meet this obligation to get rid of this horrendous deficit.

□ 1330

But that is unfortunately what they are not going to allow, and I think the gentlewoman makes incredibly important points that every segment of our society has got to be able to examine this and say, ''How does this affect me?''

What we know is when we play fair with the American people and you give them the knowledge, these are people who are willing to sacrifice as long as they know that everyone else is. As we have seen in the natural disasters that are besetting my State, neighbors are helping neighbors, communities. We saw it all up and down the Mississippi River 2 years ago.

This is a great country. Why do we not treat them like great people and invite them into the debate and have the Speaker of the House put the options on Internet and let the people choose and inform themselves? And then we will have to make the tough decisions that will flow from that kind of participation in this democratic system.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. I am also delighted to enter into this debate.

It is said the measure of good government is not where we stand and what it does when times are good, the true measure of good government is where we stand and what it does when times are tough. That was the philosphy of Dr. Martin Luther King. I think it is appropriate at this time in history that we recall his wisdom, appropriate this weekend.

Soon Congress will consider a proposed amendment to the Constitution that would mandate a balanced budget. This is not a minor matter. This is a very populist concept and really needs to be debated by those of us in Congress and also by those in America. The vote we take on this proposal will echo in our lives for years and years to come. That is especially true if the provision requiring a three-fifths vote to raise revenue remains on final passage.

I support the goals of a balanced budget. As a local government official, chair of the board of commissioners of my county in the State of North Carolina, I had to live under a balanced-budget amendment, not only amendment, but a mandate. We did that, and I felt that is, indeed, the way government should function. That is, indeed, the way this body should function.

I also realize that we must accept the reality that in the near term we face and must accept to make some sacrifice. That sacrifice must be borne by all Americans. Our senior citizens, veterans, States, local communities, and our children will be required to, indeed, receive less from their Government. However, the people really need to know what, indeed, the sacrifices are they will be called to make. There will be cuts in the budget, less spending, and continued emphasis on reducing the deficit.

The issue is not will we cut. The issue is what will we cut. The issue is not should there be cuts. The issue is where will those cuts be. The issue is where will the cuts be the fiscal responsibility will compel us to cut. The question is not will we not cut. The question is where and how much and what will be the pain and how we will inform the American people.

The American people have a right to know, and I concur with my colleague who said the American people, if they are properly informed, usually are prepared to make that sacrifice.

A balanced-budget mandate will mean painful cuts in programs that many of our citizens and our communities have come to expect and have come to rely upon. It is because of a resounding impact of this proposal that we must demand, and the American people have a right to know, which programs the majority intends to keep and which programs they intend to eliminate or to reduce.

At the end of each day, those of us in government must be honest and answer the question by our policy who have we helped and who have we hurt.

The budget of the United States makes a statement about who we are and where we stand. It signals to our citizens and to the world the priorities that we are governing our lives by. We must be a nation determined to promote peace. Or will we be a nation designed to encourage war? Will we spend our money urging our young people to stretch for the stars, or will we spend our money on dubious weaponry? What will we say to our veterans who at great sacrifice have defended this country war after war, in fact they have risked their lives, will we say to them our balanced budget requires us to eliminate their pension and health care which we promised?

These demand answers now, not after April, not after all our citizens have paid their taxes. We need those answers now.

Who will be helped by this balanced-budget amendment, and who will be hurt?

If the majority has their way, we will have a flat tax, we are told. Under the proposal, every citizen will be taxed at the same rate, 17 percent. If the truth is known, the majority is not allowing you to understand at all the average American now pays less than that. They pay around 15 percent. So they are not telling the whole. Actually they are not telling you that the unearned-income money from dividends, interest, will not be taxed under that proposal. Those with stock and money in the bank will not have to pay that tax at all and, in fact, the rich will be excused from that.

But those who have families and students in college and student loans and medical bills and debts to pay on their house, they, indeed, will have to pay those taxes.

Will we breach our contract and our covenant with the elderly and say to our senior citizens at the sunset of their lives that, ''We will not provide that which we promised; we will be cutting Social Security and Medicare''? It may be we will have to reduce these resources, but we need to be honest with our senior citizens.

Will we say to the small farmers who literally work their fingers to the bone for feeding this country and all the world, that we are no longer going to support you at any risk?

Will we say to rural areas, ''There is no longer rural credit or rural housing''? None of this will be available if we say to our young that the balanced budget requires us to cut indiscriminately.

Will we say to our children, ''We are no longer able to immunize you from disease or feed the hungry or shelter you from the cold because we are giving money to those who are more wealthy''?

The American people have a right to know the implication of this budget. Times were tough in our country in the 1930's. Our economy had virtually collapsed under the weight of a Great Depression.

How we responded then, and how we will respond now tells us something about our country. Then under the careful and compassionate hand of President Roosevelt, we did not eliminate programs. We refocused. We reenergized government to respond to that crisis. We did not just cut programs. We found ways to respond to the appropriate need then.

That appropriate use of government eventually ushered in an unprecedented growth in our country. The economy was booming, and little did we know that we were moving toward his goal that we would have a car in every garage and families, indeed, would have homes and that they would provide for the children. Good times resulted from that in America.

Today we are facing a staggering balance-of-trade deficit with many of our foreign trading partners. Very often the car Americans can afford in their garage is from Japan, and that is not as it should be. The jobs that followed in 1950 have taken flight to cheaper labor markets. Indeed, crime is on the rise.

There are problems we have now. Teenage pregnancy is at an unacceptable level.

I say these are tough times. What will we do? How will we respond to this?

The question is how will we respond to these tough issues as we balance the budget? That is the issue the American people should know. Where will they fall in our response to them as a governing official?

We do not need a government for the sake of government. Certainly we need to reduce government where it needs to be reduced. But we do need a government that is appropriate, careful in its spending, fair in its revenue raising, and should dictate how we govern in a fair manner.

We must not waste. Our citizens need not want. But we must be truthful with our citizens and tell them what sacrifices they are going to bear.

We did not get elected to come here to create a robot-like system where entitlements are slashed indiscriminately. Some may need to be reduced. Why not tell the American people what we are about as we are to make these hard decisions?

In fact, the balanced-budget amendment may be the easy vote, because we do not have to stand up to people and to tell them this, indeed, is how I will propose to reduce this budget.

The majority proposed an answer to these difficult things by saying the balanced-budget amendment, with a two-thirds vote requirement, is the only way. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to know the sacrifices we are asking them to make and we are called to make.

I think the more responsible position is letting the people know.

□ 1340

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, particularly for her reference to a man who might have been our greatest Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It brings to mind one of his most memorable phrases, which was when he spoke to the American people in the depths of the Depression and said, ''We have nothing to fear but fear itself.'' I think the Republicans' slogan today is, ''We have nothing to fear but the facts.''

They are afraid to share the facts with the American people. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] said last Sunday, they are afraid their knees would buckle when they faced the facts.

President Roosevelt had confidence in the American people. I think the Republican leadership of the House should have confidence in the American people too. Let them know what is in store, let them know the truth of what is involved in a balanced budget amendment. If it means 5 or 10 years from now the Social Security system or the Medicare system will be changed, should not families be alerted to that fact now so that they could make some sort of plans now for their future? To spring this on the family 5 or 10 years down the line when they are in retirement is beyond the time when they can do something about it. But to talk about it today is the honest way to approach it. I hope that the Republican leadership, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GINGRICH, and others will have the same kind of faith in the American people that President Roosevelt did. Let them face the crisis together, let us come together and resolve this.

What is at issue here with these various items in the Republican contract is something as basic as the economic relationship between the 50 States and the Federal Government. When it comes to the question of unfunded mandates, what we hear from Mr. GINGRICH and the Republican side is that the Federal Government should stop telling the States what to do unless you are going to pay for it. Let the States decide is the call coming from the Republican side of the aisle. But I wonder, if you apply that to real-life situations, whether most Americans would agree.

I have a district that is on the Mississippi River. The quality of the water in that river is very important to the people who live along that river. But we cannot control the quality of that water in the State of Illinois. Now, we have to have a standard, a national standard that we can trust, starting from the headwaters of the Mississippi in Minnesota, working its way down. We need a Federal standard, if you will, a Federal mandate, to suggest that the water quality is something that we as Americans can trust.

Let me give you another example: A few years ago the State of Wisconsin has a drinking age of 18, and the State of Illinois had a drinking age of 21. So on the northern Illinois border, teenagers would get in their cars on Saturday night, drive over to Wisconsin, get drunk, and drive back, drive home, wrecking their cars, killing themselves and a lot of innocent people. It got so bad that they called the stretch of highway ''Blood Alley'' because of all the lives that had been lost due to the teenagers drinking in Wisconsin and coming back to Illinois.

Do you know what happened? The Federal Government, the committee I serve on, passed a Federal mandate and said we are going to have a uniform drinking age of 21 in the United States or, ''Your State is going to lose Federal highway funds.'' Was it a mandate? Yes. Did it cost the State of Wisconsin? Yes, it did cost them to enforce it.

What was the result? Kids lives were saved, lives of innocent were saved. Blood Alley is just a bitter memory now, it is gone.

Time and again we find these Federal standards lead to a higher quality of life.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I would like to make a comment about an article today that has to do with the balanced budget amendment, from the Wall Street Journal, by their economist Robert Eisner. He points out, with regard to a balanced budget amendment, households could not begin to balance their budgets the way the Government would be required to under the Republican plan. The point being, I guess, that if we are to look at investments either by the Federal Government or by families, families borrow to buy a car, to buy a home, get their kids to school; businesses borrow. If you had to take all of that, if you had to pay for everything out of current income, you would find yourselves unable to do the things that families normally do every day.

Now, just to go back to what my colleague from California was talking about, there are a variety of ways to deal with this issue. You can, as was suggested in this article, and as some of our colleagues suggested, that you separate out a capital budget from an operating budget, which is the way, in fact, most States today balance their budgets. They do that because they have a capital expenditure, it is paid for over the life of the asset, and you deal with your current expenditures out of current cash. Families do that every single day. By narrowing the playing field, if you will, what the Republicans are doing is not allowing for various ideas and various opportunities to come up so that we can debate each of these and figure out the best way in which you can balance that budget, thereby allowing both the Federal Government and families and businesses to continue to invest in their future, and not cut them off or shut them down in their ability to move forward.

So that we are in this most important debate, finding ourselves in a position where the public has called out and cried out—and I believe this is true in this election—for open government, participatory government, for not allowing for gridlock, for moving forward. And we see that all of that is being throttled by the Republican leadership, and all in the name of saying that the public is afraid and would be fearful of the pain that is involved if we have to balance the budget. It does not make any sense.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, I think what the gentlewoman said so forcefully and eloquently is that basically we need to trust the American people, give them the information.

The Republican leadership appears to be very reluctant to do that. You know, we have been through this, some of us in this Chamber, back in the Reagan and Bush era, when we were told to just have confidence and faith in the so-called Laffer curve. That was appropriately named, the Laffer curve, and some of the different approaches, that it was all going to work out, we could increase spending, cut taxes, and when it was all over the economy was going to blossom and flourish. It didn't happen. What did flourish was our national debt during the Reagan-Bush era because we were buying into the economic theories of extreme thinkers. The Republicans have a tendency to gravitate toward extreme thinkers. I think we are hearing from those folks again.

I think most of us would agree we should reduce Federal mandates where they just involve bureaucracy and paperwork and do not serve a national purpose. But do not go too far. If the Republicans want to go so far as to jeopardize environmental quality, jeopardize health standards, they have gone too far. They should stay away from that extreme thinking.

We should move toward a balanced budget amendment, but from my point of view, more important than that is economic growth in this country. I would like to make sure we are creating new good-paying jobs. That should be our highest priority, not some bookkeeping standards that really do not pay any attention to the real world. That is the kind of extreme thinking Americans are not going to buy into. They want this Government, this Congress, to be sensitive to the real problems, to the real families, to the need for jobs, to the need for business to the need to expand.

Merely paying homage to some bumper sticker with some extreme viewpoint is not serving the national purpose.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman. I think that is an important point. The point is now the Republican Members of this Congress are forewarned. We took that route once, we took an economic plan on the back of a cocktail napkin, called the Laffer curve, and reduced those cuts in taxes to the wealthiest people in this country, and dramatically slashed some of the spending on the domestic side but not on the military side. Once again, that is an echo we are hearing in this Congress. And the result was a trillion dollars' worth of debt. The result was interest payments of $300 billion, $400 billion a year, that will be paid for by every American family, paid for by all of our children.

Many of us voted against that plan. But the way it was presented to this Congress was that you had to vote that day, there could not be any hearings, you had to vote for the substitute, take it or leave it. There was no time to tell the American people what was done. There was no time to debate it on this floor. The Congress took it, unfortunately, and a trillion dollars later in red ink, hundreds of billions of dollars in interest payments that could have gone covering back to the people or could have been used for productivity in this country or for social progress was denied because of that kind of snap decision, the same kind of snap decisions we have seen around here that have been recanted within 1 hour, 2 hours, 12 hours, on the theory that everything has to be done immediately.

Now they are saying that they have got to rush this, they cannot let the people take a look at it because it will break their political momentum. What is more important: the economic momentum of this Nation, or the political momentum of the Speaker of the House? I think it is the economic momentum of this Nation.

We see time and again economists, chairmen of the Federal Reserve, saying, ''Be careful what you do here because if you do it wrong and don't think it through, interest rates are going to go up.'' Everybody believes if interest rates continue to go up one more time or two more times, that the economic recovery is then choked off.

□ 1350

And then we can look forward to the auto worker being laid off, the aircraft manufacturer being laid off, the rail people being laid off, and once again there goes the Federal deficit, but that is not what these people are saying. They do not want to listen to this. They do not want to have these points of view aired in public.

This is supposed to be the most open time, the most open Congress. But yet we find out there is no time for debate, there is no time for the public's view. I say, you can't have it both ways. You cannot be the most open Congress. You cannot pass sunshine laws and then tell the American people to keep out.

Mr. Speaker, we owe them more. We owe them more dignity and more respect for their intelligence.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, would my colleague yield for just one second?

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, I would be happy to yield.

Ms. DELAURO. I just want to say I mean through all the discourse and commentary on this issue quite frankly, as a woman in West Haven, CT, said to me at office hours one morning, one Saturday morning, she said, ''I wish for one minute that the people in Washington would put their feet in our shoes and understand what our lives are all about,'' and that is what this is about. It is what people want to know, is their standard of living going to be raised? Are they going to be able to get their kids to school? Are they going to be able to live in some kind of sense of security? Are they going to be able to pass on that American dream to their kids the way my colleagues' fathers, and my mother and father, did for me?

The whole point of this and part of that is that we do get our fiscal house in order. There is no question about that. But let us come clean with the American public and in fact tell them whether this balanced budget amendment is going to deny their kid, one out of four, a Pell grant to get them to school. Is it going to put their mother or elderly mother and father in jeopardy with regard to Social Security and with Medicare? Is it going to jeopardize their ability to get education and training so that they can get that first job? That second job? That fifth job? And earn a living wage? And is it going to do something to allow them to work and go to work in this country? Is it going to raise that standard of living?

Let us have that open debate in this body. The American people deserve no less around this issue of the balanced budget.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

As my colleagues know, one of the interesting things over the last 12 or 13 years is how popular this balanced budget amendment has become and how necessary in many respects, and yet each of us who serves in this Chamber knows that we have it within our own power to deal with this budget on a regular basis and try to reduce spending.

Last year I came to the floor with a reduction in an appropriation bill of 10 percent from the previous year, $1.3 billion in cuts, and I am sorry to report to my colleagues that many of the people who have this extreme passion for a balanced budget amendment were nowhere to be found when I needed their votes to pass my appropriation. They call for major surgery on the deficit, and they faint at the sight of blood when they see appropriation cuts, and that happened time and time again.

So I think now what we are saying now to the people who are proposing this bumper sticker balanced budget amendment is, ''Get real. Tell us what we can live with, what you're prepared to live with. Put it on paper. Tell us what you are prepared to vote for.

Take it home and explain to your voters, as all of us are required to.'' And I do not think that is unreasonable.

As my colleagues know, ultimately the fate of this balanced budget amendment is not in this Chamber. We will pass it, I suppose, and the Senate might. Then it goes off to the State legislatures, and it takes 38 of them to approve it for it to become the law. Some 7,424 State legislators will actually decide whether or not there will be a balanced budget amendment in the Constitution.

Recently a Wall Street Journal article went around and asked some of those State legislators, some of whom had supported this in the past, what they thought of it now that it was on the horizon. A gentleman from Delaware, State Senator Robert Connor, a Republican, said, ''For us it could be devastating. In the end we could be left with severe budget cuts and an increase in taxes in Delaware.''

In Alabama a Democratic representative, Michael Bach, said it was a farce. The way the amendment looks now it simply shifts the burden to us. That is not what the people of Alabama need.

So, finally some folks are starting to realize what it is all about.

Going back to my earlier point, I hope the Governor of California will at least pause and think when he calls up his congressional delegation here in Washington and says, ''We need help in California,'' that he is the same Governor who just at Tuesday's press conference in Sacramento said of the Federal Government, quote, we are going to sue their butts off, close quote, because they are imposing burdens on us that we should not have to pay for. Well, honestly I think we should come to the help of the people of California, but it would be helpful also if the Governor of California would sit down and at least take a look at his own request, that we, a deficit-ridden Federal Government, are coming to the rescue again, as we should, of residents of his State. And all of the people who are telling us, ''Pass the balanced budget amendment; reduce the amount of money you have,'' should stop and think in Sacramento, CA, in Springfield, IL, in State capitals all across the country, that they will have new obligations and new responsibilities.

Let us get real. Let us get responsible. Let us be honest with the people of this country and let them know what is in store with the balanced budget amendment.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just like to say to my colleagues, that's absolutely correct, and that is all we are asking for, is to have that opportunity for the discussion and for the debate.

And I join my colleagues today and others, and I think what I am prepared to do is to have this discussion and debate on a daily basis, if that is what is required in order to try to get the information out to the American people as to what, in fact, we are deliberating here and how it is being deliberated. We have to call on people who are in positions as Governors and elected officials to be responsible. It is not just a bumper sticker. It is not just a slogan.

If that is what we were doing in the past, and that is what we have decried and said we are not going to do in the future, then let us not go back to business as usual. Let us not do that. The American people, as I said earlier, deserve better than that, and we have an opportunity here. That is what we were sent here to do; that is what Governors were elected to do as well.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Connecticut.

In the past special orders have been political monologs from one side or the other, and I would hope in the future that could change, and in the spirit of trying to bring that change my colleague from Indiana, my Republican colleague, asked for an opportunity to speak earlier, and, realizing we only have maybe 8 or 9 minutes left, if we could enter into a dialog, I would be happy to at the moment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for yielding, and I do not want to prolong the discussion, but what I think would be helpful for the American people is if maybe we could have some debates, not the English style debates we were talking about, where we could get two people on the gentleman's side and two on our side to come down and to debate at length the subject of the economy and how we are going to deal with it.

One of the things that I was going to take issue with and will be when I have my special order here in a few short minutes was the issue of interest rates that the gentleman from California talked about.

When Jimmy Carter was President, interests rates went to 21.5 percent——

Mr. DURBIN. They were horrible.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Because the inflation rate got out of control, and Mr. Volcker thought he had to do that to choke off inflation, and, when President Reagan came in and cut the top tax rate, which is not talked about very much, we ended up with seeing interest rates going down dramatically along with inflation.

So, when we start talking about, and the Democrat minority starts talking about, interest rates being out of control because of our policies, which we are talking about right now, I think we need to look at history and see that the real problem that was created as far as interest rates and inflation last time occurred primarily under Democrat administrations.

Mr. DURBIN. I think my colleague from Maryland would like to respond.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for yielding, and I want to respond to my friend from Indiana.

Interest rates, of course, and inflation rose very rapidly in the 1970's. as the gentleman well knows, for reasons unrelated to domestic policy, but very much related to the oil cartel that was created in the Middle East.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That was a fact.

Mr. HOYER. And energy costs skyrocketed. We had long lines, shortages, and energy prices skyrocketed.

But the gentleman also correctly observed that interest rates followed the inflation rate up, and the reason they do that obviously is because money, like any other commodity, is affected by inflation, and the payback, the amortization, the payback of the price of the money, is keyed to the differential between what our inflation rate is and what our cost of money is, and that is the real cost of money, the real.

And, as the gentleman knows, notwithstanding the fact that the interest rates were nominally high in the late 1970's, in point of fact as the gentleman——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Nominally? Twenty-one and a half percent?

Mr. HOYER. Nominally in terms of the difference between inflation, which was 17 or 18 percent, and interest rates which were 21 percent, a 3.5-point discrepancy. In point of fact, in the 1980's real interest rates, which is really what the gentleman is worried about because it is the difference between what our money depreciates at and what we have to pay it back at, were higher in the 1980's than they were in the 1970's.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Oh my. I will get into that more at length later, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I will be glad to discuss that with the gentleman, and most every economist will say that is the fact, but of course the gentleman is correct. Most people did not think that because the numbers were not as large. But, in borrowing money, we really are very interested in what the real——

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me just say to my colleague and the gentleman from Illinois, what I'd like to do, if we could, is maybe we could sit down at some point and decide on the two or three topics, and come down with two Members on each side, and have some real, in-depth debates that the American people, who may be tuning in, can watch and get both perspectives.

Mr. DURBIN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] I think has made an excellent suggestion, and I also hope we can kind of create a different kind of environment for debate on the floor where we try to have more exchange of ideas. Certainly we want to express our viewpoint, and the gentleman does, too, but we should try to maintain dialog. I think it is more interesting for those who are observing the debate, and perhaps we can generate some new knowledge for both of us.

□ 1400

I only have a few minutes remaining. The gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] has asked me to yield to him,

and I am happy to yield to him at this point.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to have these few minutes.

I was watching some of the discussion over the television as I was in the Judiciary Committee, and I thought it was important enough to come down here, because at this very moment our committee is debating the balanced budget amendment and I just wanted to add a few points.

It seems to me that for the last month and a half we have been talking about how open this new Congress will be and how important it is to give the people of America a chance to really understand the workings of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. Yet it seems to me the first thing we are doing with this balanced budget amendment is closing doors to openness to the American public. We are not giving them any idea about how we are going to pay for anything in the balanced budget amendment.

As the gentlewoman from Connecticut pointed out, we are talking about cutting $1,200,000,000,000 over the next 5 to 7 years, and the American people should know what that means. It is to me somewhat disconcerting to find that in the Judiciary Committee today the only way we could try to extract anything from the Republican majority on how they intend to pay for this is to propose amendments to find out if they would include those amendments to protect certain programs, for example, Social Security. We had an amendment that would say that in the process of trying to balance the budget we would not go after the moneys that hard-working Americans have put into the Social Security fund. That amendment failed. The Republicans said we could not do that.

Now, their reasons are similar to that analogy that I recall from that zealous military man who said that in order to save the village he had to burn it. In essence, that is what we were told today in the Judiciary Committee. We cannot put an amendment in that would protect Social Security from the massive cuts, because if we do so, we will ruin Social Security. The logic evades me.

Just minutes ago—in fact, I missed the vote because I was trying to get here—we had a vote to try to exclude some major cuts like veterans' benefits for those who have served in the wars of this country, defending this country, and who have now come back injured. We could not get the Republicans to agree to that amendment.

So it is disconcerting to see that the only way to try to find out what they are not willing to protect is by proposing amendments which they are now rejecting.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] pointed out that right now in California, as they are suffering through some major devastation from the floods and rains, it seems almost incredulous to believe that we are now talking about a balanced budget amendment which would cut away the money for some programs like the Federal Emergency Management Agency which would provide those emergency dollars to California right now. We do not know whether that will happen or not because we cannot get anyone in the majority to tell us, and that is a true shame. It seems that what we should be talking about right now is openness. It reminds me of those games that the kids play. Right now we are playing hide and seek with the American people. Rather than playing hide and seek, I think it is about time, since we are playing with Americans' hard-earned dollars, that we play show and tell. And at this stage we have not seen any show and tell.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California.

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

THE ECONOMICS OF SPENDING CUTS—AND WHITEWATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for 60 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I came down here tonight to talk about the Whitewater-Vince Foster-Arkansas Development Financial Authority debacle and how it pertains to the Clinton administration and in particular, to Bill and Hillary Clinton, the President and the First Lady. But before I do that, I feel compelled to respond a little bit to my Democratic colleagues who have been down here maligning the new Republican leadership about our economic policies and how we are going to deal with the financial problems of this country over the next 5 to 10 years.

First of all, let me say that we have been in power about a week to 10 days. You cannot expect everything to be accomplished in the first 10 days. After all, the Contract With America which we promised the American people before the election we will deal with is going to take a hundred days, and for us to do everything the Democrats are talking about today on the floor is virtually impossible. It is going to take a little bit of time to illuminate the American people as to where the cuts are going to take place and how extensive they will be.

Now, it is true that we are going to have to reduce over the next 5 to 6 to 7 years the cost of Government by about $1 trillion to $1½ trillion. That is doable, although my Democratic colleagues would lead us to believe it cannot be done without a lot of wailing and gnashing of teeth. We have a lot of Government agencies that can be done away with. We have a lot of Government agencies that can be reduced. The bureaucracy in this country can be cut dramatically.

On the first day of this session we reduced the congressional committee staff and the congressional budget by a third. That was just on the first day. So it can be done, but it is going to take time to go through each one of those agencies, each area of government, and cut the largesse that has been put on those budgets over the last 40 years. They have had control since 1954. They have had one House continuously since 1954 and both Houses for most of that time. So for us to turn around the runaway government that has caused these huge deficits and the problems facing this country is going to take more than 4 or 5 days.

Make no mistake about this, I say to my colleagues and to anyone else who may be paying attention across this great land of ours, we are going to reduce the size of Government. We are going to reduce taxes. We are going to pass a constitutional amendment that is going to say that if we raise taxes again, we are going to have to have a 60-percent vote, not 51 percent but 60 percent, because we do not want every Congress coming in here and saying on a whim that they want to raise taxes again, which has been the case for a long, long time. We are committed to streamlining Government and getting Government off the American people's backs as much as possible, and that includes the private sector, the entrepreneur, the businessman who creates these jobs in this country, as well as the cities and States that have been crying for years, ''The Government in Washington tells us to do something and then doesn't give us the money to do it, so what we have to do is raise taxes at the local level, property taxes and sales taxes and State income taxes, to pay for it.'' So we have been putting undue burdens on local and State governments without giving them the wherewithal to deal with it.

What we want to do is reduce these Federal mandates and allow States and local governments to deal with their problems themselves, closer to the people, where they can do it better and more efficiently. And all these things we are going to be talking about in the weeks and months to come.

Chairman KASICH of the Budget Committee has said time and time again on national television that we are going to create a bank account, if you will, where we make the cuts in Government spending first and put it in the bank, and then we use that to spend in other areas where it is absolutely necessary, where we can make cuts, like cutting taxes. We are not going to do the spending first; we are going to do the cutting first. That is something that is new and revolutionary in this body because every time in the last 40 years, when we wanted to do something, we just raised taxes; we did not try to cut Government, we did not try to cut the bureaucracy, and we did not try to cut

the regulations that have been burdening the private sector.

My colleagues indicated in their comments just a few moments ago that we had to create jobs, and the implication was that Government had to help in creating jobs. Government has been the problem in stopping job creation by loading on the backs of private business people more costs and more Government mandates that they have to pay for.

□ 1410

If a businessman in Ohio or Indiana or California is told by the Federal Government he has to do something, and it is going to cost money, that money does not come from heaven. He has to pay for that some way. The way he pays for it is by raising the price of his product.

We are now in a global marketplace, a global economy. You can get people to work in Mexico for $1 an hour, including fringe benefits. So the American entrepreneur, when the Federal Government adds a mandate on his back that is going to cost money, it puts him in a less competitive position with that businessman in Mexico, who has a great advantage already at the beginning because of wage rates and other things that the Mexican Government does not require that we do.

So every time our Government adds more requirements on private business in this country, it costs them money and it ends up costing jobs. So the things that they are doing over there by adding mandates and Government controls on business ends up costing Americans jobs and drives American industry out of the country where the cost of doing business is less and the American jobs go with it.

So what we want to do as a new Republican majority is reduce those mandates on cities and States, reduce those mandates and controls on the private sector so we can unchain the free enterprise system, so we can be competitive in any world market competition with Japan, with Taiwan, with Korea, with England, with France, with Germany, any country. And that is going to be good for America. It is going to cause a burgeoning economy, a growing economy in the years to come.

Less Government, less taxes, less Government interference, and less Government control means a stronger economy in the long term. And that is anathema to the more liberal element that believes more Government is better. They have believed for 40 years that the way to get things moving in the right direction is to sock it to the rich and give it to the poor. And the implication was that if you have money, that is bad, and we are going to take it from the rich and give it to the poor, and that redistribution of wealth is going to solve the problem.

The fact of the matter is poor people don't create jobs. A man who doesn't have anything doesn't go out here and create jobs. You have to have something to invest for plant and equipment. So we have to make sure when we cut taxes, we cut it fairly, not just for the poor and the middle class, but for the people who have the wherewithal to create jobs as well. They are the ones who make the capital investment for economic expansion and more jobs.

So we shouldn't have this class warfare they have been talking about for 40 years, rich against poor, because we are all in this boat together. And if we help the businessman, if we cut, for instance, capital gains, it helps everybody. It helps create jobs because there is more money for investment in new capital goods and equipment and plant expansions.

So I really kind of get upset when they are attacking various classes in our country and, in effect, attacking the very system itself which we call free enterprise, because free enterprise is the way you create jobs and economic expansion, not by more Government, not by more taxes, and not by more regulation.

When they start talking about Social Security, for anybody who may be paying attention that is a senior citizen, we have already said that Social Security is off the table. There are no cuts in Social Security planned, and so when they start talking about that, they are creating a red herring.

I think that is pretty much what I wanted to say about my colleagues. As I said during a small colloquy with my Democrat counterparts, I hope we can have some real honest debates, maybe during special orders, in the weeks and months to come, so the American people can see very clearly where both sides are coming from. But in closing on this section of my special order, let me just say that we want to unchain the free enterprise system, we want to reduce the tax burden on American citizens, we want to reduce regulation on the private sector so they can be competitive in the world marketplace, and if we do those things, then this country is going to be much, much better off. And the thing that my Democrat colleagues fear absolutely the most is that this revolution that took place on November 8 will continue into the next election and the next election and the next election, because their philosophy is not what the American people want. And I think that is one of the reasons why you hear them squealing so much right now.

COMMENTS ON WHITEWATER

Now, let me talk about something that is very, very important that deals with a different subject, and it has to deal with the President of the United States and Whitewater, the Arkansas Development Financial Authority, and a lot of other things.

Before we adjourned last November, I discussed several aspects of the Whitewater investigation and other related scandals surrounding President Clinton, in special orders. I said at that time that many, many questions remained to be answered, and that congressional hearings were the only way to get those answers.

As we begin this new year and new session of Congress, the questions are still unanswered, and the need for hearings into possible illegal activities by the President and First lady and others need to be answered, and we need these hearings. The necessity is greater than ever.

Today I am going to discuss some of the most noteworthy controversies that were created and discussed last year and that came to light. Then I will discuss some new revelations and new events that unfolded during the recess over the Christmas holiday. In the coming weeks I will be taking time on the floor to discuss a number of these areas in much more detail.

First of all, let me talk about Vince Foster. He is the fellow who was the counsel to the President, assistant counsel to the President, who was found dead out at Fort Marcy Park. There is a lot of questions concerning his death.

The evening of Vince Foster's death at Fort March Park, the White House chief of staff, Mack McLarty, ordered Vince Foster's office sealed. He said it should be sealed to protect everything in there because there may be some investigation concerning his death.

His office was not sealed. Instead, three White House officials searched his office in the middle of the night and removed many files from his filing cabinets, and these documents were taken away.

The three officials who went into his office in violation of the what the chief of staff, Mr. McLarty, said was going to be done, were Bernie Nussbaum, the President's counsel; Hillary Clinton's chief of staff, I don't know what she is doing in there, Margaret Williams; and special assistant to the President, Patsy Thomasson.

It was later revealed at last August's congressional hearings before the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs that Bernie Nussbaum gave one of the files concerning Whitewater to Margaret Williams, Hillary Clinton's chief of staff. After checking with Hillary Clinton, Ms. Williams locked the file away upstairs in Hillary Clinton's personal residence, and several days later it was given to the President's personal lawyer. When the President's First Lady was asked about this, she said it was locked away in a file and we didn't look at it.

Now, that bothers me. I am not certain that they would take that out of his filing cabinet in violation of what Mack McLarty requested and what the FBI and police would request, put it in her filing cabinet upstairs, and then she says she didn't look at it.

Two days later Bernie Nussbaum went back into Vince Foster's office and conducted a second search of his office, and he told the Park Police and the FBI to sit on chairs outside the office so they couldn't see what he was

doing, and he removed several more files.

Here are some questions that need to be answered in hearings before the Congress. Why did Bernie Nussbaum, Ms. Williams, Hillary Clinton's chief of staff, and Patsy Thomasson, the chief personnel officer at the White House, remove files from Mr. Foster's office in the middle of the night after the office was ordered sealed? What documents were they searching for and what documents did they take out, and did they destroy any of those documents?

Why weren't the Park Police and the FBI given immediate access to Mr. Foster's office? Why didn't the White House give them access to all of the documents to help them in their investigation? Why were the Whitewater files locked up in the personal residence after they were taken from Mr. Foster's office? And have investigators from the independent counsel's office been given access to all of those files? We may never known, because we don't know what was taken out of there and if any of them were destroyed.

Here are some new developments. One of the projects that Vince Foster was working on was preparing 3 years of overdue tax returns for Whitewater Development Corp. He was assistant counsel to the President and was in the process of preparing tax returns for 3 years of overdue taxes for the White Water Development Corp. He had no business doing that while he was in the White House. Nevertheless, he was in the process of doing that.

We can assume that these were among the Whitewater records removed from his office by Mr. Nussbaum. The President's deposition, the President gave a deposition concerning Mr. Foster given to the independent counsel, which was released as part of the Senate Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs report. And in his deposition, President Clinton said he was not aware that Vince Foster was working on tax records for Whitewater.

Vince Foster was the associate counsel to the President. He was working in the White House. His responsibilities were to do what the President wanted. And yet he was working on 3 years of back tax returns for Whitewater, the President was involved in Whitewater, and he said he didn't know anything about it.

The question is how could the President not know that his personal friend was working on a project of that importance? Whitewater had become a major scandal at the time and was consuming everyone's attention at the White House. Yet the President said under oath he didn't know anything about it.

Now, there was a briefcase I want to talk about. Six days after Vince Foster's death, White House officials informed law enforcement officials that they had searched Mr. Foster's briefcase in the White House office. They found a suicide note written on a sheet of legal size paper torn into 27 pieces with 1 piece missing. The pieces of paper had no fingerprints on them. Torn into 27 pieces and no fingerprints on it.

I don't know how that happens, but I guess it does. Two earlier searches turned up no such note. Now, get that. Two earlier searches of the office and briefcase turned up no such note, yet 6 days later they found this note torn into 27 pieces with no fingerprints on it.

□ 1420

Here are some questions. How can a piece of paper torn into 27 pieces of fingerprints, at least a smudge on one of them, how could two previous searches of his briefcase have missed such a note?

Here are some new developments. New and very serious questions have surfaced recently about Mr. Foster's briefcase. Independent counsel, Kenneth Starr, who I think is doing a very good job on this case, Independent Counsel Kenneth Starr is questioning witnesses before a grand jury right now about this matter. According to press reports, two of the rescue workers who were the first ones to arrive at the scene told the FBI that they saw a black briefcase in Mr. Foster's car at Fort Marcy Park. The park police reported no briefcase when they searched his car.

The two rescue workers were George Gonzalez and Todd Hall. They told the FBI about the briefcase last March.

Questions: Did the briefcase in Mr. Foster's car belong to Mr. Foster? If so, how did it get from his car at Fort Marcy Park back to the office? Three, why did the park police say they found no briefcase in Mr. Foster's car? And four, why did Independent Counsel Fiske at that time make no mention of this controversy in his report? The FBI interviewed these rescue workers a full 3 months before the report was issued. So that briefcase was in that car and it was Mr. Foster's briefcase, and they found a suicide note 6 days later in the office. And it is the same briefcase. It did not just fly there. Somebody had to take it there. That needs to be looked into by a congressional hearing as well as the special counsel, the independent counsel.

Destruction of documents in Arkansas. In March 1992, during the Presidential campaign, the New York Times published a groundbreaking story on the Whitewater Development Corp. and the Clintons. Three employees of the Rose law firm, where Hillary Clinton was employed, three employees of the Rose law firm have reported that they were summoned to the Governor's Mansion by Hillary Rodham Clinton and were given records that they were told then to shred back at the law firm. They reported making at least six other trips to the Governor's Mansion during the campaign. The shredding began after the New York Times article and ran up through the election.

The New York Times article implicated the President and the First Lady in Whitewater. They took these files back from the Governor's Mansion to the Rose law firm for shredding on seven different occasions. One employee said a conservative estimate would be that there were more than a dozen boxes of documents that were ultimately shredded and destroyed.

In 1994, a part-time courier for the Rose law firm, a man named Jeremy Hedges, told a grand jury that he was told to shred documents from the file of Vince Foster, the man found dead at Fort Marcy Park, who was assistant counsel to the President. This guy at the Rose law firm, this young man was told to shred Vince Foster's files. This occurred after Special Counsel Robert Fiske announced in January that he would investigate Foster's death. That appears to be obstruction of justice.

Here we had a possible suicide or murder case that was going to be investigated by the independent counsel or the special counsel and after the fact the Rose law firm started shredding Vince Foster's files. What were they shredding down there, why?

Mr. Hedges said that he knew they were Mr. Foster's files because they had Vince Foster's initials on all of them.

Here are some questions: Why were documents destroyed in Arkansas during the 1992 Presidential campaign after the New York Times reported that Hillary and Bill Clinton were involved with the Whitewater mess? We have other reports that indicate that the Whitewater files that Hillary and Bill Clinton were involved in were taken from the Rose law firm over to the Governor's Mansion before the campaign and then documents were taken back to the Rose law firm after this report by the New York Times and shredded. It appears they were the same documents, but we cannot prove that.

Two, did these documents contain crucial information about the Whitewater scandal that were needed by Federal investigators? One would guess that they probably did, but we do not know that for sure. Three, why were more documents destroyed in early 1994, after Mr. Fiske announced he would investigate the death of Vince Foster? Why did they start destroying all his files at the Rose law firm? And four, what documents were destroyed? And I am not sure we will ever know the answer to that one. But we do know that they were really destroying documents down there out of the Governor's Mansion after the campaign and after Vince Foster's death. That would lead one to believe that they had something to hide.

Now, Paula Casey, a conflict of interest. In 1993, Paula Casey was appointed by Bill Clinton to be the U.S. Attorney in Little Rock, AR. She had worked on his campaigns, and her husband had been appointed by Governor Clinton to

a State job. She was a friend of Bill Clinton's, a very close friend.

Just before the election, the Resolution Trust Corporation sent the first of two criminal referrals concerning Whitewater to the U.S. attorney in Little Rock to investigate. It named the Clintons as potential beneficiaries of a check kiting scheme. Here we have this friend of Bill and Hillary Clinton, who is the U.S. attorney down there in Little Rock, and she had this referral from the Justice Department saying they should check this out, because there was a possibility of them being connected with a check kiting scheme.

Paula Casey, friend of Bill Clinton, who was the U.S. attorney, then let the referral sit on her desk for 9 months and did not do anything about it. She did not investigate. Why did she not do that?

In October 1993, the Resolution Trust Corporation sent a second criminal referral regarding Whitewater to the same attorney down there, U.S. attorney, Paula Casey. This one alleged that Madison Guarantee Savings and Loan illegally diverted $60,500 to Bill Clinton's 1984 campaign for Governor. So here is a second referral in a different case where there were funds diverted to Bill Clinton's campaign in the amount of over $60,000 illegally.

In October 1993, the pressure got pretty hot, because Paula Casey formally and secretly, without telling anybody, declined to investigate the matters brought in the first referral. She said, I will not investigate them.

Later that month, the RTC's referrals were reported in the press. When this happened, Paula Casey finally recused herself. So she refused to do anything, but then finally, when the press got onto it, she said, I will not get involved. I am going to recuse myself and let somebody else handle this.

Here are some questions. Paula Casey was a friend and supporter of President Clinton. He gave her her job. He gave her husband a job at the State. So why did she not recuse herself from this entire matter at the very beginning, when she got that first referral from the Justice Department? She waited 9, 10 months before she did anything. She had a clear-cut conflict of interest, but she did not do anything for darn near a year.

Second, how much more evidence could have been uncovered if an impartial prosecutor had been investigating this matter for the 9 months that the referral sat on U.S. Attorney Paula Casey's desk down there? And three, has Paula Casey been disciplined for her actions by the Justice Department? That is a question we ought to pose to Janet Reno, because Paula Casey certainly should be taken to task for not doing her job and letting this thing lay for at least 9 months.

Let us talk about another friend of Bill and Hillary Clinton, Dan Lassiter. Dan Lassiter was a multimillionaire in Arkansas. He was a friend and political supporter of Bill Clinton's. He contributed substantial amounts of money to Clinton's campaign for governor, and he took the Clintons to several events around the State over a period of months and years on his own private plane.

Lassiter's investment company, Lassiter and Company, received millions of dollars in bond business from the State of Arkansas.

Question: Why did Mr. Lassiter's company receive the lucrative bond business from the State. Did Governor Clinton use his influence to steer these contracts to Mr. Lassiter because he was a friend? It was well-known in Arkansas at that time that Dan Lassiter was involved in drugs, in cocaine. He was the subject of a joint Federal/State criminal investigation.

In 1986, he plead guilty to Federal drug charges. Despite the seriousness of the charges, he spent less than 6 months in jail out of a 30-month sentence, and that was spent not in jail but in a halfway house.

He never went to jail.

In 1990, after he got out of the halfway house, Governor Clinton pardoned him.

Questions: Why did Bill Clinton pardon Dan Lassiter? Was it because Lassiter had been a reliable contributor to this campaigns? Was it because Lassiter loaned Bill Clinton's brother Roger $8,000 to pay off a drug debt and gave him a job? Bill Clinton's brother Roger got $8,000 from Dan Lassiter to pay off a drug debt.

All of these questions need to be answered in hearings.

Here is a little bit more on Mr. Lassiter. Last September, the Albuquerque Journal published a major expose about political interference in the investigation of Dan Lassiter and Roger Clinton. The article quotes former Lassiter employees at the Lassiter company as telling the FBI that they left Lassiter and Company between 1982 and 1985 because of the pervasive drug use at the company.

□ 1430

The article reported that the FBI received sworn statements from Lasater employees that there were company Christmas parties where cocaine was served in ashtrays. They had it sitting all over the house.

Bill Clinton and Lasater were very close friends. They went to a lot of parties together and a lot of functions, social functions together, so this was not a distant relationship.

The FBI and Arkansas State Police were cooperating in a joint narcotics investigation. State Police Investigator ''Doc'' Delaughter, and I hope everybody gets this, State Police Investigator ''Doc'' Delaughter told reporters that the investigation was closing in on Lasater. He said, ''Moneys could have been seized and planes could have been seized because we had evidence that cocaine was being used on these planes.''

Bear in mind the President flew around in a lot of these planes during several of the campaigns and on personal trips. Cocaine was being used on these planes, and they could have been seized and moneys could have been seized during the investigation.

Delaughter also told the Albuquerque newspaper that the investigation was frustrated by interference by high ranking State officials appointed by Governor Clinton. Delaughter said that he twice briefed State Police Director Tommy Goodwin over the phone about the investigation. Goodwin took the calls in the Governor's personal office.

He was talking to him about this drug problem and this investigation, and Goodwin, Tommy Goodwin, who was the State Police Director, he took those calls in the Governor's personal office. It is not known if Bill Clinton was in the room, but you would assume if it was the Governor's personal office he probably was there.

This investigation involved Bill Clinton's brother Roger. Delaughter told the newspaper that he was prohibited by his superiors from interviewing Dan Lasater or Roger Clinton. The FBI did finally interview them, but Delaughter was told not to interview Roger Clinton, Bill Clinton's brother, or Mr. Lasater.

A second State investigator, a man named Larry Cleghorn, was asked about political interference in the investigation of Lasater. He said this: ''You have to understand that we were in a State agency and our Governor was Bill Clinton. We just got done putting his brother in the penitentiary. Lasater was one of the Governor's big friends.''

The State agents alleged that the State's part of the investigation was shut down prematurely for political reasons. Lasater did eventually plead guilty to drug distribution, despite the interference by the State administration in the investigation. That was because the Federal investigation was ongoing as well.

Here are some questions:

Did then Governor Clinton's political appointees interfere in the investigation? It would appear they did. In fact, I think it is almost as clear as the nose on your face that they did.

Two, if they did, were they ordered to do so by Governor Clinton? If that is the case, there was an obstruction of justice.

Three, was Governor Clinton present in his office when the State Police Director was being briefed in the case of Clinton's brother?

Four, was Governor Clinton monitoring this case, which involved his brother and his friend?

Five, are these matters being investigated by the Justice Department or the Independent Counsel? And I believe the Independent Counsel is probably looking into all of this, because I have great confidence in Mr. Starr.

Let me just say that in the weeks and the months to come we will be continuing our investigation, my staff and I and others here on Capitol Hill, even though we have not had hearings, into Whitewater, the Arkansas development financial authority, the drug trafficking that was taking place and drug use, pervasive drug problem that was taking place at the hands of Mr. Lasater. We will be looking into all aspects of this investigation and trying to report this to my colleagues.

I'm going to make a ''Dear Colleague'' for all the freshman Congressmen, both Democrat and Republican, who came in, so they can be kept abreast of what is going on. The fact of the matter is these questions must be answered.

A lot of people across this country are saying, you know, we ought to forget about Whitewater, we ought to forget about these investigations and go on. But the problem is no one is above the law, whether it is the fellow who sweeps the streets or sets pins in a bowling alley, if they still do that, or delivers papers, or the President of the United States.

If the President was involved in any kind of coverup regarding Whitewater, if there was any destruction of documents at the hands of the President or the First Lady that would obstruct the investigation into Whitewater, if the President did something to stop an investigation into drug dealing in Arkansas because this guy was his friend, if there was campaign money being given to the President's campaign that was illegal, that was being diverted through the Whitewater Development Corp., those are criminal violations.

I don't care who it is, they should be investigated thoroughly. If somebody violated the law, they should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law, no matter what their station is in life.

For that reason, we will continue our investigation. We will try to force hearings here on Capitol Hill. I believe there will be hearings. I believe Mr. Starr will continue his investigation of this. Hopefully, we'll come to some kind of a conclusion within the next year.

But make no mistake about it, my colleagues, we will be continuing special orders down here covering this and other topics related to Whitewater, and I hope my colleagues will pay particular attention, because it is very, very important.

NAFTA AND U.S. ECONOMIC POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] for 60 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Today, Mr. Speaker, we are going to spend some time focusing on a very important issue that came before the Congress about a year ago called NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, or as some of us would like to say, the agreement that some would call ''no more taking American jobs away someplace else, especially south of our border.''

If you have been reading the newspapers, though it is sometimes buried on page 17 or 25, you will note that in Mexico there is a severe financial crisis currently going on in that nation. the purpose of today's colloquy will be to discuss with my good friend, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] and others who will join us, what this means for the American worker and what it means for the American taxpayer, as well as the citizens of Mexico, because this week we are introducing legislation which the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] will talk about in just a second.

For those of us who opposed NAFTA, it is difficult to get up here and say ''I told you so,'' but if the pain were not so great for thousands of people in our country and thousands of people in Mexico, we would not be so compelled as we are today.

There is a new kind for foreign aid afoot in our land. It is called NAFTA. Because of the instability in Mexico, our taxpayers, with no vote occurring here in the Congress of the United States, our taxpayers are being asked to foot a multibillion dollar bail-out of the Mexican peso. We do not even get a seat at the table.

Congress has no vote. The taxpayers in my district have no vote. The players who are at the table are giving the whole set of transactions a very fancy name. They are calling it debt swaps. They are calling them peso bail-outs. They are calling it teso bonos.

The average person that lives on my street in Ohio doesn't know what all this is. Only people connected with Wall Street and the Federal Reserve are supposed to understand this. So today we are going to try to clear the air a bit, because what this deal is actually doing is asking our taxpayers to back up a minimum of $9 billion of loans to Mexico, and through the Federal Reserve an additional $5 billion plus, we don't know quite how much.

But of course it is the deposits of our people in our banks, that then make payments into the Federal Reserve, that creates Federal Reserve, so we are all connected to that system. And then there are additional funds coming from some of the commercial banks in this country that are having a whole lot to worry about at the moment.

Over this past year, if you think about it, our Federal Reserve has raised interest rates on the American people seven times. All of the press has been wondering why are they doing that, because wages aren't going up in America. There is no inflation. What is going on over at the Fed? In fact, some group of citizens demonstrated against a Fed a couple of weeks ago.

We understand what the Fed is up to. When you have got to discount losses that you are going to be taking on loans that went bad through the commercial banking system to countries like Mexico, and when you have to monetize $150 billion of trade deficit, you have a problem on your hands. They are taking it out in higher interest rates on the American people.

As my colleagues and I predicted, just 1 year after NAFTA, NAFTA has meant a worsening of America's trade position with Mexico. In fact, it has been cut in half. We were told, for example, in the auto industry that we would sell 60,000 more cars to Mexico, but if you look at this charter, this is the truth about what has been happening since NAFTA passed.

□ 1440

Prior to NAFTA passing, this red arrow represents how many cars and trucks Mexico was sending to the United States. Over the years we have only been sending a trickle into Mexico, represented by this little arrow.

But after NAFTA, which was supposed to make this arrow look better for our people and this arrow look worse, what do we have? We have more vehicles coming up from Mexico into the United States, and the trickle from the United States down to Mexico continues, largely automobiles going down to rental car agencies in Cancun and Yucatan and Mexico City where our people vacation. There has been no real growth of the middle class in Mexico.

With what has been happening in Mexico, what have we seen? Their currency, called the peso, has been nearly cut in half. It has been devalued by nearly 40 percent since the end of December.

What does this mean? That means that their goods will be cheaper on export, which means this number, whether it is cars or whether it is electrical wiring harnesses, whatever, it will be cheaper for them to send more into our marketplace and it will be much harder for the United States to send goods down there because our goods will become more expensive in their market.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentlewoman will yield on that point.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I think I recall that during the debate over NAFTA, the gentlewoman from Ohio, myself and others raised the point that we thought the Mexican peso had been artificially propped up and overvalued in order to try and sell the NAFTA agreement. In fact as I recall, we said we thought it was about 20 to 25 percent overvalued. Of course we were wrong. Apparently it was 40 to 50 percent overvalued.

This was clearly on the part of the financiers on both sides of the border and some of the highest political officers in both countries an attempt to distort the ultimate impact of this agreement. In fact, the Mexican opposition party has filed criminal charges

against their former president for concealing and manipulating the value of the peso, which has now crashed.

What this means, of course, is that the average Mexican worker, who has seen their wages decline rather dramatically over the last 20 years, will see another 40 or 50 percent decline relative to United States goods. Instead of having an average of $1,600 a year in buying power, that is, if they used all of their disposable income they could buy $1,600 worth of our goods, which was always the fallacy of NAFTA, it was never designed to sell goods to Mexicans, it was always designed to get cheap labor in Mexico to ship the goods here, now those Mexican workers will have total incomes in United States dollars of $800 or $900 a year. So if they save really hard, they might be able to buy a pair of running shoes at the end of the year from United States manufacturer based in Mexico, but not likely.

I think this is really key for us to explain to the American people. Not only has this happened, and not only are we now being asked to put up U.S. taxpayer dollars to prop up the peso.

This is the free market? It seems to me the free market is saying, ''The peso is worthless, let it drop.'' No, we are going to prop it up with $9 billion out of our Federal treasury with no review by the U.S. Congress. Apparently Mexico can just draw on that $9 billion whenever they want.

Beyond that what is even more outrageous is the Federal Reserve Board which controls the deposits and the currency in this country has extended a secret line of credit to Mexico under secret conditions for a secret amount.

When my staff contacted the Federal Reserve, we were just told, ''That's none of your business. We don't tell Members of Congress what we're doing.'' But if a bill comes due, if the Mexican Government declares bankruptcy or defaults, we will get the bill, the same way we did in the savings and loan crisis.

The American people are being played for suckers here again and this is what we need to communicate today. We are not going to let this keep happening without bringing the light of day to these secret deals.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to compliment the gentleman for his leadership on this and for his introduction this week, along with several cosponsors including myself, of legislation to revoke NAFTA, until we can fix all the major missing pieces that are causing the continual job loss in our country and the tremendous instability in Mexico.

In a few weeks, we here in the Congress are going to be asked to vote on a balanced budget amendment. What is going to be very interesting about this whole debate is an issue like this one, when our taxpayers can be held hostage through our own U.S. Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve. When the private sector gets in trouble they receive special treatment at the doors of the Federal Reserve and at the doors of the U.S. Treasury. None of that is voted on here. It happens through a private set of relationships, but ultimately they get our taxpayers on the hook.

I have felt for a long time that if we are going to have requirements for certain types of budget balancing here in the Congress, we ought to put some additional restraints on the Federal Reserve and on our own U.S. Treasury Department which has all these sets of special relationships which in the end hold our taxpayers hostage and they cannot do anything about it.

It is the same thing as the savings and loan crisis. It is amazing how that stealth bomber got through here. We hardly had any debate. It came through at 2 in the morning. When the private sector's big financial interests really want something done here, they can certainly achieve it without any amendments to the Constitution. It just happens through sleight of hand.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I do not want to get too far afoot on the Federal Reserve, but I think it would be interesting for people watching to know that now this Congress has subjected itself to all laws. Yet the one entity now left in this country that is exempt from virtually every law, of conflict of interest, public disclosure, freedom of information, is the Federal Reserve Board. They have these extraordinary powers.

I can call and say, ''Excuse me, I'm elected, I represent the Fourth District of Oregon, and I understand you are taking United States dollars and shipping them to Mexico to prop up the peso. I would just like to know what kind of collateral you got, what the terms of these loans are, and what you think the prospects are of repayment and how much money we're shipping to Mexico,'' and the Federal Reserve says to me, ''That's none of your business, and we don't have to tell you. This is national security.''

National security? National security when we are now paying to ship our jobs to Mexico? That is the bottom line here. We can document that there has been a net job loss through the first year of this agreement. That was not predicted by the proponents but was predicted by us.

The gentlewoman has demonstrated it very graphically with the automobile sector. In fact, autos were the No. 3 loser. The No. 1 loser was machinery and electric parts, which was going to build things in Mexico that will be shipped back here. They are a loser. Optical and photo was a big loser, and autos were No. 3.

We had a few winners. Tobacco. We exported more tobacco products to Mexico, we exported more articles of cork, and the Mexicans bought a lot more antiques and art from the United States during the last year.

How many jobs does that produce in America versus the deficit we are running in autos and other critical manufacturing sectors and a growing deficit and one that is going to grow astronomically with the devaluation of the peso?

These are questions that need to be asked and I really appreciate the fact that the gentlewoman has the guts to stand up here on the floor, because there is a lot of pressure, and you know it, for us not to talk out about this.

Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate the gentleman's courage in doing so as well, and I find your statistic on art very interesting.

Because at the same time as we are losing jobs to Mexico, and our people's wages are not going up, art would be one of the major exports from the United States to Mexico. In 1991 there were only two billionaires in Mexico. Today there are over two dozen.

At the same time as the average Mexican citizen has lost buying power, if they were lucky enough to have $100 in savings in a local institution there, it has just been cut to $60. but somebody down there, and I have a hunch who it is, has been purchasing very expensive items, and I would guess it is those families that traditionally have owned everything in that country and command the wealth and the real political power inside that nation

One of the questions we are asking, in fact, we are sending a letter today to the U.S. Treasury Department in the Clinton administration asking them about this $18 billion bailout of Mexico. Some of the questions I would just like to read, because I think the American people should be thinking about these as well:

The first one is that in view of the fact that our banks in this country are earning historic profits, and they have been for several months now, why is our Government's intervention in the form of this currency swap and special Government loans necessary? If the private sector gambles and loses in a country like Mexico, why should those losses not be borne by the private sector? Why do we allow these people who are buying art to get off scot-free and then run right up to the door of our treasury and ask the American taxpayers to back up loans to bail them out?

Back years ago this happened again when the Brady bonds were created, if people have long memories back in the late 1980's. That debt that was accrued by Latin American nations in those days, what happened to it?

□ 1450

Well, folks, it is still out there. It is now in the form of Brady bonds, and in 1990 Mexico had to convert $33 billion of its debt to Brady bonds, and guess that the interest rate is on those bonds? Forty percent.

When Mexico pays or is supposed to be paying off all of these debts, who is earning the 40 percent? One of the questions we are asking the Treasury is we would like to know does anybody on my street have a right to buy those 40 percent bonds?

Mr. DEFAZIO. Would it not be nice if some of these interest earnings, extended with the backing of the U.S. Government, went to help defray our own deficit here in the United States? Would it not be refreshing if for once the American taxpayers did not just extend guarantees and send taxpayers' dollars but in effect they were getting a return?

I know that is not the case. The 40 percent interest is going to private investors, the largest banks in the country who are now desperately knocking at the doors; actually they are inside. We are not allowed in, but they are inside saying we would like another $10 billion for Mexico. Please send it now because we are worried out our investments and our payments. They are not worried about the American taxpayers.

Ms. KAPTUR. When we are sending this letter, and I am glad you led me in to it here, the second question in our letter to the administration is to what specific banking and corporate interests does Mexico's first $26 billion in outstanding obligations that come due this year, in fact $10 billion of that comes due in the first quarter of this year, go? Specifically we want to know names of institutions and bond holders largely in this country that Mexico owes money to. It would be very interesting to see who they are.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Now we are going to lend them taxpayer dollars under this line of credit to repay the loans made by private interests in this country.

Ms. KAPTUR. Would it not be great if every American who owned a home mortgage could do the same thing? In other words, rather than paying their mortgage payment next month, all they have to do is call the Federal Reserve, sit around the table, and rather than paying the mortgage payment they give them a loan to pay it off. Great concept.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And it comes from other taxpayers.

Ms. KAPTUR. That is right. And one of the issues here, the third question we are going to ask of those business entities incorporated in the United States to which Mexico is indebted, we would like to know which ones of these business entities hold voting rights at the district Federal Reserve offices and in which regions of the country. I would sure like to know how the Midwest compares to the Northeast and to the Northwest and to the South of this country. It would really be nice to know who has special favors at the Fed.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I would just like for the people who are watching to know this is not an ''I told you so.'' And we are going to go through the list of things we predicted would happen with NAFTA that have come to pass, including the peso devaluation. But there are a lot of short memories in Washington, DC, and a short attention span in the media when it comes to these very critical issues. But ''I told you so'' is not going to be enough in this case because thousands more American jobs such as the ones the gentlewoman talked about are at risk, and now tens of billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars are at risk and ''I told you so'' is not an adequate response. And that is why we are speaking here today and that is also why we will be introducing, this week, legislation to trigger the repeal provisions of NAFTA. There was a 6-month option out of NAFTA and we are introducing legislation to say this has worked as poorly and as badly and even worse than we ever anticipated. It is a loser for the American taxpayers, it is a loser for the American workers, it is a loser for the Mexican worker, and a loser for the environment along the Mexican border and the United States border, and it is time to repeal it and put in place an agreement that will benefit people on both sides of the border and help raise standards of living rather than depress them and bankrupt the Treasury.

I will have to step off the floor but I will be back because I want to continue the discussion. And I believe the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] will step up and take my place.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you very much, Congressman DEFAZIO. I think it is important for the audience to know this is a bipartisan effort. In fact, conservative Republicans, conservative Democrats and moderate Democrats, mainline Democrats are all supporting this particular effort.

Today in the Washington Post on page A–13 there is a story that talks about what is happening in the Mexican stock market as a result of the rippling effects of this devaluation of the peso, and one of the Mexican bankers said, ''This is really a meltdown of catastrophic proportions. So we have the United States offering us loans. Eventually you get yourself another $20 billion in debt, and how are you going to pay for it?'' And that is really the reason we are very concerned and why we have asked for NAFTA to be revoked because we would like to know, and we have asked this question in letters we are sending to the Treasury, if Mexico defaults, as nations have had trouble paying their debts in the past, is it the intention of our Treasury Department to enlarge the assistance? And what about the Federal Reserve? We are very concerned that the commercial banks that are involved in these lines of credit, that in the peso bailout their lines of credit are uncollateralized. That is how we got into trouble back during the last Latin American debt bailout, they were uncollateralized loans. Why are our commercial banks, from what we have read in the paper, since the Fed will not talk to us directly on this, why are they being allowed to have uncollateralized loans?

I know the gentleman from Vermont, who has been such a leader on this, is on the floor, and it is a pleasure to welcome him on our side.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for her leadership over the years. It is a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Oregon, PETE DEFAZIO, as well as other Members of the Congress. I am delighted to join with my colleagues today in supporting legislation which would repeal the NAFTA agreement that Congress passed last year.

When Congress passed NAFTA last year we were told that this trade agreement would be a step forward for both the economy of the United States and the economy of Mexico. We were told that it would be a win-win situation.

Unfortunately, 1 year later it appears to be a lose-lose agreement. Today up to 50,000 American workers have lost their jobs as a result of NAFTA and have filed for NAFTA trade-assistance benefits. The Mexican economy today is staggering and wages in Mexico are plummeting. Most alarmingly, is in the last few weeks the United States Treasury Department has opened up a $9 billion line of credit in order to shore up the sinking Mexican peso and they have encouraged United States commercial banks to lend additional billions of dollars to shore up the peso, all of which could very well lead to a disaster for the American taxpayer who ultimately could be asked to pick up the damage.

It seems to me that what NAFTA is about is a continuation of a trade policy in this country which has been very unfortunate for the average American worker.

Today in this country, and we do not talk about this terribly often, we have a $150 billion trade deficit. With NAFTA that deficit is becoming worse. I feel that GATT will only accelerate that problem.

Economists tell us that for every $1 billion in trade we create some 20,000 jobs. That means that with $150 billion trade deficit we are looking at the loss of 3 million jobs.

Second of all, when we look at the economy in America today, there are people who say the economy is doing fine, we are creating new jobs. The point to make is what kind of new jobs are we creating, what kind of old jobs are we losing?

The new jobs that we are creating are, by and large, low-wage, part-time, temporary jobs that often have no benefits at all. The manufacturing jobs we are losing, in agreements like NAFTA, are decent-paying jobs that have good benefits.

□ 1500

That process of losing decent-paying manufacturing jobs and replacing them with low-wage, part-time, service-industry jobs is one of the reasons that the average American worker is seeing a major decline in his or her standard of living. It seems to me that the beneficiaries of the NAFTA agreement, and as you will recall, I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], the

people who pushed hardest for this agreement will be the major multinational corporations in America who will take our jobs to Mexico where they can pay people a dollar an hour, or today with the devaluation of the peso even less.

Who are we kidding? Why will large corporations pay American workers $10 an hour, provide decent benefits, have to protect the environment, when they can go to Mexico and get the unfortunate and desperate Mexican workers to work for substandard wages, when they can go to China and hire people in an authoritarian society at 20 cents an hour?

I think it is absolutely appropriate that we in Congress demand the repeal of NAFTA, that we make certain that the American taxpayers are not stuck with a billion dollar bill in trying to shore up the peso or protecting American banks who are lending the Mexican Government money, and I also think it is very appropriate that we begin to take a fundamental and hard look at our entire trade policy, which has worked to benefit large corporations but has worked detrimentally to the needs of the average American worker. So I think that we are doing something that is important.

I hope that we will gather more and more support from Members of Congress to stand up, to repeal NAFTA, and to reverse our trade policies.

Ms. KAPTUR. I appreciate the gentleman joining us today, and your leadership on this throughout our country has just been tremendous, I say to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], and your people are very lucky to have you as their Representative, for sure. I am sure you are as distraught as I am that people like ourselves receive phone calls from the administration, whether it is this administration or the prior administration, anytime we try to question when the big interests are able to get special access at the U.S. Treasury Department or at the Federal Reserve, it is amazing to me how quickly the administration responds.

So, for example, if it Mattel Corp. or the Big Three or some of the big investment houses stand to lose anything, right away they get invited over to the Fed. They get welcomed. In fact, we were called by the Treasury Department very concerned about our saying anything about this whole question of the peso bailout here in Congress today. Yet when we tried to call them over a year ago and tried to get them interested and get the administration interested in workers across this country who would lose their jobs, they would not even come over and meet with us.

We wanted to put provisions in NAFTA to pay the kind of attention that is being paid to the investment community to the workers of our country, and we were given short shrift. In fact, we were not even welcomed into 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, those of us concerned about what is happening to workers across this country. Yet we know there has been one factory a day closed in this country as a result of NAFTA.

We have a list in our office of thousands and thousands of U.S. workers losing their jobs, 50 jobs here, and in Horsham, PA, 40-some workers who used to make bridal and bridesmaids gowns, at Alfred Angelo Co., in Bennington, VT, your home State.

Mr. SANDERS. That was the Johnson Control factory in Bennington, VT, and that was a very painful situation, very serious loss to our community and to the hundreds of workers who were affected.

The only word I want to add to what you are saying, I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR], as important as it is to document the loss of jobs, there is another process going on as well, and that is the lowering of wages of workers whose jobs remain in existence.

Very clearly when you have a process by which jobs are going to Mexico and China, when workers go into their employers and say, ''We want a decent wage increase,'' what the employers are saying is, ''Hey, you better take a 10-percent decrease in wages or we can take your jobs to Mexico or anyplace else.'' So this whole process in putting continuous pressure on the decline of real wages in America. That is a very important point to keep reaffirming.

Ms. KAPTUR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] has joined us here today, such a strong voice for industrial and manufacturing America. We are thrilled to have you as a cosponsor and welcome you here this afternoon.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, sitting back in my office, to hear that you have taken this time to have this discussion.

As a relatively new Member just beginning my second term, you both know how hard we all fought and the message we carried during that year 1993, and we said that these things that have happened were going to happen. I sat on the Banking Committee. We knew there were problems with the peso. We knew there were problems with integrating the Mexican banking industry with the United States banking industry. Yet all of this was ignored when NAFTA came to the floor. It passed and became the law of the land.

Actually being rather new at this legislative business, I told those people who live in my district, a very blue-collar area around Pittsburgh, I put a lot of my heart, soul, and blood and sweat into my first year here into defeating something that I felt was very wrong not only for the workers in my district but very wrong for the workers across this Nation. That is NAFTA.

I would very much prefer that I be wrong. I want to be wrong. I want someone to say, ''It is because you are new; you do not understand trade, Congressman RON KLINK. This is going to work. All of these promises. All of these jobs are going to be created. And you know what, the 160,000 manufacturing jobs that you lost in southwestern Pennsylvania over two decades, that whole thing is going to be reversed now because we have passed NAFTA, and we are now going into GATT and the trade policies, the gurus who have run trade for our country under Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents, are all right, and we are all wrong. We will go back and get educated and we will learn later on.''

It is very painful to me, my fellow Members who have fought very hard against NAFTA with me, to stand here today. We do not want to say we told you so. We would prefer to be here taking up another issue, enjoying the prosperity, having our workers making a very livable wage, having them be able to have additional free time in the evenings and weekends to be with their families, creating safe and secure communities. But instead what has happened is all of those people who rushed down to Mexico to make investments are now asking the people who live in our districts to bail out the peso, to bail out the investments that they have made in Mexico over the past year, because they have lost 40 percent on their investments.

The peso was being propped up before the NAFTA agreement. It was being propped up falsely before this NAFTA agreement was ever secured.

Ms. KAPTUR. Just for a second, it interested me at what point the Government of Mexico decided to devalue the peso. You know, they have their Presidential elections in August, so everything was quiet up until August. Then we had a GATT vote here, and that was right after elections. We delayed it. Nothing was said. Nobody wanted to upset the applecart.

Then we had the vote on GATT here late in November, and, boom, right after that, when everything was set and secure, then the decision was made to devalue the peso, and our Government knew for a long time this was coming, the officials over at Treasury and the Fed.

So it was all orchestrated at the highest levels, no debate down here, no discussion, and now, as you say, our people have to foot the bill.

Mr. KLINK. If the gentlewoman would yield further, I will say that we brought up, and I remember all of us being on the floor during the GATT, that we knew that there were problems. Now we have got small staffs that deal with trying to solve problems that our constituents have with the Federal Government. We have legislative staffs that help us to do whatever our legislative assignments are on whatever committees and subcommittees we serve. But we do not have the ability, none of us, as Members of Congress, have the ability to be able to

monitor each and every one of these agreements and each and every piece of legislation we vote on. Oh, but that we could. But we know there was a rotten apple in the barrel. We knew something was going on, no hearings, mock hearings they call it, on GATT, no real hearings. You are right, the Mexican elections went by the board. But what happened unfortunately again was that immediately after the passage of NAFTA we saw an uprising in Chiapas and, unfortunately, those people from Mexico, those scholars and those people working on the Mexican side, also against NAFTA, told us this unrest was going to occur. We knew there was going to be a problem in Mexico.

It did not take a week for bloodshed to begin to occur, and we have seen the problem of illegal aliens exacerbated.

My own State of Pennsylvania, No. 1 in the Nation with NAFTA trade-adjustment assistance applications, so it did not take long for these things to begin to happen.

The gentleman from Oregon is now here who has really been one of our leaders in the anti-NAFTA movement, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], and who really has authored this bill that we are here as proponents of today.

It is time, I say to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], and I thank you for your leadership, it is time that we pull off the mask, that we stop the charade and say this NAFTA has been a failure, it has been a failure to us as legislators, to the administration, to the American workers, and to the American investors, and even those corporations who have gone down there thinking they were finding tall, green grass and found out instead there is deep red ink.

I think deep red ink would be a polite description of what they are into in Mexico.

But what the gentleman said, and I thought this is something, these issues are so awesome; talk about the Federal Reserve Board, talk about the secret transfers of billions of dollars, the Treasury extending a line of credit of $9 billion of our dollars. A lot of people listening do not know what trade adjustment assistance is. What the gentleman is talking about it that in his State more people have lost their jobs and are now unemployed and have applied for a special Federal program set up under this legislation paid for this program. So when we passed this, we must have anticipated Americans were going to lose their jobs, because we set up a special program for people who lost their jobs.

Mr. KLINK. Absolutely.

Ms. KAPTUR. It is a $9 billion figure. They had a few millions of dollars to accommodate American workers. Here now we have a $9 billion bailout that we are not even aware of. I am sure it is more than that when you count the $5 billion that the Federal Reserve is putting into that. It is amazing how quickly, how quickly our Government jumps to the tune of those who have a lot of money, investors and bankers, but when it comes to workers who need attention, he and she got no attention in the body of the agreement.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Further on that point is, those 30,000 who have applied, many are lost in the Federal redtape. They have to prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that they can identify where their jobs moved to in Mexico. I believe the figure is 12,000 have been approved. That means that 18,000 are in need of special assistance. As the gentlewoman points out, out of a few hundred dollars a week for people whose jobs moved or were shifted back to Mexico, changed by United States policy, and yet at the snap of a finger, the Federal Reserve can spend billions of dollars with no Federal disclosure and the Treasury can pony up a $9 billion line of credit somehow, but the workers who are out of jobs are still waiting in line at the unemployment office, hoping, begging for a bit of help so they can get retrained.

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I think one of the questions we have to ask ourselves in this whole debate is who are the forces in America, who are the groups who pushed us into NAFTA? The answer is virtually, virtually every large multinational corporation.

Who are the forces who were opposed to NAFTA and who raised over a year ago many of the same concerns that we are raising right now? Those were the groups who represented the American workers, those were the groups who represented family farmers, those were the groups who were concerned about the environment.

What about the media? The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] made an interesting point, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] made the same point: We are talking about a $9 billion line of credit from the Treasury Department and a line of credit that we do not know from the Federal Reserve. Even in Washington, that is a lot of money.

Now, every day you turn on the television and you hear about welfare reform. Well, AFDC, aid to families with dependent children, is $12 billion, a lot of money. That is on the front pages every day. How much public discussion has this untold billions of dollars been receiving on the front pages of the paper? Money which is not going to poor people in America, money which is not going to the hungry children in America, money which is going to shore up the peso and perhaps to protect American banks which are investing in Mexico.

People in Vermont do not call me up and say, ''Bernie, I want to use my taxpayer dollar to shore up the peso.'' I do not think I have gotten one call on that issue yet.

People are concerned about our deficit, they do not want to spend billions of dollars shoring up the peso. They would like that money to go to retire our deficit, they would like to see that money go to feed hungry children, they would like to see that money going to deal with the homeless.

The second point that I want to make on this discussion: After NAFTA was passed—and everybody in this room knows that it was a tight vote, both parties split and the American people were split right down the middle, and we checked—we were concerned about the nature of the reporting that we saw during the NAFTA debates and that I am seeing right now. We checked through every large newspaper in America—the New York Times, pro-NAFTA; the Wall Street Journal, pro-NAFTA; Gannett, pro-NAFTA; and so on and so forth; 17 of the largest papers in America were all pro-NAFTA. We did not find one that was anti-NAFTA.

So I would urge and request that the corporate media pay attention to this issue, maybe admit that they were wrong, and start giving some coverage to the fact that American taxpayers may be on the line for tens of billions of dollars in bailing out the Mexican economy.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman would yield, I have five daily newspapers in my district and an untold number of weeklies. Every one of those five newspapers endorsed NAFTA.

Now just a little, tiny bit of history. I am from Oregon. We are famous for Willis Hawley. Everyone who has studied economics 101 hears about the disaster of the Great Depression having been caused by the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act was passed 9 months after the crash of the stock market. So it is hard to say that somehow those tariffs triggered the stock market crash or the Great Depression. But they become a convenient whipping boy.

Now, if anyone raises reasonable concerns about our trade agreements, the fact that we do not have reciprocity with Japan, the fact that we are giving away sovereignty with GATT, or the fact of the case of the North American Free-Trade Agreement that we are now obligated to prop up the Government of Mexico with billions of United States taxpayer dollars, you are called a protectionist. I do not call that a protectionist.

We are told that this is a national security issue. Yes, it is a national security issue. We are talking about American jobs and American taxpayer dollars, and we want to protect our national security by revising and rewriting wholesale this agreement because it is a loser for the people of this country and for the people of Mexico.

Ms. KAPTUR. Would it not be interesting to have a meeting, and I would challenge our U.S. Treasury Department and the Federal reserve. If you have ever been over to the Federal Reserve, they have the largest board room meeting table you have ever seen in your life. I do not know where they

got lumber for it. It is absolutely gigantic. On one side of the table we would have all the claimants who want our taxpayers' money, right? Would that not be great? And then on the other side we would have the representatives of every single company that has shut down in this country, and the workers that worked in those plants on the other side of the table; would that not be a great meeting over there? They would have more fun.

We would finally get the American people inside that board room and take them up to the Treasury Department, with the big room that they have over there with all the chandeliers. Would it not be an interesting meeting of all the bankers, Wall Street investors, the multinationals, the big banks who want loans and money from our taxpayers, putting our taxpayers at risk, and then the very people they put out of work in the same room? I think it would be one of the most exciting meetings in Washington.

Mr. KLINK. I think it is an interesting point that both of the gentlemen make with respect to the newspapers and their coverage on this issue. I come to this from the standpoint of having been in the news media for 24 years as a reporter myself. I think it is interesting now, and I made this point at a press conference earlier today, now that these reporters themselves are going to be asked to dig into their own pockets and take their tax dollars that are going to go to Mexico to prop up the peso, maybe all of a sudden there would be some interest in the fact that this NAFTA agreement is not working as promised.

The other point made just a few moments ago, again I think I have heard no one in my time in Congress who has been a better spokesman on corporate welfare than the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]; that is exactly what we are talking about. At a time when we have need for welfare reform, we all agree that the system is flawed, we need to make some changes to it, but we are talking about all of the welfare, 1 percent of the Federal budget. Now here we are talking about untold billions of dollars, not only in the corporate welfare that occurs in this country, but not to go offshore to prop up the peso so that this frivolous investment, this get-rich-quick scheme that pursued the signing of the NAFTA agreement, can be propped up and that they will not have to face the consequences that their investments have led them to, their faulty investments have led them. These are the same people you hear, ''You have got to prop these companies up because we can't let those people who own stock in those companies be hurt by this, because these are companies that also provide jobs here in the United States.''

The point of the matter is the reason they are in trouble is because they have not made their investments there.

□ 1520

They have not made their investment in American workers. They have decided to leave us behind, walk offshore, wherever the cheapest labor is, and they got caught, and now they want us to pay to get their fingers out of the cookie jar.

Ms. KAPTUR. I want to say something on that to the gentleman.

As my colleague knows, this talk about job training for American workers? I support all kinds of skilling up of the American work force and our kids in school, and vocational programs, and after-school programs, and college programs. But the point is, if we have got companies taking those jobs someplace else, why care how much training we give people? When they are finished with their education, there is not going to be a good-wage job with benefits there for them, and I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANDERS. I can remember on the floor of this House, in my first term 3 years ago, sometime around 2 o'clock in the morning, some $2 billion that some of us had managed to put in the budget in order to feed hungry children and take care of the needs of the millions of kids in this country who are doing without. It was taken out of the budget, my colleagues. We could not afford $2 billion to take care of hungry children in America. Big debate.

What really concerns me is not just that we are putting $9 billion into a line of credit from the Treasury Department, an untold line of credit from the Fed; what really gets me is there is no debate at all on this issue.

Now where are all of those people who ran for election in November who talked about accountability in government, who talked about the $200 billion deficit, who talked about the balanced budget amendment? Where are they now? I am listening; I do not hear anything.

I guess that when we talk about money for hungry children, when we talk about Federal aid to education, affordable housing, we cannot afford it. But when it comes to bailing out corporate America, when it comes to shoring up the peso, not only can we afford it, there is no debate, no discussion, not one word on the floor of the House.

Now our honorable new Speaker, very articulate gentleman, very clear about what he believes in; some of us are eagerly awaiting his words of wisdom on this important issue.

Last point on the issue:

In this last election 38 percent of the American people voted; 62 percent of the people did not bother to go to the polls. Tens of millions of people no longer believe that they have a voice in what happens in government, no longer believe that the U.S. Government is here to respond to their needs. They are boycotting American politics and government, and one can understand why people give up on the political process.

People are working in my State of Vermont 50, 60, 70 hours a week to keep their families afloat. They are paying too much in taxes, and now, without any discussion, we have the Government talking about a $9 billion line of credit, and that is why people are giving up on the political process.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield for just a moment, I would just like to go back to a point that came up during the press conference, and I noticed that the gentlewoman was a bit beleaguered by a reporter from her district who did not seem to understand the difference between a net trade balance and shipping a few cars to Mexico, and he would point to the representation of 2½ cars going to Mexico and say, ''Well, look, that's an increase from one and a half cars symbolized there going to Mexico. That means we send another 10,000 cars to Mexico.'' Unfortunately he was totally ignoring the other side of the ledger which showed another—I believe it is 200,000 cars coming from Mexico to the United States.

So, what this means is the United States actually entered into a deficit, a trade deficit, with Mexico for the first time in recent history of $81 million in October, and that is just the beginning. We are going to run trade deficits with Mexico.

Now I come from Oregon, and everybody says Oregon is a free-trade State, and, by gosh, we benefit from trade.

Well I met with Dr. Charles McMillan, Ph.D., contributor to the Harvard Business Review and scholar, a member of the Clinton transition team, to talk about trade issues yesterday. He said, ''Isn't it interesting?'' He said, ''In the GATT debate and the NAFTA debate we heard how every State is running a surplus and benefits from trade, but somehow the United States of America is running a $160 billion trade deficit,'' and in fact he recalculated those numbers and found out that my home State of Oregon is a net loser in trade, as is virtually every other State in the Union, and for Mr. Clinton's State, big-time losses. Thousands of jobs from his State have been shipped overseas in the last year.

Now these are points we have to make because my colleagues will read the headline. It said, ''Detroit Thrilled.'' They shipped 10,000 more cars to Mexico. It does not say Detroit really thrilled, they built 250,000 more cars in Mexico and shipped them here with dollar-an-hour labor. That is what the headline should be, but the press will not run that headline. They only run the one that comes out of the boardroom.

Ms. KAPTUR. The gentleman raises such an important point because those interests in our country, those monied interests, only want us to focus on one part of the equation, this part, the products going from America to Mexico which are——

Mr. DEFAZIO. Awful hard from here. I can hardly see it.

Ms. KAPTUR. Very, very small—and they say, ''Wow, we are sending 20,000 cars. We are doing real well. We didn't send any before.''

Of course they are sending them to rental car companies in Cancun and in Mexico City where Americans can vacation. They never talk about this number, the 277,000 cars and trucks coming the other way. It completely obliterates this, and that is why America's trade advantage with Mexico has been cut in half and, in October, went into the red. I say to my colleagues, you have to read the fine print so carefully.

It is just like articles in my own local newspaper back home when they talk about wages and they talk about the economy in our area. The last paragraph at the bottom of the page on the insert says, ''But wages didn't go up. There is job creation, but there is no wage growth, and the reason is because we are cashing out our good jobs with good benefits to the low-wage nations of the world that are largely undemocratic in nature whether it's China, whether it's Mexico, whether it's many of the nations that repress their work forces and do not in their laws provide for the dignity of work.''

It does not surprise me why our wages are going down.

Mr. DEFAZIO. And, if we use the other interesting statistic, maybe getting less esoteric here, Treasury has two sets of numbers, and that is for goods exported to Mexico that were made in the United States, and in the second is for goods that were transshipped.

We have become a point of entry for European goods that have shipped a container to New Orleans, and then will ship from New Orleans to Mexico in order to avoid the customs and tariff on European goods, and they add that into our balance of trade. Maybe one dock worker checks that container for 1 or 2 minutes of his or her day, but that was the total American contribution to that effort. But that counts as part of our exports to Mexico. It is, as my colleagues know, it is a transshipment.

I mean it is amazing, the lengths to which our Government has gone to try—and even when they get all done with that, they still have to show a deficit in October, and that was before we got to the devaluation, and does any American believe, or do any of those muckamucks really believe, that we can go on, year in, year out, running a trade deficit with the rest of the world of $120, $140, $160 billion, and someday the piper will not come due. We are not only exporting those jobs this year by running those trade deficits. Someday someone is going to ask us to cough up those dollars that we are shipping overseas. We have more than $1 trillion of Federal debt now. From 1917 until 1984 the U.S. Government was the largest creditor in the world, and now we are the largest debtor in the world. We owe more money to the rest of the world than all of those problem nations combined. Add them up, Brazil, Mexico, everybody else. Our trade debt is greater than every other nation in the world——

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, I think that is why the Federal Reserve has been hiking interest rates in this country and taking it out of the hides of our people, not because inflation is a major issue in this country, not because our people's wages are going up, because in fact they are not except for those at the very, very top. But I think that is why the Fed is raising interest rates, because they are having to monetize the traded goods sector, and we have held these huge deficits with the rest of the world. I think with China it will be over $40 billion more of Chinese goods coming into this country than United States goods going over there this year. With Japan it will be a similar number. For the last 15 years we have not had any kind of trade balance with Japan. I do not think we have ever had one in fact. Now with Mexico the advantage we had is just disappearing overnight.

□ 1530

So I think that is why interest rates are really going up in this country.

Mr. SANDERS. The absurdities pile on top of the absurdities. Not only is everything that you are saying true in my opinion, but on top of that, we are spending tens and tens of billions of dollars to defend Asis against whom I am not exactly sure.

Some years ago we were told that it was necessary to spend huge amounts of money defending freedom against the Communist Chinese dictatorship. Well, surprise, surprise. The last I read, the Chinese Communist dictatorship still exists. But now they are OK because they are, for the first time, and have been for a number of years, welcoming tens of billions of dollars of American corporate investment. So we are spending huge amounts of money defending somebody in Asia, I am not exactly sure, against a country which now welcomes American corporate investment, and in fact many of the corporations like China, because it is very difficult for the Chinese workers to stand up and defend their own rights.

So the absurdity piles on top of the absurdity.

Ms. KAPTUR. Last week, we had the swearing in of Members of Congress, and there was a performance in the afternoon by a group called the Power Rangers, which is a very popular toy where they have these animated shows that they take around the country and around the world. And most Americans do not realize that that particular toy, which sold over 300 million dollars' worth in our marketplace last year, there is not a single one made in this country.

In fact, the Power Rangers is owned by Bandai Corp., which is a Tokyo-based company. They employ about 700 people in Tokyo only in marketing. They employ all of their workers in Asia, especially in China and Thailand, and they pay them nothing. They then take those low wage produced goods and they sell them over here from $29 all the way up, there are some $5.95 figurines. But if you go into your local toy store, which I did and I turned over every toy that was there, they were all produced in China, they were produced in Thailand. And somebody is making the money off of the out sourcing of production by these big multinationals, whether it is Bandai or Mattel, which is located in our country. And most young girls do not know that there is not a single Barbie doll made in America. Mattel has out sourced all of its production, and yet the children, these companies look upon our children not as children, but as a market, as a market. And they buy time on all these television shows and all of the rest. And none of our workers are working, yet parents and grandparents go to the store, they want to buy that for their child or their grandchild, and they pay top dollar, $29 all the way up to $200.

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentlewoman would yield on that, because this is a point that occasionally a constituent brings up with me. And they say look, if we didn't have this free-trade agreement with Mexico, consumers would suffer. I said wait a minute, do you think that Chrysler, which is building a new large Dodge Ram truck plant, a truck that sells for a minimum, I think, of $15,000, some of them sell for as much as $30,000, I said do you think Mexicans with their former average earnings of $1,700 a year, this week reduced to about $800 or $900, are going to be buying many of the Dodge Rams which they build? And they say, well, no.

I said, have you noticed that since Chrysler or other United States firms started building these trucks in Mexico, that the price has come down? Oh, no.

Have you noticed that the profits have gone up, but the price has not come down?

Well, now that you say that, yeah, I guess I did notice they had their most profitable quarter ever.

I say that is the point. Even if you can argue that we should produce goods overseas because we can exploit cheap labor and it will be beneficial to the American consumer, the bottom line is that does not happen. The prices do not go down. The profits go up.

Nike Corp., based in Portland, OR, they don't make anything in America anymore. They used to manufacture shoes here.

Ms. KAPTUR. If the gentleman will yield, I read that Nike, it costs them $8 to make a pair of sneakers in China. They have some white collar workers up there in Oregon that are marketing people, just like the Bandai Corp., in Tokyo with Power Rangers. It costs them $8 because they pay their workers 10 cents an hour in places that you and

I have never been in China. The American public doesn't see it. They ship the shoes over here, and we are charged $66.99 all the way up to $150, but they pay Charles Barkley $20 million to make us all feel good through advertising when we buy those shoes. And there are very few shoe manufacturing companies, most of those were located in Congressman SANDERS' region of the country, very few shoe manufacturing companies left in this country.

So our people are really being put over a barrel. And you are right, prices do not go down, but corporate profits go up. Prices go up and our wages are coming down. And there are some pretty significant reasons for it.

Mr. KLINK. If the gentlewoman will yield, I had the distinct honor last year to chair a hearing in Wilkes-Barre, PA, it was a company by the name of Leslie Fay. This gets us back to NAFTA. Because you understand at the time when we are being asked to prop up the peso, the administration and others are taking a look at how can we expand this NAFTA agreement to Central America and to South America.

This hearing was because the Leslie Fay Company wanted to pull out thousands of jobs from Wilkes-Barre, garment workers, and they wanted to take these jobs down to Central America. And we had two blouses there. One was made in Central America, and it was a $50 blouse, and the workers were paid 35 cents an hour. The other one was made by Leslie Fay workers in Wilkes-Barre, PA, and it costs $48, and the workers were paid over mininum wage for certain. So there is no savings on this.

Ms. KAPTUR. I believe that our time has expired. I just wanted to thank the gentleman here, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK], and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], for their leadership in speaking for up for the people of the United States, the people of the continent, and the people of the world, not just those investors in large multinational corporations who have access to the media and to our own financial centers.

□ 1540

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 34) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 34

Resolved, That the following named Members be and they are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. Moakley, Ranking Minority Member;
Mr. Beilenson;
Mr. Frost;
Mr. Hall of Ohio.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BALDACCI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCINTOSH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCINTOSH, for 5 minutes, today, and on January 13.
Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BALDACCI) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. TRAFICANT in six instances.
Mr. LEVIN in two instances.
Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.
Mr. SCHUMER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCINTOSH) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. CHAMBLISS.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
Mr. PACKARD.
Mrs. VUCANOVICH.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
Mr. HOKE.
Mr. WOLF.
Mr. LAZIO of New York.
Mr. NEY.
Mr. BILIRAKIS.
Mr. WALSH in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. QUINN.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.
Mr. MCCOLLUM.
Mr. KIM.
Mr. ORTON in two instances.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Ms. KAPTUR.
Mr. MCCOLLUM.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. GEPHARDT.
Mr. FORBES.
Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.
Mr. HOKE.
Mr. GALLEGLY.
Mr. SHUSTER.
Mr. DUNCAN.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Ms. ESHOO.
Mr. UPTON.
Mr. FILNER.
Mr. STARK.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, January 13, 1995, at 10 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports of various House committees concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by them during the first, second, third and fourth quarters of 1994 in connection with official foreign travel, as well as the consolidated report of Speaker authorized foreign travel for the third quarter 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, and 1994 reports of various miscellaneous groups, are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Julian Dixon	5/27	5/31	Caribbean area								
Hon. Bill Richardson	5/27	5/31	Caribbean area								
Calvin Humphrey	5/27	5/31	Caribbean area								
Total									964.00		964.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN GLICKMAN,
Chairman, Oct. 17, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Ron Wyden	1/31	2/1	Japan		393.00		1,176.95				1,569.95
Hon. Bill Sarpalius	1/12	1/15	Russia		950.00		1,784.95				2,734.95
Christropher Mattson	1/12	1/15	Russia		950.00		1,784.95				2,734.95
Hon. John LaFalce	1/11	1/13	Mexico		213.00		675.45				888.45
Marilyn Seiber	1/11	1/13	Mexico		213.00		450.45				663.45
Steve Jenning	12/26	1/6	England		[3] 138.00		520.45				658.45
Hon. John LaFalce	3/30	4/1	England		552.00						552.00
Committee total					3,409.00		6,393.20				9,802.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Reflects actual expenses.

JOHN LaFALACE,
Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. William J. Hughes	5/27	5/29	Sweden		482.00						482.00
	5/29	5/31	Finland		352.00						352.00
	5/31	6/2	Russia		600.00						600.00
	6/2	6/4	France		580.00		1,721.10				2,301.10
	6/4	6/7	Greece		639.00						639.00
Military air transportation [3]											
Hayden Gregory	5/27	5/29	Sweden		482.00						482.00
	5/29	5/31	Finland		352.00						352.00
	5/31	6/2	Russia		600.00						600.00
	6/2	6/4	France		580.00		1,721.10				2,301.10
	6/4	6/7	Greece		639.00						639.00
Military air transportation [3]											
William Patry [4]	6/2	6/4	France		580.00						580.00
Committee total					5,886.00		3,442.20				9,328.20

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Will be reported by the Committee on Armed Services.
[4] No transportation expenses.

JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, Oct. 18, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Joan M. Bondareff	4/8	4/11	Panama		414.00		(3)				414.00
Douglas J. Cheramie III	4/8	4/11	Panama		414.00		[4] 552.95				966.95
Gene Green, M.C.	4/8	4/11	Panama		414.00						414.00
George Hochbrueckner, M.C.	4/8	4/11	Panama		414.00						414.00
Sheila Clarke McCready	5/27	5/29	Sweden	3,750.50	482.00		(3)				
	5/29	5/31	Finland	1,900.80	352.00						
	5/31	6/4	Russia		1,250.00						
	6/4	6/7	Greece	157,450	639.00						2,723.00
Richard M. Russell	5/27	5/29	Sweden	3,750.50	482.00		(3)				
	5/29	5/31	Finland	1,900.80	352.00						
	5/31	6/4	Russia		1,250.00						
	6/4	6/7	Greece	157,450	639.00						2,723.00
Karen L. Steuer	6/22	6/24	France	4,767.60	870.00		[4] 659.95				1,529.95
Billy Tauzin, M.C.	4/8	4/11	Panama		414.00		(3)				414.00
Robert L. Wharton	5/27	5/29	Sweden	3,750.50	482.00		(3)				
	5/29	5/31	Finland	1,900.80	352.00						
	5/31	6/4	Russia		1,250.00						
	6/4	6/7	Greece	157,450	639.00						2,723.00
Cynthia M. Wilkinson	4/8	4/11	Panama		414.00		(3)				414.00
Committee total					12,323.00		2,086.05				14,409.05

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Transportation provided by Department of Defense.
[4] Commercial airfare.

GERRY E. STUDDS,
Chairman, Aug. 26, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Joan T. Rose	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/29	Thailand		638.99						638.99
Military air transportation											

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Commercial airfare							3,304.95				3,304.95
Committee total					1,423.99		3,304.95				4,728.94

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

E de la GARZA,
Chairman, Oct. 31, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to Germany, Bulgaria, Austria, and Hungary, July 1–11, 1994:											
Hon. Earl Hutto	7/1	7/5	Germany		1,000.00						1,000.00
	7/5	7/7	Bulgaria		516.00						516.00
	7/7	7/8	Austria		240.00						240.00
	7/8	7/11	Hungary		657.00						657.00
Commercial airfare							1,003.05				1,003.05
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	7/1	7/5	Germany		1,000.00						1,000.00
	7/5	7/7	Bulgaria		516.00						516.00
	7/7	7/8	Austria		240.00						240.00
	7/8	7/11	Hungary		657.00						657.00
Commercial airfare							1,003.05				1,003.05
Visit to Cuba and Jamaica, July 3–4, 1994:											
Ms. Hazel Ross-Robinson	7/3	7/3	Cuba		0.00						0.00
	7/3	7/4	Jamaica		148.31						148.31
Visit to Russia, July 4–10, 1994:											
Hon. Glen Browder	7/4	7/10	Russia		2,000.00						2,000.00
Commercial airfare							3,424,95				3,424,95
Mr. Stephen O. Rossetti	7/4	7/10	Russia		2,000.00						2,000.00
Commercial airfare							3,424.95				3,424.95
Mr. Paul F. Walker	7/4	7/10	Russia		2,000.00						2,000.00
Commercial airfare							3,424.95				3,424.95
Visit to Korea, Thailand, and Republic of China, August 22–31, 1994:											
Hon. Marilyn Lloyd	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Republic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							2,514.38				2,514.38
Hon. Floyd Spence	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/29	Republic of China		259.00						259.00
Commercial airfare							2,148.00				2,148.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Republic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							2,527.00				2,527.00
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Republic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							1,524.54				1,524.54
Mr. Andre K. Ellis	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Republic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							1,524.54				1,524.54
Ms. Cathleen D. Garman	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Republic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							1,524.54				1,524.54
Delegation expenses	8/25	8/28	Thailand				1,120.08		3,153.28		4 273.36
Visit to Germany, August 22–26, 1994:											
Archie D. Barrett	8/23	8/26	Germany		599.00						599.00
Committee total					24,261.31		25,164.03		3,153.28		52,578.62

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RONALD V. DELLUMS,
Chairman, Oct. 28, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Ron DeLugo	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					
Gene Green	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					
Ron DeLugo	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					
Gene Green	8/25	8/29	England	728.67	1,132.00	(3)					
Committee total					4,977.00						4,977.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

WILLIAM D. FORD,
Chairman, Oct. 24, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
David Leach	7/19	7/24	Russia		1,600.00		3,013.55				4,613.55
Gerald Waldron	7/19	7/24	Russia		1,600.00		3,013.55				4,613.55
Catherine Reid	7/19	7/24	Russia		1,600.00		3,013.55				4,613.55
Michael Regan	7/19	7/24	Russia		1,600.00		3,013.55				4,613.55
Douglas Bennett	6/28	7/1	Switzerland		995.98		3,114.95				4,110.93
David Finnegan	8/28	9/1	Switzerland		1,335.00		2,100.15				3,435.15
Catherine Van Way	8/28	9/1	Switzerland		1,335.00		2,100.15				3,435.15
Al Swift, M.C.	8/27	8/31	Germany		944.00						944.00
	8/31	9/3	Italy		873.00						873.00
	9/3	9/5	Spain		488.00						488.00
Billy Tauzin, M.C.	8/27	8/31	Germany		944.00						944.00
	8/31	9/3	Italy		873.00						873.00
	9/3	9/5	Spain		488.00						488.00
Mike Oxley, M.C.	8/27	8/31	Germany		944.00						944.00
	8/31	9/3	Italy		873.00						873.00
	9/3	9/5	Spain		488.00						488.00
Arthur Endress	8/27	8/31	Germany		944.00						944.00
	8/31	9/3	Italy		873.00						873.00
	9/3	9/5	Spain		488.00						488.00
Committee total					19,285.98		19,369.45				38,655.43

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Oct. 26, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. G. Ackerman	8/8	8/10	Cuba		[3] 200.00		2,065.00				2,265.00
P. Berkowitz	8/31	9/4	Thailand/Bangkok		1,065.00				60.50		1,125.50
	9/4	9/6	Thailand/Udorn		131.00						131.00
	9/6	9/7	Laos/Vietiene		[3] 142.00						142.00
	9/7	9/9	Thailand/Bangkok		426.00						426.00
Commercial airfare							3,698.95				3,698.95
Hon. H. Berman	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00		186.31		477.26		1,823.57
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czechoslovakia		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military air transportation											
E. Broitman	8/20	8/30	Indonesia		450.00						450.00
	8/30	9/5	Thailand		1,638.00				60.50		1,698.50
	9/9	9/10									
	9/6	9/9	Laos		426.00						426.00
Commercial airfare							5,698.95				5,698.95
G. Cannon	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00		186.31		477.26		1,823.57
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czechoslovakia		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military air transportation											
	8/21	8/15	United Kingdom		333.00						333.00
	8/15	8/21	Israel		876.00						876.00
Commercial airfare							5,444.95				5,444.95
	10/2	10/9	Japan		2,600.00						2,600.00
Commercial airfare							3,891.95				3,891.95
N. Carman	8/28	9/4	Switzerland		[3] 1,620.60						1,612.60
Commercial airfare							2,063.05				2,063.05
F.M. Chambers	8/28	9/2	El Salvador		905.00						905.00
Commercial airfare							867.95				867.95
	9/15	9/18	Belgium						93.00		93.00
Commercial airfare							2,360.25				2,360.25
Hon. P. Deutsch	7/3	7/3	Cuba		(4)						
	7/3	7/3	Jamaica		(4)						
Commercial airfare							226.95				226.95
C. Doherty	7/5	7/9	Austria		[3] 864.00						864.00
Military air transportation											
M. Ennis	8/28	9/2	El Salvador		905.00						905.00
Commercial airfare							867.95				867.95
Hon. E. Faleomavaega	7/1	7/11	China		2,049.00						2,049.00
Commercial airfare							3,805.95				3,805.95
M. Gage	7/5	7/8	Austria		[3] 598.00						598.00
	7/8	7/12	Yugoslavia		[3] 789.00						789.00
	7/12	7/13	Hungary		[3] 182.00						182.00
Military transportation one-way											
Commercial transportation one-way							983.00				983.00
R. Garon	8/28	8/30	Burundi		142.00						142.00
Military air transportation											
B. Gordon	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00		186.31		477.26		1,823.57
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czech Republic		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military air transportation											
	8/11	8/15	France		1,204.00						1,204.00
	8/15	9/6	Israel		1,460.00						1,460.00
Commercial airfare							1,378.15				1,378.15
D. Gordon	8/13	8/19	Ethopia		1,130.00						1,130.00
	8/19	8/23	Kenya		856.00						856.00
	8/23	8/29	South Africa		1,215.00						1,215.00
	8/29	9/1	Mozambique		840.00						840.00
Commercial airfare							6,095.95				6,095.95
K. Grant	8/13	8/19	Ethopia		[3] 800.00						800.00
	8/19	8/23	Kenya		[3] 725.00						725.00
	8/23	8/29	South Africa		[3] 915.00						915.00
	8/29	9/1	Mozambique		[3] 700.00						700.00
	9/1	9/2	South Africa		[3] 140.00						140.00
	9/2	9/3	Kenya		[3] 180.00						180.00
	9/3	9/7	Egypt		[3] 893.00						893.00
Commercial airfare							6,299.95				6,299.95
	9/25	9/29	Czech Republic		[3] 900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							1,518.85				1,518.85

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
A. Griffin	8/28	8/30	Burundi		142.00						142.00
Military air transportation											
	8/30	8/30					353.00		96.47		449.47
	8/31	9/3	Egypt		600.00						600.00
Commercial airfare							2,151.00				2,151.00
Hon. A. Hastings	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00		186.31		477.26		1,823.57
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czech Republic		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military air transportation											
T. Hirsch	8/11	8/15	France		1,120.00						1,120.00
	8/15	8/29	Israel		1,022.00						1,022.00
Commercial airfare							1,420.15				1,420.15
G. Ingram	8/13	8/19	Ethiopia		542.00						542.00
	8/19	8/30	Kenya		1,070.00						1,070.00
	8/30	8/30	Ethiopia								
Commercial airfare							5,258.25				5,258.25
B. Jenkins	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00		186.31		477.26		1,823.57
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czech Republic		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military air transportation											
G. Kapen	8/18	8/23	Kenya		1,070.00						1,070.00
	8/23	8/29	South Africa		1,215.00						1,215.00
	8/29	9/1	Mozambique		840.00						840.00
Commercial airfare							6,202.95				6,202.95
C. Kupchan	8/21	8/29	South Africa		[3] 1,310.00						1,310.00
	8/29	9/1	Mozambique		800.00						800.00
Commercial airfare							5,867.75				5,867.75
Hon. R. Menendez	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00		186.31		477.26		1,823.57
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czech Republic		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military air transportation											
K. Moazed	8/13	8/19	Ethiopia		1,130.00						1,130.00
	8/19	7/22	Kenya		428.00						428.00
Commercial airfare							4,382.00				4,382.00
A. Pandya	9/9	9/19	Hong Kong		3,640.00						3,640.00
Commercial airfare									3,537.95		3,537.95
Hon. D. Payne	8/28	8/30	Burundi		142.00						142.00
Military air transportation											
B. Poisson	8/20	8/30	Indonesia		450.00						450.00
	8/30	9/5	Thailand		1,638.00				60.50		1,698.50
	9/9	9/10									
	9/6	9/9	Laos		426.00						426.00
Commercial airfare							5,698.95				5,698.95
D. Restrepo	8/28	9/2	El Salvador		905.00						905.00
Commercial airfare							867.95				876.95
D. Shapiro	8/15	8/20	Israel		876.00						876.00
Commercial airfare							2,386.15				2,386.15
M. Sletzinger	7/5	7/8	Austria		648.00						648.00
	7/8	7/12	Yugoslavia		864.00						864.00
	7/12	7/13	Hungary		215.00						215.00
Military transportation, one-way											
Commercial transportation, one-way							983.00				983.00
Hon. C. Smith	7/22	7/24	Peru		522.00						522.00
Commercial airfare							2,740.95				2,740.95
Committee totals					$6,544.00		$12,677.00		$60.50		$19,281.50
D. Taft	7/22	7/24	Peru		522.00						522.00
Commercial airfare							2,430.95				2,430.95
R. Wilson	8/8	8/10	Cuba		[3] 200.00		1,486.00				1,686.00
Grant total for the 3rd quarter											155,323.79

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Represents refunds of unused per diem.
[4] A few hours.

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Oct. 28, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. William J. Hughes	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Republic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							2,514.38				2,514.38
Military air transportation [3]											
Committee total					2,201.00		2,514.38				4,715.38

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Will be reported by the Committee on Armed Forces.

JACK BROOKS,
Chairman, Nov. 29, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Shelia Clarke McCready	7/9	7/12	Germany		[3] 800.00		[4] 873.15				1,673.15

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Fred Zeytoonjian, Jr	9/10	9/18	Norway		[3] 1,000.00		[4] 1,261.65		[5] 500.00		2,761.64
Committee total							2,134.80		500.00		4,434.80

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Cash advance issued by U.S. Department of State.
[4] Commercial airfare.
[5] Cash advance for registration fee.

GERRY E. STUDDS,
Chairman, Dec. 27, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
William Clay	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					1,215.00
Melvin Watt	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					1,215.00
Alcee Hastings	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					1,215.00
Gail E. Weiss	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					1,215.00
Doris Moore-Glenn	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					1,215.00
Laura Geer	8/22	8/25	Germany	1,878.39	1,215.00	(3)					1,215.00
William Clay	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					1,415.00
Melvin Watt	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					1,415.00
Alcee Hastings	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					1,415.00
Gail E. Weiss	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					1,415.00
Doris Moore-Glenn	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					1,415.00
Laura Geer	8/25	8/30	England	910.85	1,415.00	(3)					1,415.00
Committee total					15,780.00						15,780.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivlent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

WILLIAM L. CLAY,
Chairman, Oct. 18, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Butler Derrick	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00						1,160.00
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czech. Republic		1,120.00						1,120.00
Military aircraft											
Hon. Butler Derrick	8/22	8/25	Korea		785.00						785.00
	8/25	8/28	Thailand		639.00						639.00
	8/28	8/31	Repubic of China		777.00						777.00
Commercial airfare							2,514.38				2,514.38
Committee total					4,919.00		2,514.38				7,433.38

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currently is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE MOAKLEY,
Chairman, Oct. 5, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Anna Eshoo	7/1	7/5	France		1,160.00						1,160.00
	7/5	7/7	Hungary		438.00						438.00
	7/7	7/11	Czech Republic		1,120.00						1,120.00
Katherine Van Sickle	6/30	7/7	France		1,353.00				168.81		1,521.81
Commercial airfare							1,307.15				1,307.15
Michael Quear	7/6	7/9	France	4,756.68	876.00						876.00
Commercial airfare							1,248.15				1,248.15
Committee total					4,947.00		2,555.30		168.81		7,671.11

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.,
Chairman, Oct. 18, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Mike Kopetski	9/13	9/18	France	7,931.35	1,505.00						1,505.00
Committee total					1,505.00						1,505.00

SAM M. GIBBONS,
Chairman, Oct. 3, 1994.

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Frank McCloskey		7/6	United States				1,889.25				1,889.25
	7/7	7/11	Croatia		679.00						679.00
Committee total					679.00		1,889.25				2,568.25

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

STENY HOYER,
Chairman, Oct. 28, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Bill Richardson	7/16	7/19	Caribbean area		371.00						371.00
Calvin Humphrey, staff	7/16	7/19	Caribbean area		371.00						371.00
Louis Dupart	9/6	9/10	North America		900.00		589.45				1,489.45
Committee total					1,642.00		589.45				2,231.45

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN GLICKMAN,
Chairman, Oct. 17, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
David Finnegan	11/8	11/11	Switzerland		825.00		3,203.25				4,028.25
Douglas Bennett	11/7	11/10	Switzerland		1,100.00		3,126.55				4,226.55
Ripley Forbes	10/9	10/15	France		1,225.00		1,800.25		568.00		3,623.25
David Finnegan	10/15	10/19	Brazil		600.00		3,079.96				3,679.96
Van Way	10/15	10/21	Brazil		900.00		2,896.95				3,796.95
Peter Stockton	10/3	10/5	Czech Republic		460.00						460.00
	10/5	10/11	Ukraine		1,300.00						1,300.00
Commercial airfare							2,765.25				2,765.25
Bruce Chafin	9/29	10/2	Austria		570.00						570.00
	10/2	10/5	Czech Republic		690.00						690.00
	10/5	10/11	Ukraine		1,300.00						1,300.00
Commercial airfare							2,503.35				2,503.35
Robert Roach	9/29	10/2	Austria		760.00						760.00
	10/6	10/7	Austria								
	10/2	10/5	Czech Republic		920.00						920.00
Commercial airfare							2,076.05				2,076.05
Dennis Wilson	9/29	10/2	Austria		570.00						570.00
	10/2	10/5	Czech Republic		690.00						690.00
	10/5	10/11	Ukraine		1,300.00						1,300.00
Commercial airfare							2,905.65				2,905.65
Committee total					13,240.00		24,352.26		568.00		38,165.26

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
David S. Whaley	11/27	12/3	Spain	259,580	[3] 2,009.00		[4] 670.95				2,679.95

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Committee total					2,009.00		670.95				2,679.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Unused per diem in the amount of $791.84 returned to the U.S. Treasury—12/21/94 (Check #10880).
[4] Commercial airfare.

GERRY E. STUDDS,
Chairman, Dec. 27, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Robert Underwood	10/1	10/1	Palau				335.00				335.00
Committee total							335.00				335.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

GEORGE MILLER,
Chairman, Dec. 28, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. John J. LaFalce	11/14	11/15	Taiwan		234.00						234.00
	11/15	11/17	Vietnam		652.00						652.00
	11/17	11/19	Philippines		380.00						380.00
Commercial airfare							3,769.95				3,769.95
Committee total					1,266.00		3,769.95				5,035.95

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN J. LaFALCE,
Chairman, Dec. 30, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO MEXICO, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 5 AND JULY 9, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Amo Houghton (Member paid own airfare, lodging, and expenses).	7/5	7/9	Mexico								
Chet Lunner (Staffer received only per diem for trip).	7/5	7/9	Mexico		784.00						
Committee total					784.00						

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

AMO HOUGHTON,
August 8, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO IRELAND AND NORTHERN IRELAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 2 AND SEPT. 8, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Richard Neal	9/2	9/8	Ireland/Northern Ireland		1,391.00		4,474.62				5,865.62
Kevin Peterson	9/2	9/8	Ireland/Northern Ireland		1,391.00		4,444.99				5,835.99
Committee Total					2,782.00		8,919.61				11,701.61

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD E. NEAL,
Oct. 2, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO GERMANY, KAZAKHSTAN, AND RUSSIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 27 AND SEPT. 3, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Pete Peterson	8/27	8/28	Germany		173.00						1176.15
	8/28	8/30	Kazakhstan		277.00	(3)					277.00
	8/30	9/3	Russia		1,350.00		(3)				1,350.00
	9/3	9/3	Germany								
Commercial airfare							1,003.15				
Shannon Smith	8/27	8/28	Germany		1,800.00						2,803.15
	8/28	8/30	Kazakhstan				(3)				2,803.15
	8/30	9/2	Russia				(3)				
Commercial airfare							1,003.15				
Suzanne F. Farmer	8/27	8/28	Germany		173.00						1,176.15
	8/28	8/30	Kazakhstan		277.00		(3)				277.00
	8/30	9/3	Russia		1,350.00		(3)				1,350.00
	9/3	9/3	Germany								
Commercial airfare							1,003.15				
Committee total					5,400.00		3,009.45				8,409.45

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PETE PETERSON,
Chairman, Oct. 20, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO SLOVAKIA, BULGARIA, AND GERMANY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 7 AND SEPT. 20, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Cathy Brickman	9/8	9/11	Slovakia		2,400.00						2,400.00
	9/11	9/17	Bulgaria								
	9/17	9/20	Germany								
Commercial airfare							2,556.75				2,556.75
William Freeman	9/8	9/11	Slovakia		2,400.00						2,400.00
	9/11	9/17	Bulgaria								
	9/17	9/20	Germany								
Commercial airfare							2,556.75				2,556.75
Committee total					4,800.00		5,113.50				9,913.50

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KRISTI E. WALSETH,
Oct. 17, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO AUSTRIA, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 4 AND JULY 9, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem[1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency[2]
Hon. Benjamin L. Cardin		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. John Dingell		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Mr. John P. Elliott		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Mr. David M. Evans		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Ms. Mary Sue Hafner		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. Earl F. Hilliard		7/3	United States				2,842.20				2,842.20
	7/4	7/9	Austria		1,200.00						1,200.00
Hon. Steny H. Hoyer		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Ms. Marlene Kaufmann		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. James P. Moran, Jr.		7/3	United States				2,842.20				2,842.20
	7/4	7/9	Austria		1,200.00						1,200.00
Hon. Harold Rogers		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. Carlos Romero-Barcelo		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Ms. Erika B. Schlager		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/7	Austria		720.00						720.00
Ms. Victoria A. Showalter		7/3	United States				691.20				691.20
	7/4	7/9	Austria		1,200.00						1,200.00
Hon. Louise M. Slaughter		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. Floyd Spence		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. Craig Washington		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Hon. Henry A. Waxman		7/4	United States				(3)				
	7/5	7/9	Austria		960.00						960.00
Mr. Samuel G. Wise		7/3	United States				691.20				691.20
	7/4	7/9	Austria		1,200.00						1,200.00
Delegation expenses	7/5	7/9	Austria						21,490.74		21,490.74
Committee total					18,000.00		7,066.80		21,490.74		46,557.54

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military aircraft.

STENY H. HOYER,
Chairman, July 9, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO FRANCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 13 AND SEPT. 18, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Michael Kopetski	9/13	9/18	France		1,505.00		(3)				1,505.00
Tom Lewis	9/14	9/18	France		903.00		(4)				903.00
William Clinger	9/14	9/18	France		903.00		(4)				903.00
Ben McMakin	9/13	9/18	France		1,505.00		[3] 660.15				2,165.15
William Bishop	9/14	9/18	France		1,204.00		[3] 660.15				1,864.15
Peter Abbruzzese	9/14	9/17	France		602.00		[3] 2,678.65				3,280.65
Butler Derrick	9/14	9/18	France		903.00		(4)				903.00
Ron Lasch	9/14	9/18	France		903.00		[3] 1,348.08				2,251.08
Committee total					8,428.00		5,347.03				13,775.03

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Commercial air transportation/DOD.
[4] DOD.

BUTLER DERRICK,
Chairman, Dec. 14, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO EGYPT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1 AND SEPT. 11, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Anthony C. Beilenson, MC	9/4	9/10	Egypt	LE4,698.54	1,386.00		3,014.55				4,400.55
Patricia Schroeder, MC	9/2	9/7	Egypt	LE3,112.02	918.00		6,463.55				7,381.55
Constance A. Morella, MC	9/2	9/7	Egypt	LE3,895.11	1,149.00		1,704.35				2,853.35
John E. Porter, MC	9/2	9/8	Egypt	LE4,678.20	1,380.00		6,860.95				8,240.95
Christopher H. Smith, MC	9/4	9/11	Egypt	LE5,481.63	1,617.00		2,627.15				4,244.15
Janet K. Faulstich	9/4	9/10	Egypt	LE4,698.54	1,386.00		3,014.55				4,400.55
Lisa Moreno	9/1	9/7	Egypt	LE4,657.86	1,374.00		2,247.95				3,621.95
Susan Wood	9/1	9/7	Egypt	LE4,657.86	1,374.00		2,247.95				3,621.95
Vicki Elkin	9/2	9/8	Egypt	LE4,678.20	1,380.00		4,488.95				5,868.95
Dorothy Taft	9/5	9/10	Egypt	LE3,915.45	1,155.00		1,921.15				3,076.15
Committee total					13,119.00		34,591.10				47,710.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TONY BEILENSON,
Chairman, Nov. 3, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. BRETT W. O'BRIEN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 16 AND JULY 19, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Brett W. O'Brien, staff	7/16	7/19	Caribbean Area		371.00						371.00
Committee total					371.00						371.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BRETT W. O'BRIEN,
Aug. 11, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MS. KRISTI E. WALSETH, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 11 AND SEPT. 24, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Kristi E. Walseth	9/12	9/17	Albania		2,400.00						2,400.00
	9/17	9/20	Italy								
	9/20	9/24	Hungary								
Commercial transportation											2,892.35
Committee total					2,400.00		2,892.35				5,292.35

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

KRISTI E. WALSETH,
Oct. 17, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. PHILIP G. DYER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 6 AND SEPT. 13, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Philip G. Dyer	9/6	9/7	United Kingdom	227.51	349.50					227.51	349.50
	9/8	9/13	Africa—Uganda, Zaire, Rwanda		1,235.00						1,235.00
	9/13	9/13	France								
Committee total					1,584.50						1,584.50

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TONY P. HALL,
October 12, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. MARTIN HUGHES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 11 AND SEPT. 14, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Martin Hughes	9/11	9/14	Canada	653.96	477.00		421.92			653.96	898.92
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

MARTIN HUGHES,
Sept. 30, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, 91ST INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION CONFERENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 20 AND MAR. 29, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Eliot Engel	3/25	3/29	France		910.00	(3)					
Hon. John Tanner	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
Hon. Barbara-Rose Collins	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
Hon. Earl Hilliard	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
Hon. Bennie Thompson	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
John Calvelli	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
Steve Abrams	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
Veronica Craig	3/25	3/29	France		870.00	(3)					
Catherine Zimmer Liebel	3/20	3/29	France		2,698.82	(4)					
Delegation expenses						(5)	326.00				
Control Room expenses					7,321.49						
Official Meals					1,483.79						
Committee total					18,504.10		326.00				18,830.10

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.
[4] Commercial airfare.
[5] One-way.

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Sept. 27, 1994.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NORTH ATLANTIC, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 8 AND SEPT. 13, 1994

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Butler Derrick	9/9	9/14	Italy		1,236.00		(3)				1,236.00
Tom Lewis	9/9	9/14	Italy		1,236.00		(3)				1,236.00
William Clinger	9/9	9/14	Italy		1,236.00		(3)				1,236.00
Peter Abbruzzese	9/8	9/14	Italy		1,236.00		(3)				1,236.00
Ron Lasch	9/8	9/14	Italy		1,236.00		(4)				2,584.08
Committee total					6,180.00		1,2348.08				7,528.08

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] DOD.
[4] Commercial airfare.

BUTLER DERRICK,
Dec. 14, 1994.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

132. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available emergency appropriations totaling $11,695,000 in budget authority for the Department of the Interior and the Federal Emergency Management Agency [FEMA], and to designate these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 104–17); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

133. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary (Communications, Computers and Support Systems), Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification that the installation commander at Tyndall Air Force Base, FL, is initiating a multi-function cost comparison pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304 note; to the Committee on National Security.

134. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to Russia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

135. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Republic of Tunisia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

136. A letter from the Director, Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting activities of the U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission fund for the 6-month period which ended on September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 100–696, section 804 (102 Stat. 4610); to the Committee on House Oversight.

137. A letter from the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the annual report of activities for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1994, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 715b; to the Committee on Resources.

138. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the annual report on transportation user fees, fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 447(e); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

139. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1992–1994 interim report of demonstration activities under Public Law 96–265, section 505(a), as amended and related activities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

140. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's annual report on the progress in implementing CERCLA requirements during fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 9651; jointly, to the Committees on Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

141. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a quarterly update report on development assistance program allocations as of September 30, 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

142. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a quarterly update report on development assistance program allocations as of December 14, 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted January 2, 1995]

Mr. MILLER of California; Committee on Natural Resources, Legislative and review activities of the Committee on Natural Resources during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103–890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOAKLEY: Committee on Rules. Survey of activities of the House Committee on Rules, 103d Congress (Rept. 103–891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 462. A bill to establish the Commission on the Review of National Policies Toward Gambling; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. DUNCAN)

H.R. 463. A bill to prohibit the use of certain assistance provided under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 for employment relocation activities; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself and Mr. STOCKMAN):

H.R. 464. A bill to repeal the prohibitions relating to semiautomatic assault weapons and large capacity ammunition feeding devices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 465. A bill to ensure that the Caribbean Basin Initiative is not adversely affected by the implementation of the North American Free-Trade Agreement and to authorize entry into free-trade agreements between the United States and certain Caribbean Basin countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATEMAN:

H.R. 466. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire and to convey certain lands or interests in lands to improve the management, protection, and administration of Colonial National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 467. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to exempt veterans' organizations from regulations prohibiting the solicitation of contributions on postal property; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

H.R. 468. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish outpatient medical services for any disability of a former prisoner of war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 469. A bill amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that remarriage of the surviving spouse of a veteran after age 55 shall not result in termination of dependency and indemnity compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 470. A bill provide for adherence with the MacBride Principles by United States persons doing business in Northern Ireland; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 471. A bill amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to employers who employ members of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

H.R. 472. A bill establish a priority in the disposal of real property resulting from the closure or realignment of military installation toward States and other entities that agree to convert the property into correctional facilities for youthful offenders to be operated as military-style boot camps and to require the Secretary of Defense to develop a program to promote the expanded use of such correctional facilities; to the Committee on National Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DELAY:

H.R. 473. A bill repeal provisions of the Clean Air Act dealing with toxic air emissions; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 474. A bill to repeal provisions of the Clean Air Act dealing with acid rain; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 475. A bill to repeal provisions of the Clean Air Act dealing with stratospheric ozone protection; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 476. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal certain emissions standards for motor vehicles which have not yet taken effect; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 477. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to allow emission reductions caused by fleet turnover to be created to the emission reduction requirements of the act; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 478. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prohibit the Federal Government from requiring State plans to mandate trip reduction measures; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 479. A bill to repeal the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (Public Law 101–549); to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 480. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the mandatory requirement for State motor vehicle inspection and maintenance programs for ozone nonattainment areas; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MICA, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. CALLAHAN):

H.R. 481. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 482. A bill to direct that certain Federal financial benefits be provided only to citizens and nationals of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, and Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MINGE, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PORTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. FOX, Mr. FARR, and Mr. GREENWOOD):

H.R. 483. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 484. A bill to prohibit public welfare assistance to aliens not lawfully in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, Banking and Financial Services, Economic and Educational Opportunities, Agriculture, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. ROYCE, and Mrs. SEASTRAND):

H.R. 485. A bill to expand the authority for the export of devices; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on International Relations, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 486. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reform the manner of determining rent paid for public housing dwelling units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ORTON:

H.R. 487. A bill to improve the Single Family Housing Mortgage Insurance Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. QUINN (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BACHUS,

Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KING, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CANADY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.R. 488. A bill to prohibit the distribution or receipt of restricted explosives without a Federal permit, and to require applications for such permits to include a photograph and the finger prints of the applicant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 489. A bill to establish a uniform and more efficient Federal process for protecting property owners' rights guaranteed by the fifth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 490. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to ensure that constitutionally protected private property rights are not infringed until adequate protection is afforded by reauthorization of the act, to protect against and compensate for economic losses from critical habitat designation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 491. A bill to amend titles II and XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by reconstituting the Boards of Trustees of such trust funds and the Managing Trustee of such trust funds to increase their independence, by providing for annual investment plans to guide investment of amounts in such trust funds, and by removing unnecessary restrictions on investment and disinvestment of amounts in such trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 492. A bill to impose a tax and import controls on bullets expressly designated to penetrate law enforcement personnel bulletproof vests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 493. A bill to amend section 106 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 to improve the Housing Counseling Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 494. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a demonstration program to make grants to community development corporations for reducing interest rates on loans for economic development activities in five federally designated enterprise communities; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. HOEKSTRA, MR. CAMP, Mr. CHRYSLER, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG):

H.R. 495. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to delay implementation of enhanced motor vehicle inspection and maintenance programs; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 496. A bill to prohibit site characterization of the Yucca Mountain site in the State of Nevada during fiscal years 1996 through 1998, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 497. A bill to create the National Gambling Impact and Policy Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COX, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. DOOLITTLE):

H.J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to designate the visitors center at the Channel Islands National Park, CA, as the ''Robert J. Lagomarsino Visitors Center''; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas (for himself and Mr. BARTON of Texas):

H.J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to require three-fifths majorities for bills increasing taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H.J. Res. 52. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for 4-year terms for Representatives and limiting the service of Senators and Representatives to 12 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNTON (for himself, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. WISE):

H.J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for a balanced budget for the U.S. Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KENNELLY:

H. Res. 32. Resolution designating minority membership to the Committee on House Oversight; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RICHARDSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OBEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SABO, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. SCHUMER):

H. Res. 33. Resolution providing for consideration of a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLINK:

H. Res. 34. Resolution designating minority membership to the Committee on Rules; considered and agreed to.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. EDWARDS introduced a bill (H.R. 498) for the relief of Jung Ja Golden; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WALKER, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 5: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. NEY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and MR. CLEMENT.

H.R. 6: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. HOKE, Mr. KIM, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 9: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 11: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 26: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. TORRES, and Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 52: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FOX, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 65: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. TORRICELLI.

H.R. 70: Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. COX, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 76: Mr. STUMP, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MINGE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. FROST, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 77: Mr. NEY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. TATE, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. FOX, Mr. DORNAN, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 103: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 104: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COBURN, Mr. FROST, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. FOX.

H.R. 106: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 109: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 118: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. KING, Mr. CANADY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 208: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 209: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 210: Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 214: Mr. DORNAN and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 217: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. JONES.

H.R. 218: Mr. NEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COBURN, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 259: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 303: Mr. HALL of Ohio and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 359: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. LARGENT. Mr. HAYES, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. LONGLEY.

H.R. 394: Mr. COBLE, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. WOLF, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BEREUTER Mr. GORDON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 450: Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MARTINI, Mr. BONO, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. COX, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 461: Mr. BLILEY.

H.J. Res. 3: Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. JONES, Mr. BURR, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. CRANE.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. FORBES.

H.J. Res. 27: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. FORBES, Ms. MCCARTHY, and Mr. KLUG.

H.J. Res. 28: Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.J. Res. 49: Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. COLEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. FOX, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. COBURN, Mr. NEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. WALSH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. SKEEN, and Mr. STUMP.

H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. ACKERMAN and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. HOUGHTON.