United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1995 No. 72

House of Representatives

The House met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 3, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable BOB INGLIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

With this ardent petition, O gracious God, we pray for the gift of wisdom in our hearts and in our actions, that what we ask or think or do will advance the good of the Nation and be to the benefit of every person. May we have perceptive minds and discerning hearts; may we be astute in our judgments and show mercy in our decisions so that the gift of wisdom will be our heritage and our legacy. Bless us and all Your people this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] will lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DURBIN 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.

THE PRESIDENT'S RELEVANCE AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Bill Clinton proclaimed he was relevant to the legislative process. Since he is still President of the United States, I certainly hope he is relevant, but as time goes on, I begin to wonder.

The debate on Medicare is just one example of the President's slipping relevance.

Republicans in the House and Senate are taking steps now to save Medicare in the future.

Our plan will preserve, improve, and protect Medicare far into the next century.

But comprehensive Medicare reform will take bipartisanship, statesmanship, and cooperation.

Unfortunately, the President has decided to walk away from this problem. In fact, he has rejected Republican attempts to get the administration involved in solving the Medicare problem.

I urge the President and his advisers to join Republicans in saving Medicare.

Actions speak louder than words, and if the President wants to be relevant, he has to act relevant.

TIME TO BRING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE INTO THE BUDGET DEBATE

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is getting ready to make dramatic changes in the Medicare program. I am concerned that the American people will not be included in this debate.

The Republican majority has already missed the deadline to submit a budget. To balance the budget and save $1 trillion over 7 years will be a difficult task, I admit. However, the Republican majority should submit a plan which we all can review. The Republican majority makes promises without making the tough choices on how to achieve their goals.

The Republican majority plans to cut Medicare by $300 billion over 7 years. These cuts will hurt seniors and result in higher costs. It is estimated that this will add $900 in out-of-pocket expenses for seniors in 2002.

Democrats have been responsible in reforming Medicare. In the 1993 OBRA bill, Democrats voted to strengthen the trust fund and made it solvent for an additional 3 years. No Republican Members supported these important reforms.

I am also concerned that any Medicare cuts will affect the health care industry. In my district, reduction in indirect medical education and direct medical education will have devastating consequences. I represent the Texas Medical Center which has two medical schools. Any medicare reductions in these payments will negatively impact the Houston area, and I will work vigorously to oppose these reductions.

If we are going to balance the budget, the American people should be involved and we should all contribute fairly to the solution. Without a plan,

☐ 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

I cannot judge whether this goal will be met.

The American people deserve to know the details of a plan and we have the responsibility to ensure that they are included in this debate.

CONGRATULATIONS ON THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(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, during the last 3 weeks, I held 11 town meetings, 3 senior citizen conferences, and a very successful agriculture conference. I always ask those in attendance to tell me what they were hearing about the new 104th Congress.

Here is one letter I received last week:

DEAR ANDREA: You asked the question, ''What are you hearing?''

Our son said, ''The Republicans have a chance to do something, but they will probably drop the ball.'' A 17-year-old cynic. Now he says, ''They did it. The Republicans did it.''

My cousin in Santa Barbara said her husband is so excited she was not able to tear him away from the TV coverage for the first 100 days.

In general, people say, ''We can depend on the freshmen in the Congress to stand together and do what they said they could do.'' Congratulations on the Contract With America. Thank you for your very hard work.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY DANA.

NIPOMO, CA.

REPUBLICANS HAVE PROMISED MORE THAN THEY CAN DELIVER

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the senior citizens of this country should be deeply concerned about the rumblings that they hear on the Republican side of the aisle.

The Republicans have now come to face the fact that they cannot give tax cuts to the wealthy, balance the budget, and preserve Medicare, so now they are devising a plan by which they can make the cuts in Medicare to provide for the tax cuts for the wealthy.

I think we have to ask ourselves, is this really what America expected at the time of election, that we would pass on massive tax cuts to the wealthiest people in this country and we would do it at the expense of the Medicare plan, the health safety net for millions of seniors who have nowhere other to turn for health care in this country? I am saying to the senior citizens of this country, keep your eyes open and your ears tuned to the news waves because what the Republicans have in store is nothing but bad for the Medicare system of this country.

If they do not do that, what they have in store is to add another $150 billion in budget cuts to $1 out of every $3 that the Federal Government now spends, so they have run up against the cruel facts that they have promised more than they can deliver, and it looks like the beneficiaries of that will be the wealthy of the Nation, and the victims will be the health care of the senior citizens.

THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, doubtlessly, we will return in just a moment to the 1-minute handgrenades back and forth. But first this happy birthday greeting.

My colleagues, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, we are 175 years old as of today. As we begin our work on the 1995 farm bill, it is appropriate for us to take a brief moment to reflect on the long and distinguished story and history of the committee.

April 29, 1820, Congressman Lewis Williams of North Carolina, introduced a resolution to create a Committee on Agriculture in the House of Representatives. Since that time, we have remained true to the original purpose of the committee that was stated by Congressman Williams, to guard and protect the great and leading substantial interests in this country.

Hey, the House Ag Committee over the break, 16 hearings, 5,000 farmers in attendance, over 600 witnesses. When we are 200, I can assure you we will continue to do our work, to make sure we have the best quality food at the lowest price in the history of the world.

Happy birthday, House Ag Committee.

WHERE IS THE BUDGET?

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, well, the tax cuts got passed, the circus came to the Hill, and, guess what, we still do not have a budget.

We do not have any budget because now they have got to do the tough part, the spending part, and there is nothing really there they can cut except Medicare. They do not want to cut Medicare.

You know, we have tried last year, for the last 2 years, with the President, to reform the whole health care system. Boy, we did not get any help on that side.

They promised they could do this. This was going to be so easy. Now you hear everybody, saying, ''Hey, where is the President, where is the President? He ought to do this.''

Well, he was here last time. He was trying to do it. We were trying to do it with him. We got no help there.

Let us get this budget out. Let us see what we are going to do to get this thing balanced, and let us stop seeing the whining for help from the White House.

CONTINUING TO WORK FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, while home during the 3-week recess, I traveled 17 of 21 days, visited 15 of 19 counties that I have the privilege to represent, appeared on several radio talk shows, and held numerous town meetings.

Overall, people are optimistic about the direction the new Congress is going. People believe Congress is starting to represent the working man and woman and passing commonsense legislation. I sincerely believe we are in the process of rebuilding the public's trust in Congress which was lost after previous Congresses neglected to listen to the people.

In the next few months we will all have to make difficult choices. But we, as elected officials, must continue to use common sense when drafting, discussing, and voting on legislation. We must continue to work for the American people.

Ultimately, we need to stay focused to the commitment we made with the American people—to again make America a great country.

LEADERSHIP IS TOUGH

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, leadership is tough. During the welfare reform, the Republican majority pulled seniors out of that legislation and I agreed with that decision. And now it appears Medicare is off the table to pay for tax cuts and budget reduction.

The Republican majority, which is attempting to balance the budget by the year 2002, plan to cut $400 billion out of Medicare. The Republican majority is realizing what President Clinton, and a number of other Democrats, and I said last year, when we were first elected, that to have a balanced budget we must control health care costs.

The Republican majority has promised not to cut Social Security or the military budget, and interest on the national debt, which is 20 percent of our budget, has to be paid.

Guess what? Medicare is 25 percent of everything left. And now they have promised not to tamper with that.

In 1993, the Democrats made Medicare solvent for 3 more years, without

one Republican vote, and now they are criticizing the President and Democrats for not coming up with a plan before they introduce a budget.

Today the majority criticizes us for not providing leadership on Medicare. Well, they are the majority. Leadership is tough. If the Republican majority wants to continue to live in a dream world and think that they can balance the budget without cutting health care costs, they need to come up with a plan. Medicare should not be a cut.

THE TRAGEDY IN OKLAHOMA CITY

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, following the tragedy in Oklahoma City, as was expected, tremendous rhetoric grew out of this fracas that occurred, both from the right and the left, calling for hearings on terrorism, international terrorism, domestic terrorism, paramilitary actions, all kinds of themes and theses that were propounded following that tragic event.

But we must focus once and for all on what happened there and then at that tragic moment. This was an act of mass murder, willful, deliberate, intended to kill people, and succeeded in that.

Our job, as the American people and the law enforcement and Members of Congress, communities together, must focus to bring those culprits to justice, bring them to the bar of justice, and then try them for murder and seek the death penalty. That is the analysis with which we must start in contemplating what happened in Oklahoma City on that fateful day.

The death penalty, which is favored by most people in our country, has never been more appropriate than in this particular situation.

GOP MEDICARE CUTS

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today, the Republicans are over 2 weeks late in producing a budget.

I believe the reason for the Republican delay is that they do not know how they are going to keep all of their promises. Part of their answer to balancing the budget is to cut Medicare by over $300 billion. This means that seniors will have to pay on average an additional $900 in out-of-pocket expenses.

Now, Speaker GINGRICH is claiming that any Medicare cuts will be used to keep Medicare solvent. Of course he forgets to mention that Democrats have already worked to keep Medicare from going bankrupt in the past. In addition, it was Democrats, last year, who put forth an effort to reform health care and save Medicare.

I believe in balancing the budget and have always voted in support of a balanced budget, but I feel that any Medicare reform needs to arise in the context of health care reform. It is rising health care costs that are contributing to the deficit, not senior citizens.

OPPOSING THE AGREEMENT WITH CASTRO

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, the secretly negotiated agreement between the Clinton administration and Fidel Castro, announced yesterday, to return Cuban refugees to Castro's state security is unprecedented as well as immoral.

As Speaker GINGRICH declared yesterday, for the first time in history, the U.S. Government has agreed to cooperate with a Communist dictatorship's security forces in order to carry out the forced return of refugees who managed to escape.

□ 1115

The administration now says that Castro has given it assurances that those refugees turned over to state security will not be persecuted, and yet they did not even ask Castro to abrogate his own law that requires jailtime for those caught trying to leave without permission. An administration official told me yesterday not to worry, that Castro has prosecutorial discretion. This, Mr. Speaker, this incident, this agreement, is shameful. It is another attempt to appease a totalitarian dictator who will still not be satisfied by the McGovernites who now control American foreign policy.

SAVAGE PLANS FOR MEDICARE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Gingrichites took a poll, and now they are scurrying here, there, and everywhere searching for a way to dress up their plan to slash Medicare.

The Gingrichites are understandably scared silly that the American public recognizes that what they have in mind is a raid of $305 billion from the Medicare trust fund to fund last month's $345 billion tax break for the privileged few.

This week the Gingrichites say, well, Medicare is in such bad financial shape that it needs surgery to survive. Well, I ask, ''Why didn't they think about that last month when they were standing on this floor and they approved a contract tax bill that pulled out $56 billion from the Medicare trust fund?''

That is right, $56 billion from the same fund they now complain is going broke, and, having bled the trust fund, now they intend to start whacking off the benefits for America's seniors.

The Gingrichites do not plan to salvage Medicare; they plan to savage it, and I think the American people are smart enough to recognize savagery when they see it, to know the difference between savagery and salvation.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is our National Day of Prayer, and there will be events, big and small, commemorating this all over the Nation. Every faith, every religion, believes prayer is a good thing.

If we have any hope of overcoming evil things like we saw in Oklahoma City 2 weeks ago, we need to overcome evil with good—good things like prayer.

I hope all Americans will participate in our National Day of Prayer tomorrow, at least in a small way. I do not say this in any holier-than-thou manner, because I have as many faults as anyone.

But I do believe this Nation would be a better place if more people spent more time in prayer.

The Old Testament tells us:

> If my people which are called by my name shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and heal their land.

Almost all of us need some type of healing—physically, emotionally, spiritually. I hope everyone will support the National Day of Prayer tomorrow.

REPUBLICANS TURNING TO MEDICARE IN ORDER TO PAY FOR TAX CUTS

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, why have the Gingrich Republicans failed to meet the statutory deadline for passing a House budget resolution? The same Gingrich Republicans who were so proud of the fact that they met their hundred-day deadline for the Republican Contract With America, they read letters, fan mail, all sorts of comments from their districts about how proud they were, and yet when it comes down to the most basic thing, the spending bill for the Federal Government, the Gingrich Republicans have just dropped the ball.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the reason is pretty simple. The last item in the Republican contract was a Republican tax bill which adds $600 billion to our national debt over the next 10 years. When they sit down and try to figure out this $600 billion and how to make it up, they run out of solutions.

Well, where did they turn? They turned to one of the most important

programs in America, Medicare, a program not only important for seniors, but important for hospitals and doctors all across the United States.

The Republicans have found themselves in this box, they have painted themselves in this corner, because they insist on tax breaks for the wealthiest people and absolving corporations from paying their Federal taxes, and they want to make up the difference by cutting Medicare. That is not fair.

I hope the Republicans will get off this premise that they have to give these tax cuts to the privileged few and focus on the truly important programs like Social Security and Medicare.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN AUTOMOTIVE AND AUTO PARTS NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an extremely important issue facing the automotive and auto parts industry. The United States-Japan framework talks were initiated in July 1993, but no agreement has been reached in these critical areas which amount to 60 percent of the United States bilateral deficit with Japan. Now these 1993 talks are only part of an effort that is now 10 years long to deal with very substantial nontariff barriers that Japan throws up to American auto parts and American automobiles even though that is the biggest item of our bilateral deficit. In recent years, as a result of these talks and all of the efforts that have been made, yes, Japan has increased the purchase of American parts, but only for those factories that produce in America.

Mr. Speaker, if we are to maintain a strong industrial base in America, we must be able to export quality, cost-competitive United States auto parts and automobilies everywhere in the world, even to Japan, and I strongly support the need for a negotiated agreement with Japan and support our United States Trade Representative, Mickey Kantor, in his efforts.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN JOSEPH NOVABILSKI, AN AMERICAN HERO

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a fallen hero. On Monday, May 1, in Prince Georges County, MD, we buried Police Corporal John Joseph Novabilski, known as ''Nova.''

Corporal Novabilski was killed in uniform while sitting in his cruiser working as an off-duty security guard. Allegedly, following an earlier argument, his assailant walked up from behind and shot Novabilski 11 times.

Officer Novabilski first joined the Prince Georges police force in 1988. He took his job as an officer of the law seriously, and sought duty in high crime areas. He was also compassionate, using his own money to buy toys for poor youngsters in the neighborhood. His fellow officers knew him for his big, warm smile and good humored griping.

At the funeral, a friend, Kirk Mullings, described Corporal Novabilski as a good man who wanted nothing more than to fall in love with a good woman, have many good friends, and do the job he loved.

On behalf of the citizens of Prince Georges County and the State of Maryland, I want to say to his wife, Karen, and his family that we appreciate what John did to help our community and we'll long remember his efforts. May God rest his soul. John Joseph Novabilski, American hero.

UNITED STATES-JAPAN AUTO PARTS NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, the meetings that begin today in Canada between the world's four economic powers mark another critical juncture in this country's ongoing effort to level the playing field for Japanese-American automotive trade. Although progress has been made in this area since talks began 4 years ago, much remains to be done.

This is not a question of demanding one-sided concessions: an improved trade situation is in the interest of both countries. Motor vehicle and equipment manufacturing is the largest U.S. manufacturing industry, and a cornerstone of America's industrial base. The ''Big Three'' alone—Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors—employ almost 700,000 Americans, and are among the largest employers of research engineers and scientists in the country. Thus the health of the U.S. auto industry has far-reaching implications for the larger U.S. economy and its competitiveness. Japan stands to gain, as well, including Japanese consumers, who currently pay prices for auto parts that are on average 340 percent higher than for identical parts in the United States.

Resolution of this crucial imbalance can set an important precedent, not only for anyone seeking access to Japan's markets, but also for American access to and competitiveness in other critical markets overseas. I strongly urge Ambassador Kantor to continue his effective leadership on this issue. I am confident that with a healthy balance of trade, this important relationship can flourish rather than flounder.

REPUBLICAN MEDICARE CUTS

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. speaker, I must rise today to speak out against the proposed reductions in Medicare spending which I feel will devastate our Nation's elderly.

Under the guise of protecting and strengthening the Medicare trust fund, Republicans have proposed billions in reductions in future spending over the next 7 years. Republicans have pledged not to cut Social Security, interest on the debt, or defense in order to pay for their tax cuts, therefore, the only remaining source from which to cut is Medicare.

The Medicare trust fund should be addressed appropriately as a long-term problem and should take into careful consideration the needs of our Nation's seniors. This debate should take place apart from the budget debate and apart from efforts to salvage the cynical, public opinion poll-driven Contract for American campaign promises.

Mr. Speaker, I call once again for compassion for the elderly of our society, another vulnerable, defenseless group which must be protected.

THE USUAL CLASS-WARFARE RHETORIC ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there are some things going on here in Washington the American people really ought to know about. Members of President Clinton's Cabinet have raised some very serious questions about the long-term health of Medicare. A report by the Medicare trustees concludes that Medicare will begin losing money next year and could become insolvent by the year 2001, and, by the way, this Medicare board includes Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala, Labor Secretary Robert Reich, and Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin.

Now, last Friday, the Speaker of the House wrote the President expressing his concerns over this matter and communicated a willingness to work together on a solution, but the news about Medicare has apparently fallen on deaf ears at the White House and on this side of the House because the Speaker's letter is being dismissed with the usual class-warfare rhetoric. In fact, Leon Panetta suggested the White House will do nothing to help fix Medicare.

This is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker. Medicare is going broke and all the White House can offer up is class-warfare rhetoric. This shows a total avoidance of responsibility and a lack of respect to older Americans who expect leadership from Washington, and not excuses, not class-warfare.

ONE TOO MANY PROMISES

(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, there is no mystery as to why the Republican leadership is late in producing their promised balanced budget and it seems that the party that loves to talk about promises made and promises kept may have made one too many promises when it comes to tax breaks for their wealthy friends. Who is being asked to finance the GOP tax windfall to the wealthy this time? Senior citizens. In fact, the Republican leaders want to cut $300 billion from Medicare to help to pay for their $325 billion tax giveaway to the wealthy. These cuts would add more than $3,000 to seniors' health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare is a program that works. It has made a difference in the lives of our seniors by bringing affordable care to seniors on fixed incomes.

This cut would be devastating to seniors. Do not take my word for it; listen to what the Republican chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], said last year about Medicare cuts. I quote:

> I just don't believe that quality of care and availability of care can survive these additional cuts. And that is the price that is going to have to be paid to pay for these cuts.

Republican leaders in the House should remember those words and reconsider this wrongheaded plan. We, in this body, should be fighting to save the Medicare safety net for seniors, not robbing the Medicare trust fund to pay for tax breaks for the wealthy.

THE GIVING INCENTIVE AND VOLUNTEER EMPOWERMENT ACT

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, the Cato Institute estimates that spending on welfare programs by all levels of government runs over $35,000 for every family of four below the poverty line. But it is painfully obvious that the average poor family does not even come close to receiving this much money. The bulk is spent on bureaucratic overhead, not on the people it is intended to help.

Today, I will be introducing a bill to expand the tax incentive for charitable giving, thereby offering average citizens a chance to do more for those in need than the government ever could. My bill—the Giving Incentive and Volunteer Empowerment Act, or the GIVE Act—will encourage more charitable donations to private sector charities and other nonprofits, which get a much bigger bang for their bucks than do government-run programs.

The GIVE Act will do four things:

First, allow all individual filers to deduct from taxable income 120 percent of the value of their charitable donation.

Second, once again allow non-itemizers to deduct for charitable deductions, as long as they give more than $1,000, or $2,000 filing jointly.

Third, exclude charitable giving from the overall limitation on itemized deductions.

Fourth, extend the deadline for making tax-deductible charitable donations until April 15, when taxpayers are past the end-of-the-year cash crunch and can better estimate their tax liability.

I want to make it plain the GIVE Act is not meant to supplant all Government spending on social programs. But as we seek to reassert fiscal responsibility in government, increased private giving and volunteer involvement can fill a need the deficit spending cannot—and with more success, efficiency, and compassion.

□ 1130

THE BALANCED BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution is just around the corner and it is time to put the money where our mouths are and actually balance the budget.

Our deficits have left us with a debt of $4.7 trillion or $47,000 per taxpayer. Our yearly interest payments on the debt exceed $200 billion or $2,000 per taxpayer. This reduces wage rates, destroys jobs, and mortgages our future.

To start balancing the budget today, Mr. STENHOLM and I have introduced the Balanced Budget Enforcement Act. This bill will force us to make the tough decisions to balance the budget in 2002.

Unlike past attempts to balance the budget, this bill holds everyone's feet to the fire. There are no loopholes. Everything's on-budget. And all smoke-and-mirror projections will be checked by a nonpartisan Board of Estimates at the beginning and end of the annual budgeting process.

Mr. Speaker, everyone says they want to balance the budget, but we have not even come close. I have been in Washington long enough to know that the Balanced Budget Enforcement Act will work. If we are really serious about balancing the budget, the House will include this bill in the budget resolution.

DON SODERQUIST

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to recognize a personal friend and distinguished businessman from my district, Don Soderquist. Don is the chairman of the board of the International Mass Retail Association [IMRA], and vice chairman and chief operating officer of Wal-Mart Stores, and in both capacities has shown a tireless commitment to this country and the principles on which it was built.

This month, Don is ending his term as chairman of the IMRA, the trade association that represents the vibrant mass-retailing industry. Don has been involved with discount and mass retailing since 1964, when he began his retailing career with Ben Franklin Stores. He joined Wal-Mart in 1980 as senior vice president. Throughout his career, he has exemplified the work ethic and entrepreneurial spirit.

Don is characterized by the depth of his personal commitments to his family, his church, and his community.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in saluting Don Soderquist as a devoted family man and dedicated business leader. While his leadership at IMRA will be missed, we wish him the best of luck at Wal-Mart and in his other endeavors.

AMERICA LOSES WITH THE MAJORITY BUDGET

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, by all accounts, there is at least a $3,500 billion hole in the budget that the majority will present to us next week. They want to balance the budget, and so do I. They do not want to cut Medicare, if possible; so do I. But they have also passed a bill to give the wealthiest of Americans a tax cut.

In other words, they want to use one-half of the budget for deficit reduction, they say; half of the money will go for Medicare, and the third half will go for the wealthiest Americans. That math does not add up, Mr. Speaker.

The tax cut will cost more than $345 billion that they gave to the wealthiest Americans. That is $45 billion more than they need to save Medicare. Now we are told the majority wants to put off the decision about Medicare. They are already 1 month behind their commitment to present a budget to this House.

Mr. Speaker, it seems clear what is going on here. In the end the majority will cut more than fat out of Medicare; they will cut the bone and the marrow out of Medicare. They will cause senior citizens to spend more than $3,000 more for their medical care.

Mr. Speaker, that is not fair. America will be the losers in the end if we do not address this appropriately.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 774

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 774.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the House will not be in session on Monday, May 8. On Tuesday, May 9, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 o'clock p.m. for legislative business to take up H.R. 1139, the Striped Bass Conservation Act Amendments of 1995.

Mr. Speaker, of course, this is very important legislation, and we will want to give it our immediate attention. Mr. Speaker, this bill will be considered under suspension of the rules.

After we complete H.R. 1139, we plan to take up H.R. 1361, the fiscal year 1996 Coast Guard reauthorization, which is subject to a rule. While it is our intent to complete consideration of H.R. 1361 on Tuesday, we do not expect Tuesday to be a late night for Members. Members should be advised that we do not expect any recorded votes to be taken before 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

On Wednesday the House will meet at 11 o'clock a.m. to consider H.R. 961, the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1995, subject to a rule. We expect consideration of this bill to extend through the end of the week. The House will meet at 10 o'clock a.m. on Thursday and Friday. It is our hope to have Members on their way home to their families and their districts by no later than 3 o'clock p.m. on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. If I might inquire to my friend from Texas, on Tuesday we have the suspension bill that the gentleman mentioned, which I know is of great interest particularly to my friend from Texas, who is one of the best at that sport. But let me ask you this: Is it possible if we could not hold the votes until 5 p.m. on Tuesday, given the fact we are going to have a suspension bill and the Coast Guard authorization will be under an open rule?

Mr. ARMEY. Well, I appreciate the gentleman's inquiry, but we do believe there will be some important amendments offered on the Coast Guard bill that follows. We do not expect a vote on the rule, but I do think in fairness to all Members who would participate in that important legislation, that we need to be prepared to have the membership prepared to have a vote as early as 3:30, but not before 3:30, on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. Before 3:30?

Mr. ARMEY. 3:30, yes.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman plan to vote directly on the suspension on Tuesday, or are we going to take that up after the Coast Guard bill?

Mr. ARMEY. If there is a vote on the suspension ordered, we will roll that vote. But we do not intend to roll votes that might be called while we are in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman. So Members would be safe until 3:30, and presumably longer?

Mr. ARMEY. Right.

Mr. BONIOR. Do you expect votes on Friday?

Mr. ARMEY. At this point, I think we have to be prepared for votes on Friday. We will be working on the Clean Water Act, and again we want to be able to, as we prepare for the week, be prepared to accommodate all the participation that any of the Members might want to make on that.

Mr. BONIOR. On the clean water bill that we will have before us, since it is probably one of the most important environmental pieces of legislation that we will consider in this body this Congress, I would ask my friend, what do you anticipate with respect to a rule?

It is our hope, obviously, that the rule will be open and we will not have a time cap on amendments, especially as the latter part of the week looks as if it is open and we can use indeed Thursday and Friday to complete this. I would hope that we would have an open process on this important bill.

Mr. ARMEY. Well, again, the gentleman is absolutely correct on that, although a rule has not yet been granted. It is anticipated that will be an open rule, and on that basis it is our anticipation we should expect some votes on Friday.

Mr. BONIOR. I would hope we would not have a time cap on that bill, I would ask my colleague. We want to clean up the waters of the country so you can catch all the great bass you referred to.

Mr ARMEY. The gentleman's priorities are those I applaud in that regard. We want to keep this as open a process as possible.

Mr. BONIOR. Finally, I would inquire from my friend from Texas with respect to the budget resolution. We are now into the 3d day of the month of May and we are past the April 15 deadline in which a budget resolution is required to be produced by this Congress. We are weeks behind. It is the first time that we have been behind in a number of years.

When are you going to bring the budget bill to the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. It is our anticipation we can have the budget bill to the floor the week after next on May 17. Obviously the committee is working very hard and working as much as it can in conjunction with other committees. I checked with the committee, and we are very confident that that timetable will hold up.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman and yield back my time.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield for one final observation, as long as we are on the subject of striped and other bass, may I just ask the Nation, catch 'em, kiss 'em, and release 'em.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND THE MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND TO MAKE APPOINTMENTS NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Tuesday, May 9, 1995, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, May 10, 1995.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, if I may just take a moment, I would like to thank all of these Members that are patiently waiting for their 1-minutes for the courtesy they have extended Mr. BONIOR, the Democratic whip, and myself, in carrying out this colloquy.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1361, THE COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–111) on the resolution (H. Res. 139) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TIME TO KEEP CONTRACT WITH OLDER AMERICANS

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

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, we were sent here to keep our word with the Contract With America, and that is exactly what we did. Now we plan to keep a contract with our older Americans. Bill Clinton's own Medicare Board of Trustees, which includes the Cabinet members of Mr. Rubin, Secretary Shalala, and Secretary Reich, came out with a report that said that Medicare will be insolvent in the next few years, within 7 years. But have we heard something from the President? I am still listening. I have heard nothing.

This report that came out is not a Republican fact, it is not a Democrat fact. It is the Board of Trustees, and it is a fact.

Now, the Democrats' proposal as well, we had health care reform last year and that had Medicare reforms. If you have a leaky roof, you do not tear off the entire roof, you fix the leak. And that is what we want to do. Republicans are committed to preserve, to protect, and to improve Medicare, not to bury our heads in the sand, and that is exactly what we are going to do.

KEEP MEDICARE SOLVENT

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, our seniors depend on Medicare, and its solvency is a national priority. That is why President Clinton addressed this issue as soon as he took office in 1993.

The omnibus budget bill of 1993 not only reduced the deficit; it also strengthened the Medicare Trust Fund and made it solvent for 3 additional years. President Clinton and the Democrats in Congress did this without one Republican vote. The administration also recognized that Medicare could only be solvent if we have comprehensive health care reform. These initiatives passed out of committee without one Republican vote.

□ 1145

Now, Mr. Speaker, Republicans are poised to take $300 billion over 7 years from the Medicare Program. The Republicans plan to use the Medicare Program as a bank for their tax cuts. We must not let this happen. These Medicare cuts will cost seniors $3,000 over the next 7 years, using up most of their Social Security cost-of-living adjustment.

Chief of Staff Panetta said it well when he said, ''No amount of accounting gimmicks, separate accounts, dual budget reconciliations can hide the reality that you,'' the Republicans, ''essentially are calling for the largest Medicare cut in history to pay for tax cuts for the well-off.''

We must fight these cuts.

TRADE IMBALANCE WITH JAPAN

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

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today U.S. Trade Representative Mickey Kantor is meeting with Japanese Trade Representative Hashimoto in Canada to discuss United States auto sales in Japan. Last year, as in previous years, the largest share of our trade imbalance with Japan was in the automotive sector. In 1994, this imbalance was about $37 billion and represented 56 percent of our total trade deficit with Japan.

Japan has the second largest auto market in the world, but has by far the lowest sales of imported cars and trucks of all industrialized nations that manufacture cars.

General Motors has been building cars in the Third District of Kansas since the late 1940's, and I hope they will be there for another 50 years. But to ensure the success of our domestic automobile manufacturers, we must gain access to the second largest auto market in the world.

Right now Japanese auto makers hold 22 percent of the United States market, while the United States ''Big Three'' has only 1 percent of the Japanese market. United States Trade Representative Kantor should take all steps necessary to level this playing field with Japan. So long as this automotive imbalance exists, we will never be able to reduce our trade deficit with Japan.

WALK AMERICA

(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, today I rise to recognize the 25th anniversary of Walk America, the annual fundraiser for the March of Dimes, and one of the most important walking events in the Nation.

In 1938, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, a man who wanted to save future generations from the pain of paralysis that he understood so well, founded the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, which later became the March of Dimes.

For almost 60 years, the March of Dimes has been helping America's children live healthier lives. In Wisconsin, grants from the March of Dimes have provided prenatal care for low-income women, bought soccer tickets for children with disabilities, and funded research that has lead to breakthroughs in understanding birth defects.

Building a healthy future for our kids is an important part of what this Congress is all about, and the March of Dimes has provided invaluable assistance and dedication for our work in this direction.

I appreciate this opportunity to thank the March of Dimes on behalf of my State and to wish the foundation continued success.

OPENING JAPANESE MARKETS

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it was 10 years ago that MARCY KAPTUR and I met with Japanese officials about opening their markets to United States auto parts. Imports then had less than 1 percent of Japan's protected market. Today, despite incessant American efforts, that figure is only 2.4 percent.

The Japanese sell their automotive products on every United States Main Street, but they make it difficult, often impossible, to sell United States products even on Japanese side streets.

The negotiations that begin today in Vancouver are make it or break it for opening the Japanese market. That is why there is broad support on a bipartisan basis here in Congress and in the U.S. business community, from the Business Roundtable and NAM to semiconductors and motion pictures.

Japan's protected markets undermine the world trading system. Resolution of this issue with Japan will affect this Nation's economic future, the confidence of Americans in their Nation's trade policy.

CIVIL LIBERTIES FOR ALL

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am fascinated with the process by which right-wingers have become devotees of civil liberties. A few years ago, when a lot of them were getting indicted, they became great supporters of such procedural protections as due possess and the fifth amendment.

Now we have seen a great rightwing rush, late in life, but I always like conversions, to embrace the principles of free speech. They have now decided that people who say crazy, irresponsible, dangerous things under the first amendment should be allowed to say them. I agree with them. I have always felt that way.

The problem is that they only imperfectly understand that. Because the fact is that the right to say these kinds of things—irresponsible and obnoxious and in some cases threatening—cannot only go to their rightwing caricatures. It goes to the left as well.

I am particularly struck by the fact that many of those who wanted the rapper Ice-T to be shut up and taken off the air, because he talked about killing policemen—and he certainly was, in my judgment, obnoxious and irresponsible—turn around and want to honor G. Gordon Liddy.

Now, they got a little embarrassed after the Oklahoma bombing, so they backed away from Liddy a little bit. But the fact is, there is very little difference morally or in the nature of the rhetoric between Ice-T and G. Gordon

Liddy. I suppose at a future Republican senatorial dinner, we will see both of them doing a duet.

WE HAVE TO GET OUR FINANCIAL HOUSE IN ORDER

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

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, this Congress faces two challenges in the next 100 days and in the rest of this session. We have got to get our financial house in order. We have got to finally balance the budget, do it for the first time since 1969. The second thing we are going to have to do is finally get Medicare costs under control. A report by President Clinton's own task force shows that Medicare goes bankrupt by the year 2002. We have got to do both of these things at the same time, and it is going to call for heavy lifting, and it is going to call for bipartisan support.

I ask the Democrats today to come forward with a plan that not only saves Medicare but also balances the budget by the year 2002. If they are not willing to take part in the process, I ask that they step back and let the Republican Party do it, along with other conservative Democrats who are just as concerned about this very important issue. We have no choice. We must take care of Medicare and we must balance the budget by the year 2002, or it is the senior citizens who will suffer in the end.

COMMENDING THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO SERVE THE PUBLIC

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, the deadly bombing 2 weeks ago in Oklahoma City has had a chilling effect on our Nation.

More than 100 Federal employees died.

They died because a few used violence to express their hate for the American Government.

We are angry. We want justice.

Our healing has barely begun.

As we mourn with the families of the victims, let us remember that Federal employees are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats. They are people. They help others every day.

In my district many Federal employees help us in our everyday lives.

I am reminded of Jeffrey Reck who serves as district manager of the Social Security Administration in Fitchburg, MA.

Jeff helps people get the benefits they deserve.

He gets answers. He gives people the personal help that we all need from our Government. He treats people like people.

Jeff's work is a tribute to his fallen colleagues and to Federal employees everywhere. I commend him and so many thousands who serve the public.

PROTECT MEDICARE

(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, I rise today to say to my Republican colleagues, it is time to deliver on your promises.

You said you would cut taxes, balance the budget, and leave Social Security and defense intact. Now tell us: How will you do it?

To date the Republicans have raided the Medicare trust fund to pay for their tax cuts for the rich. Their tax bill takes $27 billion away from the Medicare trust fund and from our Nation's senior citizens.

In 1993 and again in 1994, the President and the Democrats took action to make the Medicare Program stronger. And, we did it over the loud protests of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

I say to my Republican colleagues, don't take health care from our senior citizens to pay for tax cuts for the rich. That is not Medicare reform. And our senior citizens will not be fooled.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO ACT AS CHAIRMAN OF REVIEW PANEL ESTABLISHED BY RULE 51 OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable WILLIAM M. THOMAS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT,
Washington, DC, May 1, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to House Rule 51, clause 7, I have appointed the Honorable Vernon J. Ehlers as chairman of the review panel established by that Rule for the 104th Congress.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,
Chairman.

NEW DEREGULATION FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to advise and introduce to the Members that we had a telecommunications press conference today offered through the Committee on Commerce a new deregulatory bill which will allow mass communications to change dramatically, and I had the honor to offer as an amendment to this bill new broadcast ownership changes to allow many new forms of ownership for video broadcasting. It is bipartisan bill.

Basically it reduces restrictions on ownership of broadcasting stations and other media mass communications. As I mentioned, it repeals antiquated rules and regulations and brings broadcasting up to date with technology. The bill states that the FCC does not provide or enforce any regulations concerning cross ownership. The details of this will be in a statement that I will put in the extension of my remarks today.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning, I introduced on behalf of myself, Chairman TOM BLILEY, our Republican Members, and Democrat cosponsors, the Communications Act of 1995. Hearings are planned for Wednesday, May 10, Thursday, May 11, and Friday, May 12.

Truly, this is a watershed and historic moment for the telecommunication industry, our country, and the consuming public.

This legislation meets several broad objectives:

First, and foremost, the legislation gives definition and certainty as we move into this time of convergence and technological innovation.

Second, this legislation is much more deregulatory than the telecommunications legislation, introduced and passed last year. This legislation recognizes that the 1934 act is outdated—a dinosaur—and coupled with a hodgepodge of FCC administrative decisions and Federal court decisions, the telecommunications industry could be stifled and the consumer denied better products and services at lower costs unless we pass this historic legislation.

Third, great attention was paid in creating level playing fields—an atmosphere of legislative parity so that the rules are fair to all competitors as new lines of business are entered.

Fourth, it was our goal and objective for our legislation to be dynamic so that it evolves with and recognizes new technology and its applications.

Fifth, our legislation is predicated on competition and an opportunity model not government, be it Federal or State micromanagement.

I can't stand up here and tell you that the Communications Act of 1995 is perfect or that it will not change; of course, the legislative process itself is dynamic.

But, I can tell you that there has been much consultation with industry leaders, consumer groups, States and cities, with our members and between our respective staffs, and it should be recognized that this legislation builds on the foundation of the 14 months of

negotiation between ED MARKEY and me last session and the 4 months of discussion and negotiation this year.

In January, we had very constructive meeting with CEO's from broadcast, computer, long distance, cable and satellite, telephony and wireless industries. The checklist approach in opening the local loop originated as a result of these meetings. Rather than a date certain, the regional Bell operating companies receive a date certain which is uncertain, meaning that if their loop is open, they could begin offering long-distance service as early as 18 months after the date of enactment. The long-distance companies said they could compromise on the involvement of the Justice Department if a certain number of requirements were met, meaning that the local loop is really open to competition. The checklist requirements which must be met are: interconnection and equal access, unbundling, number portability, dialing parity, resale, access to conduits and rights of way, elimination of franchise limitations, network interoperability, good-faith negotiation, and facilities-based competitor.

Our legislation gives pricing flexibility to telephone companies, eliminating the rate-of-return concept, and totally eliminating all pricing regulation when a telephone company has competition.

Bell operating companies can enter manufacturing when they have met interconnection and equal access requirements with no separate subsidiary required.

Bell operating companies are allowed to provide electronic publishing through a separate subsidiary with safeguards and a prohibition against cross-subsidies and discrimination against unaffiliated electronic publishers. This provision sunsets in the year 2000. The BOC's are not allowed to offer alarm monitoring service before July 1, 2000.

Broadcasters receive the ability to compress their signal under the spectrum flexibility language. There is also a streamlining of the broadcast license process and an extension of the length of the license from 5 to 7 years.

Direct broadcast satellite services will be exempted from State and local taxation laws.

Congressman SCHAEFER has composed a package of cable provisions which are part of the bipartisan bill. We deregulate the small cable provider upon enactment and deregulate the upper tier of larger companies at about the time that the telephone company will begin operating a cable service.

Congressman STEARNS will offer his bill as an amendment to raise broadcast ownership caps quickly and eliminate cross-ownership restrictions. VHF–VHF combinations could be restricted if it were determined that they would restrict competition or the diversity of voices in a local market.

Congressman OXLEY will offer an amendment to remove foreign ownership restrictions on domestic telephone and broadcast companies.

Congressmen GILLMOR and BOUCHER will offer an amendment to remove restrictions that prohibit the entry of those companies governed by the Public Utility Holding Companies Act into telecommunication services.

We stand here today with broad and deep bipartisan support; telecommunication policy should not be Democrat or Republican.

We feel that this legislation serves the consumer; that this legislation gives the definition and certainty for the industry to move forward and to build the information superhighway.

This will be an evolutionary and dynamic process—but now unleashed, our legislation will pass this committee and the House—there will be a conference with the Senate and a bill will be presented to the President and signed into law, because that's good for the country and our consuming public.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today is a historic moment. Today we introduce the Communications Act of 1995, one of the most sweeping reforms of communications law in history. No law can stop the advancement of technology, but bad and antiquated laws can stop consumers from enjoying the fruits of technological progress. And that is what we have today: Americans not able to enjoy the full range of technologically feasible telecommunications services because technology has outpaced the state of the law.

MORE COMPETITION

The legislation that we are introducing today will bring competition to the local telephone and video markets—two traditional monopolies. Many companies would like to have the opportunity to compete for local telephone service. But the laws and regulations of this land effectively prohibit them from competing for business and offering innovative services, higher quality services, and lower priced services. American consumers want the choices that competition provides. The Communications Act of 1995 will give them those choices.

The bill sets the rules of the road for opening the local exchange to competition. It requires the presence of a competitor in the local exchange prior to allowing a Bell operating company to apply for entry into long distance.

Current laws restrict firms from entering other telecommunications markets as well, and the American consumer ultimately suffers. Telephone companies are prohibited by law from offering video services. The competition for higher quality and lower priced services that these and other firms could bring to the home video market would only benefit consumers. The bill will give broadcasters greater freedom to use spectrum creatively to offer new services. The bill will ultimately lead to more competition for electronic publishing, alarm, and telemessaging services.

LESS REGULATION

In short, the Communications Act of 1995 will promote competition in practically all telecommunications markets. But the mere presence of many firms competing in the current American telecommunications would not be enough to make consumers as well off as they could be. American telecommunications markets today are burdened with excessive regulations.

Firms that offer telecommunications services in the United States have artificially high costs because of: First, the high costs of complying with regulations, second, the length of licensing procedures, and third, the uncertainty of the outcome of licensing procedures. Who pays for the high cost of regulation? As always, it is the poor American consumer who pays the price. These costs of regulation are passed along to telecommunications consumers in the form of high prices for services, a lack of responsiveness to new market conditions, and a slow rate of innovation.

The Communications Act of 1995 would harness and substantially reduce Federal regulation of telecommunications. The act streamlines licensing procedures for broadcasters. The act creates temporary rules that promote a transition to competition. After the transition, most of the act sunsets. The act requires the Federal Communications Commission to forbear from—to stop—regulation. Much of the act would be largely administered locally rather than federally. The act would prevent States or the Federal Government from requiring costly rate-of-return regulation. Once telecommunications markets are competitive, price regulation would be banned altogether.

GREATER BENEFITS TO TELECOMMUNICATIONS CONSUMERS

American telecommunications consumers will be the beneficiaries of the Communications Act of 1995. Less regulation will lead to lower costs. More competition will lead to greater innovation, greater choice of services, and lower prices. Today we embark on the effort to fulfill these promises to the American telecommunications consumer.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today's introduction of a telecommunications law rewrite is a landmark compromise that culminates years of work. I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of the Communications Act of 1995. The bill has already attracted significant support among Democrats, thanks to the leadership of subcommittee chairman JACK FIELDS.

America is poised to lead the world in communications technology. This procompetitive, anti-regulatory legislation will help us make the most of the greatest economic opportunity in the history of the world.

The United States should pursue two basic strategies during this transition into the information age: to increase competitiveness among U.S. companies to inspire more choices, better programming, and more efficient service for U.S. consumers, and to export aggressively so U.S. companies will prosper and hire American workers.

I will offer a free trade amendment to the bill to repeal restrictions on foreign investment that date back to World War I. The foreign ownership restriction is a telegraph law that has no place in a telecommunications age.

Section 310(b) of the 1934 Communications Act prohibits any foreign entity from holding an investment of more than 25 percent in U.S. broadcast facilities or common carrier companies. It was passed to guard against foreign sabotage when a limited number of information sources existed. When U.S. firms seek to sell telecommunications goods and services abroad, foreign governments point to U.S. market restrictions as justification for theirs. This is a distressing reality for U.S. companies seeking to create new jobs here at home.

Telecommunications is one of the Nation's most dynamic export industries, expected to account for one-sixth of the domestic economy by the year 2000. The global telecommunications services industry alone will generate almost $1 trillion in revenues by the end of the decade.

I look forward to a constructive hearing and markup process on this bill, and I believe we will achieve our goal of enacting a modern telecommunications statute this year.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, the telecommunications bill we are introducing today is one of the most important bills to be considered in Congress in many years, and its passage will have a tremendous impact in America for decades to come.

If this legislation is enacted, the law will begin to foster economic and technological development, instead of hamper it. The bill will provide consumers and businesses new communications services, an increase in choices in the marketplace, more competition and better prices.

The bill represents the biggest single deregulation of a major industrial sector in American history, involving one-seventh of the U.S. economy and affecting virtually every American citizen.

In addition to the provisions of the main bill, I have introduced a measure to allow public utilities to enter the telecommunications industry. Right now utility companies have the technological capacity to offer cable and telephone services, but they do not have the legal capacity. This legislation I am sponsoring with Representative RICK BOUCHER would allow public utilities this entry, further increasing competition and reducing prices for consumers.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today Commerce Committee Chairman TOM BLILEY, and Telecommunications Subcommittee Chairman JACK FIELDS, introduced the largest telecommunications reform bill ever to go through Congress. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this historic legislation.

The Communications Act of 1995 will be the biggest job creation bill to pass this Congress. This legislation moves a number of currently heavily regulated industries into true market competition with each other, thus ensuring consumers real choices as to who to place their local telephone, cable television, and electronic data business with. The bill, when it becomes law, puts the consumer in the driver seat for all of his or her communications needs.

It is the most comprehensive, promarket and procompetition bill introduced for these services in the history of the Congress. The current telecommunications laws were passed over half a century ago when there were few radios, television existed only in the laboratory, and computers had not even been thought of. Today, telecommunications services are expanding daily and our laws should be expanded accordingly. Congress should quickly move ahead with this reform effort to meet the new challenges facing us today.

I support this deregulatory approach that will promote growth and competition in the telecommunications industry. If we can create a fair marketplace for telecommunication services, the industry, through competition, will create the much-touted information superhighway in a less expensive and more efficient fashion.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 1555, the Communications Act of 1995. I'd like to thank Mr. FIELDS and Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. BLILEY for their commitment to this legislation.

I'm proud that this issue has remained a priority and that we have been able to build upon the legislation that passed the House of Representatives during the last Congress.

Once again, I have a special interest in keeping telephone rates in rural areas low while protecting small- and medium-sized phone companies from unfair competition. I have appreciated Chairman FIELDS' willingness to work with me on this issue throughout the drafting process. This bill, as introduced today, offers several protections for rural carriers, but I realize that it does not go far enough. Today, I pledge my commitment to improving this bill as it moves through the Commerce Committee. I have encouraged my colleagues to look at the Senate language regarding rural carriers, which exempts carriers who have 2 percent or fewer of the access lines nationwide, because I would like to see this bill move in that direction. As a start, Mr. FIELDS has assured me that we can amend this bill to exempt carriers that provide telephone exchange service to any local exchange carrier study area with fewer than 100,000 access lines. I appreciate his willingness to work with me and his commitment to protecting and preserving rural America.

Mr. Speaker, for rural America, this bill represents an amazing opportunity for advancements in education, among other things. I was pleased to see provisions to ensure that educational institutions will have access to this growing technology. Additionally, I pledge to work toward enhancing this bill to ensure that health care providers will be able to tap into resources to expand their infrastructure to provide telemedicine, which is essential to rural areas like the First Congressional District. This will be vital in delivering services that will help up keep up with advances in larger cities while preserving the quality of life we enjoy.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Commerce Committee to build upon this legislation and bring a bill to the House floor that this body can approve with the overwhelming support that we saw in passage of H.R. 3636 and H.R. 3626 during the last Congress.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to give my full support for the Communications Act of 1995 which the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance introduced today with bipartisan support. I commend Chairman BLILEY and Chairman FIELDS for the outstanding work they did on this much-needed legislation.

I would also like to thank the staffs of both the subcommittee and full committee for their efforts in getting this legislation drafted and wish to commend them for the open and fair manner in which they achieved writing this groundbreaking legislation. This bill provides sweeping reforms in the communications industry and gives consumers a greater choice of services. This legislation will provide lower prices and higher quality. Clearly, the consumers will be the winners.

The antiquated Communications Act of 1934 needs to be updated to ensure that the American telecommunications industries will be able to compete in this high-technology information age in which we are living. This legislation encourages competition and deregulation, thereby opening up future market opportunities for those who wish to compete in all telecommunications services. Comprehensive reform of this industry is long overdue and I am proud to cosponsor this bill which will achieve that goal.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today I joined many of my colleagues on the Commerce Committee in the introduction of H.R. 1555, the Communications Act of 1995. I would like to congratulate the chairman of the Commerce Committee, Mr. BLILEY, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Telecommunications and Finance, Mr. FIELDS, for their cooperation and work in drafting this landmark piece of legislation.

This legislation closely tracks the legislation overwhelmingly passed by the House last year, H.R. 3626. That bill passed by a vote of 423 to 5, and it is my hope that H.R. 1555 will have the same level of support when it goes to the floor.

The legislation does several important things. It removes the artificial barriers to entry that restrict competition in several telecommunications markets. Upon the enactment of this bill, telephone companies will be permitted to offer cable service. Cable operators will be able to offer telephone service. Long distance companies will be able to resell local telephone service. And ultimately, the Bell operating companies will have the ability to enter the long distance market.

The dismantling of these barriers to entry will result in several significant improvements for the American public. Perhaps most importantly, services that have traditionally been offered by regulated monopolies will become competitive. Cable operators will have to fight with telephone companies to attract—and keep—consumers. Telephone companies will face a variety of competitors, each seeking new and innovative ways to attract subscribers. The long distance industry will face the entry of seven large, well-financed competitors.

The result, for the American public, will be lower prices and greater responsiveness to the needs of consumers.

In addition, we are likely to see the pace of innovation accelerate. Markets that heretofore have been responsive to Government edict will listen to consumers. Companies will refine their marketing efforts to make certain that consumers come first.

And by allowing competition across the telecommunications landscape, competitors are likely to create packages of services that appeal to consumers. Consumers can have the option of one-stop shopping, in which local and long distance telephone service can be obtained from a single vendor. Cable subscribers will be able to obtain a package that also includes telephone service. Consumers will be able to obtain greater convenience and save money—or, if they choose, they will still be able to purchase their service on an a la carte basis from a variety of service providers.

This is a good bill. But like any piece of legislation, it can be improved. I am particularly troubled by the provisions that end the regulation of cable rates on the day that the Federal Communications Commission issues its rules governing the offering of cable service by telephone companies. My concerns are shared by

many of the Democratic members of the committee; they are shared by the administration; and I think it's likely that we will see some amendments to ensure that consumers are not gouged by monopolies until a competitive alternative is available.

But despite my reservations about this provision, I expect that we will be able to resolve our differences here in a manner comparable to the way we have developed a consensus on the other provisions of this bill. In that regard, I would like to commend both Chairman BLILEY and Chairman FIELDS for the manner in which they have treated the Democrats during the drafting process. This has been a truly bipartisan process, and the legislative text that was introduced today reflects the many compromises and changes that were made by both sides.

Telecommunications issues have never been partisan, and have never been ideological. The manner in which the majority has treated the minority in this case is exemplary, and it is my hope that it will serve as a model for the many legislative initiatives we have before us. I would like to thank both of these fine legislators, and look forward to continuing this bipartisan approach as H.R. 1555 moves through the House.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1555 is a good bill, and before it is sent to the President for his signature, it will be a better bill. I urge my colleagues to join with us in support of this legislation, and enact a statute that will enable the telecommunications industries to bring to the American people the benefits that the twenty-first century has to offer.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform Members about the introduction of the Commerce Committee's historic legislation to reshape our Nation's telecommunications laws.

I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation and commend Commerce Committee Chairman BLILEY, Telecommunications and Finance Subcommittee Chairman FIELDS, and ranking members JOHN DINGELL and ED MARKEY for their efforts to produce a bipartisan bill.

The Nation cannot wait another year for telecommunications reform. The current law of the land for telecommunications is based on a law written in the 1800's to govern railroads in America. Now, after several decades of extraordinary advances in information technology, most of our Nation's telephone system consists of a pair of copper wires.

As the Representative from Silicon Valley in California, I know the importance of deregulation to computer and software technology. Information technologies are the business of Silicon Valley.

I believe we can look to the computer and software industries as examples of good things to come for the communications industry if competition can be established.

Consider the first digital computer made in 1943 which was 8 feet high, 50 feet long, contained 500 miles of wire, and could perform about three additions per second. Today, consumers can purchase a computer with wafer-thin microprocessors which are capable of hundreds of millions of additions per second and fit on your lap.

Yet today's twisted copper wire telephone network is unsuitable for modern computers and software applications which can incorporate voice, video, graphic, and data transmissions and send them simultaneously in real-time exchanges.

A technology gap exists between the information technology and communications industries and this hurts our international competitiveness. This bill can help close the gap, encourage competition, and foster increases in high technology exports and jobs.

A successful telecommunications bill should pass two critical tests. First, it should establish a process which brings the greatest competition to bear, and second, it should promote technology innovation and production in a way that can make a difference in peoples' lives.

This bill is a step forward in meeting these important goals and I'm proud to cosponsor it.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of the special order today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FIELDS].

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

There was no objection.

FINANCIAL SERVICES REFORM

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, the House has a unique opportunity during this Congress to take important and long-overdue steps to modernize the U.S. financial services system and prepare it for the competitive challenges of the 21st century.

In 1991, I served as chair of the Banking Committee's Task Force on the International Competitiveness of U.S. Financial Institutions. That task force concluded that our financial services policy had failed to keep pace with new market developments, including changes in corporate and individual consumer needs, new technology and product innovation. The result was a financial services system that was potentially uncompetitive, inefficient, unduly expensive, and slow to respond to changing customer demands.

The task force report concluded that it was incumbent upon policymakers to undertake a fundamental and comprehensive reassessment of the major laws and the regulatory structure which underpin the U.S. financial system. There have been several abortive efforts since that time to do so. But I believe we have now finally achieved substantial consensus that change is necessary, the circumstances are now ripe for meaningful action, and the goal is within our reach.

The chairmen of both the House and Senate Banking Committees have put forward comprehensive reform proposals. While these proposals differ in important regards, they share many key elements. The Treasury Department has put forward a proposal of its own that is substantively comparable in many critical respects. In addition, the affected industries are engaged in meaningful and substantive discussions on the key issues in an effort to achieve some consensus.

While differences in perspective certainly exist, what is most noteworthy is the widely shared assumption that our financial services system requires substantial reinvention. If we can keep our eye on this shared goal, we should be able to build upon the many points on which we all agree and effect reasonable compromise where we do not in the days ahead.

To that end, while I have very definite ideas of my own as to the best course of action on key issues, I do not plan to introduce legislation at this point. A Banking Committee markup is imminent, and we will be working from the chairman's mark—which is still in preparation—as is appropriate. I believe our best prospect of success lies in working cooperatively and in a spirit of compromise to further refine that mark in a way that builds consensus on these important issues. Past experience should certainly have taught us that legislation which does not reflect a reasonably broad consensus is doomed to failure.

I. PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE DELIBERATIONS

I would, however, like to set forth some principles which I believe should guide our deliberations.

(A) Congress should attempt to achieve the broadest reform possible;

(B) Elimination of the barrier between commercial and investment banking should be accomplished so as to maximize efficiencies and take advantage of possible synergies between lines of business, while safeguarding safety and soundness;

(C) Reform should create a true two-way street between banks and securities firms, level the competitive playing field, and provide such firms equal opportunity to enter each other's businesses;

(D) Nothing we do should turn the clock back or impose new restrictions where none are warranted;

(E) Safeguarding consumer rights and interests should be an integral part of any reform package;

(F) Proper regulatory oversight should emphasize functional regulation, ensure necessary political accountability, and take advantage of the benefits provided by a creative tention between regulators; and

(G) Reform should ensure that foreign banks have a fair opportunity to compete on equal terms, and are not competitively disadvantaged.

II. THE MAJOR ISSUES

A. The need for broad reform:

It is imperative that we strive for the broadest financial services reform on which it is possible to achieve consensus. This is not a time to be timid.

The current structure of our financial services system fails to reflect substantial changes in products, technology, customer demand, and service delivery that have occurred over many years. It is increasingly difficult to discern meaningful differences between the products offered by banks, securities firms, and insurance companies, or to place into neatly segregated compartments the customer needs each provider is attempting to serve.

Past ad hoc attempts to adjust to market changes without comprehensive reform have created a system replete with inconsistencies, and regulatory and legal anomalies. Our goal should be to correct this unduly complex and conceptually inconsistent structure, not perpetuate it. But we should not achieve purity by the elimination or undue restriction of legitimate businesses that pose no harm and contribute positively to the competitiveness and efficiency of our financial services system.

We must also focus on achieving progressive change, If financial services reform is justified, it is presumably because the premise behind our action is that we are constructing a safer and sounder financial services system, offering opportunities for diversification and better risk management. I believe that is the case. In my view, it is the very limited nature of the existing bank charter that has created many of the industry's past problems. The reform we craft should reflect that understanding.

B. Removing barriers between commercial and investment banking:

The Leach bill takes a major step forward in finally removing the barriers between the banking and securities businesses, businesses which simply offer alternative means of meeting similar customer needs. Such a step is long overdue.

Substantial changes have occurred in recent decades in the way traditional bank customers have attempted to meet their financial needs. Major corporations have moved increasingly to the capital markets to obtain needed financing. At the same time, individual consumers and small businesses have increasingly sought alternatives to traditional checking and savings accounts for transactional, savings, and investment purposes. Yet, while the market has changed substantially, the Nation's banks have been precluded from following their customers and effectively responding to changing demand.

Bank holding companies do have limited authority to enter the securities business through the section 20 subsidiaries authorized by the Federal Reserve. The successful operation of such subsidiaries has established clearly that commercial and investment banking activities can be combined within a holding company structure to the benefit of consumers, and without risk to safety and soundness, if proper controls are put in place.

I believe there is substantial consensus that the barriers between these two banking businesses should be eliminated, with proper prudential controls, and that should be a top priority of any reform package. Moreover, this reform should be effected in such a way as to maximize possible efficiencies and synergies.

1. Wholesale bank holding companies:

For those institutions that wish to engage solely in a wholesale business, the provision in the Leach bill for creation of a wholesale bank holding company, subject to more limited regulatory strictures, makes eminent sense. Many prudential controls are designed primarily to protect against an inappropriate use of depositor funds. For those institutions not engaged in retail activity and not seeking deposit insurance protection, less onerous controls are appropriate. While it is true that wholesale institutions will maintain access to the discount window, appropriate controls on such access are already in place.

2. Appropriate firewalls:

In the course of the debate on financial services reform in the past, great emphasis has been placed on firewalls between holding company affiliates as the primary mechanism for guarding against misuse of depositor funds. While I believe firewalls are important, they are only one element of an overall structure of prudential controls. A single-minded focus on firewalls as a source of protection may only ensure that they are so restrictive as to render inoperative useful synergies that can otherwise be achieved within the holding company structure.

Much has changed since earlier debates on these issues. The changes in bank capital requirements, coupled with provision in FDICIA for prompt corrective action and enhanced supervisory authority, have given bank regulators ample authority to intervene well before depositors are placed at any risk.

Firewalls certainly offer additional protection, but are no substitute for the prudential controls otherwise already in place.

I believe experience with the new authorities granted banking institutions will help us determine what firewalls are more or less meaningful and appropriate. Therefore, I believe it appropriate that the relevant regulatory authority be granted some marginal discretion to adjust those firewalls as experience dictates.

3. Exercise of authority through operating subsidiaries:

The Leach bill relies heavily on the holding company structure as protection against newly authorized activities placing the depository institution at risk. I believe this is largely appropriate. However, we should not insist on the expense and potential inefficiency of creating a holding company structure where one might not be necessary.

Where activities have been performed in the bank or bank subsidiaries with presenting any undue risk, such an alternative structure might continue to be appropriate. We should review closely what activities can reasonably continue to be conducted by the bank directly without undue risk.

C. The need to establish a true two-way street:

This reform effort should not be a debate simply about giving banks or any particular type of financial institution more powers, at the competitive expense of other financial services providers. Our goal should be to remove barriers between financial industries which we have come to see as artificial, level the competitive playing field and increase opportunities for all financial services providers.

In removing the barriers between commercial and investment banking, our goal should be to create a full two-way street through which commercial and investment banks can enter each other's businesses on equal terms. Yet, while this is our appropriate goal, it is not easily achieved if a reform bill is too narrowly structured. The structure of many existing securities firms and their existing affiliations with insurance companies may well preclude their taking full advantage of the removal of existing barriers between commercial and investment banking.

While the Leach bill provides some accommodation, I do not believe it goes far enough. Correcting this potential inequity must be a major matter of concern as we debate these issues.

D. Avoiding retrenchment:

There are legitimate and substantial differences of opinion regarding how far we should go in breaking down the walls between banking and commerce or, indeed, the barriers between various financial services providers. We may not ultimately be able to produce as broad reform as some, including myself, might like. However, in no case should this reform proposal become a vehicle for turning the clock back and eliminating or taking authority away from financial institutions whose activities have posed no risk while providing much benefit to consumers.

In my view, many of the existing anomalies in our financial services system represent marginal progress toward a more integrated financial services system. In fact, some of these anomalies simply reflect our financial services system as it once existed before new restrictions were imposed in various bank and thrift holding company legislation, CEBA and other legislation imposing what were new restrictions and limitations. The proper response is not to remove these anomalies or restrict them further, but to move, incrementally if need be, toward a comprehensive reform of the financial services system which will ultimately embrace them.

The original Leach bill would have eliminated the charter of unitary thrift holding companies. A subsequent draft

would grandfather existing institutions. In my view, if we are not to address the banking and commerce issue fully, the proper approach is for the bill to remain silent on this issue. Existing unitaries have served as instructive examples of how financial and commercial activities can in some cases be appropriately mixed. They have posed no risk to safety and soundness, are subject to appropriate regulatory and oversight authority, and serve customers well.

There is no compelling reason to circumscribe their operations at this point. Grandfathering is an unworkable alternative in my view. To artificially circumscribe the ability of functioning businesses to expand and compete on equal terms is to effectively sound their death kneel. I believe that any changes in the unitary structure should await a subsequent day when we are willing and able to address banking and commerce issues in some comprehensive fashion.

In the same fashion, I believe it is time to eliminate the restrictions imposed on limited purpose banks. I always believed these restrictions were anticompetitive and should never have been imposed. But in any case they were intended as a temporary measure awaiting comprehensive financial services reform. We are still awaiting such reform, and I believe even this Congress' effort will fall short of what is desirable.

In the meantime, changes in the restrictions imposed on these financial institutions can no longer wait. This is virtually the only financial services arena in which time is standing still. There have otherwise been substantial changes in the laws and regulations that have enhanced opportunities for other financial services providers and made full-service banks more efficient, strong, and competitive. In this context, the arbitrary restrictions imposed on limited-purpose banks are untenable and unreasonable.

E. Safeguarding consumers:

Safeguarding the consumer's interests must be a central element of this reform effort. If banking institutions are to be permitted to offer an array of products, some of which are insured, and others not, it is imperative that the consumer be clearly informed of any risk he is assuming and that safeguards be put in place to eliminate any potential confusion. Clear disclosure requirements which will ensure that the consumer understands what protections are afforded with any particular products must be a part of this bill.

But disclosure alone is not enough. Institutional structures can inadvertently or purposefully suggest protections that do not apply. For example, the marketing of mutual funds under a name or logo that may suggest that the product is somehow insured or guaranteed by a banking institution could place the consumer at undue risk, and prohibitions or restrictions on the use of a common name and logo may be appropriate.

We must also find a proper balance between the consumer's right to privacy and the synergies available from cross-marketing. Both financial services providers and consumers can benefit from marketing efforts that bring the full array of products available from a particular financial services provider to the consumer's attention. Yet consumers also have a right to have confidential information maintained as such, and to be protected from being inundated with sales pitches and marketing information they neither seek nor wish to have. We must strive for a proper balance between these competing interests.

F. Providing for proper regulatory oversight:

The regulatory controls put in place in FDICIA—most notably, tougher capital requirements and provision for prompt corrective action—have contributed substantially to the safety and soundness of our banking system. These and other prudential controls are essential to the proper implementation of financial services reform.

I believe any effort at complete regulatory reorganization should follow rather than precede or accompany modernization legislation—it is difficult to determine what authority appropriately lies with what regulator when the distinctions between types of financial services providers and their products remain unclear. Nevertheless, clarification and, where appropriate, enhancement of regulatory authority should be central elements of the Banking Committee's product.

In my own view, the proper regulatory oversight structure would rely heavily on a scheme of functional regulation, while providing some limited oversight authority to the Federal Reserve at the holding company level to protect against systemic risk. I have great confidence in the Federal Reserve as an institution and in its skill as a regulator. However, I believe there are inherent risks in placing plenary authority in any independent regulatory institution, and I believe the authority granted the Federal Reserve in the Leach bill is too encompassing. The scheme we ultimately construct should ensure the necessary degree of political accountability and take advantage of the creative tension between regulatory authorities that has proved a useful source of adaptation and innovation in the past.

G. Equal treatment of foreign banks:

The presence of foreign financial institutions in our market has served our economy and our communities well. In addition, U.S. financial institutions benefit when they are able to enter foreign markets under regulatory regimes that permit them to compete fairly with domestic service providers.

Any financial services reform should provide for the equal treatment of foreign banks so long a hallmark of U.S. law. Most international banks in the United States operate uninsured, wholesale branches and agency offices rather than bank subsidiaries. The reform legislation should ensure that foreign banks that seek U.S. securities affiliates can continue to be able to operate branches and agency offices in the United States and not be required to ''roll up'' their U.S. banking operations into subsidiary banks.

Most countries permit nondomestic banks to compete through branches, because the entire world-wide capital of the bank stands behind the branch's operations. Such rules applied in foreign markets substantially benefit U.S. banking institutions operating abroad. Any change in that requirement would disadvantage them severely.

Applying these same rules in our own market benefits not only foreign banks but the U.S. customers they serve. The ability of a branch to draw on the resources of the entire bank directly benefits U.S. corporate customers by enhancing the availability of credit, increasing the availability and size of loans from international banks, and reducing the cost of financing for customers.

III. CONCLUSION

This Congress provides a singular opportunity to take major steps toward financial services reform which will make our financial services system safer, more efficient, and more competitive and provide consumers better and more varied services. I look forward to working with Chairman LEACH, Ranking Minority Member GONZALEZ, and my colleagues in both sides of the aisle to achieve this long-sought goal.

SOME COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES PERFORM A DISSERVICE TO AMERICA'S YOUNG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DUNCAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, some of the colleges and universities in this Nation are performing a real disservice to our young people.

They are encouraging them to get—or at least not discouraging them from getting—degrees in fields in which there is almost no hope for a good job.

This is particularly true concerning many graduate programs—especially in the field of law.

My wife recently had her groceries carried out by a young man who had received a law degree but who could not find a job.

Many law schools are perpetrating a fraud. They tell their students ''Yes, there are too many lawyers, but there will always be room for a few more good ones.''

Well, everyone thinks they will be the good one.

Only after spending a small fortune and devoting several years of hard work to the task, do they receive a very rude awakening.

Except for a very few of the top graduates from the most prestigious schools, or the very few who have good family connections, most find out they could make more money managing a McDonald's or driving a truck.

We possibly should require colleges and universities to put warning labels on some of their degree programs such as ''There are currently almost no jobs available in this field'' or ''This degree will do you absolutely no good whatsoever in obtaining employment.''

If you think I am exaggerating, listen to these two letters in the April 24 issue of U.S. News & World Report:

Thank you for including ''Gypsy Profs'' with your rankings of liberal arts programs. It should give pause to anyone misinformed enough to think a graduate degree will guarantee a chance to teach. Like those in your article, I have a Ph.D., which entitles me to drive 480 miles each week to teach five courses for two community colleges. Each semester is an employment uncertainty. But I love what I do—something not true of most people—and I don't see a great deal of employment security anywhere. I knew what I was getting when I entered graduate school. Still, I dearly wish that the future looked more promising. There's no dignity in being a mercenary teacher-for-hire; last week my father-in-law described me as ''unemployed'' at a family gathering.

MICHAEL J. BOOKER.

KNOXVILLE, TN.

I received my Ph.D. in history from the University of Chicago in 1993, and after two years in the job market and well over 100 applications for employment, I have yet to be called for my first interview despite my teaching experience and track record of publishing in professional journals. The time I spent working toward my doctorate would have been better utilized in almost any other career, where I would have been earning money and accruing seniority. The ''gypsy profs'' may not realize it, but they are the lucky ones in the fraud America's graduate schools are perpetrating on their students!

JONATHAN R. DEAN.

CRAWFORDSVILLE, IN.

Now, I hope I will not be misunderstood. A college education is a good thing.

I am not saying people should not go to college.

I am saying that many college graduates cannot find jobs today, particularly in fields like law and in teaching school.

There is a huge surplus of lawyers—and a huge surplus of teachers—and a huge surplus of people who want jobs in law enforcement or other Government jobs.

All I am really saying is that we need to do everything possible to encourage young people to go into fields where they are needed more—where the future is brighter.

We should also do a better job promoting what used to be called vocational education, but which in most places today is called technology education.

We need more young people today with technical training.

It is sad to see so many young people today getting college degrees, and particularly graduate degrees, which really do them no good.

It is just wrong to continue perpetrating fraud on our Nation's young people so some universities can make more money or so that some colleges can continue to employ professors who are teaching in fields in which there are almost no jobs.

Fortunately, our unemployment is low; but our underemployment is great and, unfortunately, is growing. Many colleges and universities are helping to make this situation worse.

IN HONOR OF FALLEN SECRET SERVICE AGENTS

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as the ranking member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government. I rise today to pay a solemn tribute to the six employees of the U.S. Secret Service, one of whom is missing and five of whom we know have lost their lives as a result of the heinous attack on the Federal building in Oklahoma City. I rose yesterday in the context of the Oklahoma City resolution to talk about all the Federal employees.

I want to express my deepest sympathy to all the families, friends, and neighbors, but particularly, at this time to the family, friends, neighbors, and colleagues of the brave six Secret Service employees who we lost at Oklahoma City. This is a time of deep anguish and pain for the families of those killed, those injured, and those whose loved ones are still unaccounted for as they were doing the business of the people of the country.

Today we remember Assistant Special Agent in Charge Alan G. Whicher, who served as part of the detail protecting President Clinton, and then was transferred to what I am sure he and his family thought was a more tranquil environment in Oklahoma City. He lost his life.

Special Agent Cynthia L. Brown, appointed a special agent only a little over 1 year ago. She lost her life.

Special Agent Donald R. Leonard. His career assignments included the Vice-Presidential Protective Division. He lost his life.

Special Agent Mickey R. Maroney, who served with the Secret Service since 1971. He lost his life.

An investigative assistant, Kathy L. Seidl, appointed to the Secret Service in 1985, to the Oklahoma City office; and the office manager, Linda McKinney, who was recovered from the rubble only yesterday. She was the one I said was missing, and I was in error. She has been located.

I cannot say that I know the pain the people of Oklahoma City are experiencing. I do know very well the feeling of loss that communities all across this country feel for the people of Oklahoma City and for the loved ones of those who lost their lives.

Mr. Speaker, God blesses America, and he does so through the services of so many, and particularly through the service of those who are fallen but not forgotten. Let us, Mr. Speaker, resolve at this moment to embrace the wives and the children, the mothers and the fathers, the sisters and the brothers, the fellow colleagues, all those who love them dearly, in the fellowship of love and compassion. While they have lost an important part of their families, we must assure them they will always be a part of our larger family.

To the family and friends of those brave U.S. Secret Service agents and employees, my words today, of course, cannot express the sorrow for the loss of this Nation's best, and the gratitude for their sacrifice. I recall the words of President Lincoln, and I quote:

I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming, but I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and the lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

President Lincoln, of course, spoke of those who lost their lives in the preservation of the Union; those who lost their lives in Oklahoma City did so as well.

As a father, a husband, and as a child of God, my heartfelt sympathies go out to each of the families. May they, too, find comfort in their sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I know that every colleague joins me in expressing our sympathy and our sorrow, and our wishes that God will bless Alan, Cynthia, Donald, Mickey, Kathy, and Linda.

THE DIFFICULTIES OF THE HOUSE AS IT DEALS WITH THE BUDGET ISSUE

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to talk a bit about some of the things that are in some of the newspapers today about the difficulties this House is facing as it forces itself to deal with the budget issue. For the last 4 years, we had the budget done on time. That was before April 15. This year, for all the magic done and all the things that got going, guess what, we do not have a budget, and everybody is saying ''Just do it. Where's the budget?''

I think the budget happens to be the most important thing, and we should have done that first, before we did all the giveaways and all the tax cuts and all the other goodies, but the goodies have been given out, and now it is time

to take the medicine. The first issue that I thought was so interesting was the Hill newspaper, which said, guess what,

The Republicans are having trouble with their own appointed head of the Congressional Budget Office.

Luckily, the Congressional Budget Office is there. When the Democrats appointed the head of the Budget Office, we had trouble. Mr. Reischauer pointed out that we had underestimated the cost of the health care proposals that were out there. Thank goodness he did that, because I think he brought real reality.

Now they are very angry because the new head that they appointed is telling them their Medicare stuff does not add up, that they have put in all sorts of little amendments, and they want to tinker a little bit with it, and it is going to be a whole lot more costly than they thought. That is not the news they want to hear, but Americans want to hear what is really going to happen to the budget, so I am glad that both under Republicans and Democrats that Budget Office has worked to be nonpartisan and look at the numbers, not poll numbers, but budget numbers.

This budget fight goes on and on and on because, as you see in the other newspaper, you see both Republican leaders out pleading with the President to join them in the rescue of Medicare. They want the President to join them in the rescue of Medicare after they have proceeded to raid Medicare. What a deal. They get to raid it, we get to rescue it. There is something wrong with that picture.

The President and his administration were very responsible in the last 2 years. They have dealt with Medicare in our last budget. We bailed it out for the next 3 years, added solvency to it. We did it without one Republican vote. We have been talking about how not only Medicare but all health care should be looked at, because of the rising costs. We have had many proposals. Guess what, we didn't get a lot of bipartisan help.

In this last election people went out and said, ''It is so easy. Those silly Democrats, they just mess everything up. Just give it to us. We can do tax cuts, we can balance the budget, and we can increase defense.'' I guess people forgot they had heard that once before in 1981. It didn't work then, and we see it isn't working now.

I really hope we get on with business, we get a budget out here. The No. 1 issue people want is doing something about that deficit, doing something about that deficit as rapidly as possible. All the other stuff was frill. We got the frill out of the way. We still don't have the main course, the budget. I hope we don't see politicization of the budget office.

We saw earlier this year the Speaker taking on his own budget nominee, saying he didn't like the way that they were responding. They are supposed to respond neutrally and according to real numbers. That is the way it should be. I salute Director O'Neill for continuing that tradition, and I must say, let's stop whining about that and let's get on with the real budget. Just do it. Let's stop whining about how the President should rescue them from their own raids that they made to do tax cuts for the wealthy. Hey, they gave it away, now they have got to figure out how they pay. I don't think they should blame it on the President. He didn't get the credit for giving it all away.

Let's get on with it, let's see that budget, and let's get on with the real hard tasks of government.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I think I have heard some speculation that the Republicans want to cut somewhere in the neighborhood of $350 billion out of Medicare spending, which would mean, of course, that there would either be higher payments by senior citizens, or lower reimbursement to hospitals and doctors and clinics and the like.

What I find curious about this is that $350 billion figure is very close to the figure that we hear will be the cost of the tax cut bill, which was part of the Republican Contract With America. So this tax cut that took the money out of the Treasury is obviously being plugged with some cuts in Medicare. Maybe I have missed something here, but the two figures are very similar.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Illinois listened very properly and very correctly. That is exactly right. They raided it, they gave it away, and now they are screaming to the President, ''Rescue us, rescue us from our own craziness.'' If you remember, when these tax cuts went into effect, the Speaker attacked the same budget director who came out with this analysis on what those tax cuts were going to cost: ''Did you write the numbers the same,'' and said it looked like she had socialists doing the analysis. Really.

That is why I think the rhetoric has gotten too high on this, and the gentleman has gotten right to the core of the problem, as he usually does.

□ 1215

MEDICARE AND THE BUDGET

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues on this side of the aisle have raised the question about exactly what is going on with the Republican budget process where we are now a month late in meeting the deadline, a deadline that we have not missed over the last 4 years.

I guess the answer is in the daily press. That is, that the Republican leadership is having a terrible time with now trying to figure out how to connect all of the dots in what they have promised in their budget to the American public. That is, that they would provide a huge tax cut to the wealthiest people in this Nation, they would balance the budget, they would add money to the military, and they would not touch Social Security.

Of course, what we now find out is that they cannot meet those targets without touching Social Security, and they plan to do more than just touch Social Security. The speculation runs from cuts of somewhere around $200 billion over the next 7 years to Senators estimating as high as $400 billion. What that means, if you just take an average, if you just save $250 billion, you are talking over that 7-year period of asking senior citizens to pay somewhere between $3,000 and $3,700 more for their health care.

The problem is that many, many of these senior citizens simply have no way to replace that income. They have no way to replace the money that they would have to pay out for the additional cost of Medicare. They have no ability to go back to work. They cannot get a job. They cannot lean on their children any harder. So those cuts are immediately translated to the declining assets and the financial well-being of the senior citizens.

The Republican leadership has run around the last couple of days trying to explain that this is really about their saving Medicare, this is about reforming Medicare. But it is interesting, as each objective observer who has looked at this says that this continues to translate into cuts to Medicare that must be made up by the beneficiaries of that plan, the senior citizens of this country, the $3,000 that I just talked about.

It is also interesting to note that when you get into a discussion of rural hospitals, we find out that there are 10 million Medicare beneficiaries who live in rural America, where often there is only a single hospital available to service that population and the rest of the community, and that these kinds of cuts, the hospital association tells us, translate into a serious threat of these hospitals closing, and not only the senior citizens losing access to that hospital but the entire community losing access to that hospital.

We also know that these rural residents very often are more likely than urban residents to be uninsured. So the ability to offset these cuts would then be shifted in rural areas, perhaps to those who have less access to insurance.

It is interesting also to note that the plan of just cutting across the board in Medicare is resisted by the National Association of Manufacturers, companies like Eastman Kodak that say if you do that, once again you are taking

the cost of Medicare and you are shifting it onto the backs of working people who are already paying very substantial premiums for current Medicare recipients and for their future cost.

This kind of leads you to what happened yesterday when Senator DOLE and Speaker GINGRICH called a news conference to explain all this, and as they found that they could not explain it to the press, they finally just simply walked out of the news conference. They just walked off stage.

They called the news conference, they said, ''We want the news conference to explain to the American people how we are saving Medicare,'' and when they got into the news conference a few minutes, they found out that they could not explain it because the numbers do not add up. They cannot protect Social Security under their plan or they cannot protect the balanced budget under their plan or they cannot protect the tax cut under their plan. So they simply in a huff walked out of the room and said they would get back to everyone later.

That is what the fear is about in the country today, is that they will get back to us later. I guess the new date for the budget is on May 17, and at that point then we will, I guess, be able to unravel the puzzle here on how they are going to meet the goal of the balanced budget which almost everybody in the country believes should happen, the goal of the tax cut which most of the country thinks is kind of a luxury when you are running a deficit of $250 to $300 billion a year, a $4 trillion national debt, to now borrow money to give people a tax cut or borrow money from the Social Security recipients to give the people a tax cut.

This just no longer makes any kind of economic sense, and looks very bad both for the deficit, for Social Security recipients, and eventually for low-income people who rely on the programs that have already been cut.

I will be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wanted to focus on one point you had made about the Republicans saying they would not touch Social Security, but what these Medicare cuts will do. It would reduce half of the Social Security cost-of-living adjustment for millions and millions of our senior citizens. In fact, 2 million Medicare beneficiaries will have all or most of their cost of living adjustments consumed by the Republican beneficiary cost increases.

Mr. MILLER of California. So in fact what you are saying is when they get a COLA increase, the vast amount of that COLA will simply be absorbed in additional Medicare costs to the Social Security recipient?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes. It is a back door way of cutting Social Security.

MORE ON MEDICARE

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the earlier discussion by the gentleman and the gentlewoman from California about Medicare.

I think it is critically important for us to focus on the fact that when we are talking about Medicare, we are not necessarily just confining our interest to the health care of our parents and grandparents. Some of us who are advancing in age look to Medicare just a few years down the line to take care of them, too.

But the bottom line is that Medicare and Medicaid, the other Government health care program, are major sources of funding for hospitals across the United States. In my small-town district in Illinois, I have many, many hospitals, and I find that 60 percent to 80 percent of the revenue coming into those hospitals comes from those two Government programs, Medicare and Medicaid.

So when I hear suggestions made, as I have from some Republican leaders who are trying to come up with a budget, that they want to make cuts of billions of dollars in Medicare funds in out years, it not only should cause concern among seniors and people soon to be seniors as to whether they will have to pay more out of pocket, it also raises a serious question as to whether or not these hospitals will receive enough revenue to keep their doors open.

Those who visit with the hospital administrators and boards know that there have been dramatic changes in these hospitals in rural and small town America over the last 10 years. Most of them have downsized, there are fewer patient beds, there is more outpatient service, and they depend dramatically on Medicare and Medicaid to continue to keep their doors open.

We just finished last week in Ames, IA, a rural conference with President Clinton and Vice President Gore talking about the future of small-town America. A lot of concentration was put on bringing new jobs and keeping businesses in rural America. What we found is that when the Chamber of Commerce or the local boosters want to bring in a business or keep one, they have to answer some basic questions. The first question is: Do you have a hospital? How many doctors do you have?

So when we talk about changing a Federal program for medical care, reducing the expenditure and literally threatening the bottom line of rural and small-town hospitals, the ripple effect goes far beyond the jobs at that hospital. It goes far beyond whether or not that ambulance has to drive 5 minutes or 50 minutes with a patient who is in critical need. It goes to the question of whether or not the community survives.

Members of Congress fight battles day in and day out to keep Federal facilities open in small towns. We know how important they are. There is nothing more important than a hospital. Absolutely nothing. In rural America, it is critically important because we have an older population. Many of them are in farming, the most dangerous occupation in America, and a lot of them get involved in automobile accidents in rural areas at higher speeds with more injuries.

So all these debates that we hear on Capitol Hill about budget resolutions and the future of Medicare have dramatic importance to people living in small town America. They had better tune in.

Let me tell you, also, as I listen to this debate, I am really troubled. The Republicans yesterday, Mr. DOLE, Mr. GINGRICH, tossed down the gauntlet and said, ''President Clinton, why haven't you told us anything about health care reform?''

Excuse me? This President was here 2 years ago with a proposal on health care reform. It was one that was detailed. Perhaps it was overly bureaucratic, maybe it was too large in its scope, but he accepted the challenge long before they issued it. He came to us and said, ''Let's look at the integrated health care system of America and how we can help Medicare, Medicaid, uninsured people, and the private sector,'' and it fell on deaf ears.

The insurance industry ran over him like a steamroller, and that was the end of the debate. Now the Republican leaders have discovered the issue again because the problem is still there. The problem is there in terms of human terms and in terms of budget terms.

I sincerely hope that we can come to some sort of bipartisan dialog on this. But I think honestly before that occurs that the Republican leaders, particularly those in the House, are going to have to basically admit the reality that they cannot have a tax cut package which adds more to our Nation's deficit at the time that they are talking about cutting a program as critical as Medicare.

I think if they drop that whole Republican tax bill and then say, ''Let's come to the table,'' we have got a real opportunity for bipartisanship. But why in the world should my senior citizens, should my small towns and should my neighbors lose a community hospital critical for the future of that community in order to give tax breaks to the wealthiest people in America under the Republican Contract With America? That does not compute. You cannot give a tax credit large enough to a family to make up for the loss of a hospital when there is serious need, when that family needs that medical care.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. I appreciate the gentleman's comments about what it means to hospitals, both rural and urban, and why we need to address the budget seriously without taking out all these hundreds of billions of dollars for tax cuts for the wealthiest.

I wanted to point out that distinction again, though, between tax cuts for the wealthiest and who is paying the price, out-of-pocket cost to senior citizens.

Right now the Urban Institute says that seniors spend a staggering 21 percent of their incomes to pay for out-of-pocket health care costs. That is now. If the Republicans go through with their tax cuts and take it out of Medicare, as we said earlier in the special order of the gentleman from California, this will again take it out of the pockets of seniors, a back door way of reducing their Social Security benefits by having them pay in some cases 100 percent of the cost-of-living adjustment and in many cases a majority of the cost-of-living adjustment.

So we absolutely must recognize who is paying for whose benefit. The senior citizens, the most vulnerable in our country, their health care benefits, out-of-pocket costs, will be used to pay for tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. That just cannot be right.

Let's all be of good faith in this. Eliminate the tax break from this equation. Let's get down to talking about making Medicare solvent and doing it in a way that is respectful of the limitations of income of our senior citizens.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I want to add something.

We are in a period of sacrifice. We will have to cut back on Federal spending. We are asking people to accept that reality. But think about some of the people affected by this debate. Some of the people literally dependent on Medicare and Medicaid are in nursing homes, totally unable to take care of themselves. They have exhausted all of their savings. They are dependent on Government programs and what their families can come up with. As we increase their expenses, there is nowhere for them to turn to make up the difference.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PROFESSIONAL TRADE SERVICE CORPS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleagues who were on the floor here of the absolute necessity of the United States balancing its budget and putting our financial house in order. But this afternoon, I want to talk to you about a different deficit, the trade deficit, and a piece of legislation I am introducing today, the Professional Trade Service Corps Act, which is essential to America correcting that deficit as well.

U.S. trade policy for the last two decades under both Democratic and Republican Presidents has been a major net loser for our Nation, its businesses and our workers. While some individual corporations and certain shareholders have benefited, overall the productive wealth of America has been diminished, as ballooning trade deficits have fueled the movement of our dollars offshore, as our citizens bought more and more imported goods coming into this country rather than our exports being sold abroad.

Trade deficits represent a serious decapitalization of this country, with more and more of our people's money moving abroad to pay for the goods they are buying from foreign importers, while foreign capital pours into this country. The economic accounts tell the story.

In 1980, our country was a net lender to the world, as foreign interests owed us more than $400 billion.

□ 1230

Today, however, the United States owes foreign creditors nearly $800 billion. We are now a net debtor nation.

As foreign imports, including many from U.S.-based firms that have escaped offshore, surge into our country, jobs that should have been created here, good-paying jobs, are now being located elsewhere in the world.

Furthermore, the value of our dollar continues its decade-long decline as U.S. dollars flood into the international market to pay for the goods that we are buying from other places.

Last year our country racked up yet another record deficit with the world in merchandise trade of over $166 billion. For January of this year, the United States set a monthly record deficit of $12 billion more in just 1 month, and keep in mind $1 billion of debt in trade translates into 23,000 lost jobs in this country.

These deficits represent real lost jobs, stagnant wages, and decreased living standards as your dollar buys less in this country.

You might be watching the trade talks that are going on with Japan right now. Last year we had over $66 billion in trade deficit with Japan, more of their goods coming in here than our goods being able to get into that market, because in fact it is a closed market, and if you just look at the automotive segment of that deficit, which represents half of our deficit with Japan, if we could solve that problem we could build in this country 100 factories, each employing over 5,000 workers, 100 factories, each employing over 5,000 workers, if we only solved half the trade problem that we have with Japan.

In short, these deficits hurt every American in our communities, and that is why today I am introducing the Professional Trade Service Corps bill to upgrade U.S. trade negotiating functions through creation of a specialized tenured body of trained professional trade negotiators for this country. The Corps' mission would be to conduct U.S. trade negotiations and streamline the trade functions of this Government.

The Professional Trade Service Corps incorporates a three-tier strategy to address the need for more skilled and committed U.S. trade negotiators. First the proposal would accomplish that goal by creating an elite professional body of American negotiators to address the issues of short tenure and the revolving door among our trade negotiators.

The average trade negotiators for our country stay in their position 2 years. The average negotiator for Japan stays in his position 30 years, speaks several languages, and has worked in various countries around the world.

Our bill would also establish a Trade Services Institute to train our current and future U.S. trade negotiators in the practices, culture, and customs of our trade competitors.

Then finally the bill restricts Trade Service Corps officials as well as other senior members of the executive and legislative branches from representing or advising foreign interests immediately after leaving Government service.

U.S. trade negotiators serve on the front lines of today's battle to win market share in the increasingly competitive international marketplace. To win, our country must have highly trained, professional, tenured, and committed trade negotiators with integrity at the table negotiating the best terms for America's workers and America's businesses.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in cosponsoring the Professional Trade Service Corps Act. Put this country on an equal footing at the international bargaining tables that control our destiny in terms of jobs and development in this country.

FAIR TRADE WITH JAPAN

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

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today, officials from the U.S. Trade Representative's Office are meeting with Japanese officials to address the current trade imbalance in auto parts between our two countries. I hope their efforts are successful.

Now, I am an advocate for free trade. For countries to prosper in today's global market place, they must export and import freely. The deal is simple. It's a two-way street.

Unfortunately, when it comes to Japan, our open market-policies have not been reciprocated. Hard-working American autoworkers and manufacturers of automotive parts in Indiana and throughout America have faced unfair barriers to their products. Last

year, Japan imported 1 U.S. car for every 25 it exported; 60 percent of our $66 billion deficit with Japan results from imbalances in cars and autoparts.

American autoparts manufacturers are not asking for special privileges, just a fair opportunity to compete in Japan. We have waited too long. The Japanese must honor the practices of free trade and agree to fairly import U.S. auto parts.

When I meet with automakers and autoworkers in the Second Congressional District of Indiana they tell me, ''We make the best auto products in the world, just give us a fair chance to compete.'' An agreement that allows real access to the Japanese market for autos and auto parts is a matter of fairness for U.S. automotive firms and workers.

WHY AMERICANS ARE ANGRY

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, it is no great secret that throughout the United States of America today there is a great deal of anger, there is a great deal of unrest. Fortunately not every angry person goes about blowing up buildings and killing hundreds of innocent people, but all over this country, people are feeling an unease. Something bad is happening and they do not quite understand what it is about.

What I would like to do this hour, Mr. Speaker, with the help of some of my colleagues, is to perhaps try to explain to the working people of America, to the middle-income people of America, perhaps some of the reasons why people are angry, why people are frustrated, and then maybe make some suggestions as to how we can develop public policy which will improve life for all of our people.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by quoting from an I think very important article that appeared on the front page of the New York Times on Monday, April 16, just a couple of weeks ago. And what it says is that the United States of America today has by far the most unequal distribution of wealth in the entire industrialized world. And the article says that:

> Recent studies show that rather than being an egalitarian society, the United States has become the most economically stratified of industrialized nations. Even class societies like Britain, which inherited large differences in income and wealth over centuries, going back to their feudal past, now have greater economic equality than in the United States.

Then the article goes on to say:

> Federal Reserve figures from 1989, the most recent available, show that the wealthiest 1 percent of American households, with net worth of at least $2.3 million each, own nearly 40 percent of the Nation's wealth.

That in contrast to Britain where the richest 1 percent only own 18 percent of the wealth. So in other words, we are now living in a country from which the richest 1 percent own 40 percent of the wealth, which is more wealth than the bottom 90 percent. Rich are getting richer, poor are getting poorer, the middle class is shrinking, and I think that explains or begins to explain why it is that American people and especially working people, the middle-income people are feeling very, very anxious. Because the bottom line is, and we do not talk about that too much here, Democrats do not talk about it, Republicans do not talk about it, Rush Limbaugh somehow forgets to talk about it, but the reality is that since 1973, four-fifths, 80 percent of the American workers have experienced falling or stagnant real incomes.

Now what does that mean? That means in the last 22 years the American people are working very, very hard, in many instances they are working longer hours, in fact a study came out recently, if you can believe this, that in order to compensate for the falling wages American workers are now receiving, workers are now working an extra 1 month a year. In my own State of Vermont it is certainly not uncommon for workers to be working not one job, not two jobs, but on occasion three jobs.

Since 1973, for production workers, there has been a 20-percent decline in real wages. There has been an increase in poverty. For low-wage workers, workers who just have a high school degree, who do not have any college, the drop in entry-level jobs has been precipitous. For young male workers there has been a 30-percent decline in entry-level wages for young men graduating high school going into the work force; for young women the drop has been 18 percent.

There was an interesting article which I think typifies much of what is happening in this country, that appeared in the Wall Street Journal some months ago and they said the good news is that in the Midwest, many of the factories that has been closed in the 1980's are now reopening, workers are now going back to work in the factories. That is the good news. The bad news is that those workers, same workers are going back to the same factories at wages which are paying them 50 percent to 60 percent to 70 percent of what they made 10 or 12 years before.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Oregon, one of the outstanding Congressmen in this institution.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman. I think what you brought up in your introductory remarks here brings you to three major issues, and I would like to frame the debate that way as we continue the discussion.

You pointed out the decline of incomes and the standard of living for middle-income families and the disproportionate accrual of wealth to the top 1 percent, generally those earning over $250,000 a year. And what I think people would be interested in is what is the majority, the Republican majority's response to that growing disparity of income. Do they have a plan to deal with it. And of course the plan is their tax bill. And the tables on the tax bill are pretty interesting.

If we look at the tax bill which passed the House of Representatives by a fairly narrow margin, but with virtual unanimity on the Republican side of the aisle, 71.4 percent of the benefits of the capital gains tax break are going to go to people who earn over $200,000 a year. And if you go to the corporate tables, you find similar distributions. That is the largest corporations in America, and the multinational corporations will do well. Small businesses will get scant or no tax relief, and even smaller incorporated firms. In fact, we are repealing the corporate alternative minimum tax, something that was put in place in 1986 with agreement between President Reagan and a Democratic Congress that it was embarrassing that the largest, most profitable corporations in America, AT&T, $24.898 billion in profits 1982 to 1985, paid negative $635 million in taxes. So we had to put in place a corporate alternative minimum tax. But now we are being told the solution to the growing disparity and the unemployment in America is to go back to those tax policies of the 1980's.

Mr. SANDERS. If the gentleman will yield, what we are trying to explore is in fact why Americans are angry, and what I get upset about is people are angry, they should be angry, but to a large degree they do not know what they are angry about.

□ 1245

What the gentleman from Oregon has just said is that in the early 1980's some of the largest corporations in America, and in America most of the stock is owned by the wealthiest people, what he said is that in the early 1980's, major corporations earning billions in profit paid zero in Federal taxes, less than the working stiff who makes $20,000 a year, and because the Congress, which had passed that legislation, was a little bit embarrassed going back to their districts, they passed a minimum corporate tax law which said to these corporations that, ''After all your lawyers and all of your fancy accountants get through going through the tax loopholes, you still are going to have to pay at least something in taxes.''

And what the gentleman has just described is that several weeks ago right here on the floor of the House the Republican leadership voted to repeal that minimum corporate tax, so we are going to go back to those good old days when major corporations paid zero in taxes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I would like to introduce another element. What I think angered people, when I went around to

my 13 town hall meetings during the break, was when I pointed out, when they heard the idea of tax reform and tax relief, a lot of middle-income families had a little bit of hope. When I pointed out where the benefits are going to go, to the largest, most profitable corporations, we were in fact opening new loopholes for them, we were not going to close loopholes on multinational corporations which could bring in $60 billion a year to U.S. taxpayers, that we were going to provide the most benefits, 75 percent of the benefits in the individual tax breaks for capital gains to people who earn over $200,000 a year, there was not anybody who earned over $200,000 a year in my audiences in any of my town halls.

They were a little bit distraught, but what we did not know then and what we know now is that not only is this an outrageous return to trickle-down economics, which nearly bankrupted the country and began to bankrupt the country in the 1980's, did not provide more jobs, provided a flurry of leveraged buyouts which actually were job-destroying, but now the Republicans are planning to pay for these tax breaks by cutting Medicare. Now, is that not extraordinary?

They are trying to back pedal as quickly as they can. But the numbers just happen to add up.

When you look at their proposed reductions in Medicare in their budget, which they will unveil today at their special retreat at IBM's or Xerox's posh retreat center, and I wonder what kind of benefit that is being provided to the Republican Party and how that relates to the tax loophole, but in any case, when they go out to this corporate retreat center today and unveil their budget there, they are going to show they are going to pay for their tax break by reducing Medicare for average Americans and retired Americans.

It is an absolutely outrageous attempt to pilfer the pockets of those least able to pay, senior citizens and people in the lower economic bracket, to give tax breaks to people at the top.

But the sham is, well, we will all benefit because they will invest this money wisely. We already went through that once before. We found that trickle-down did not benefit the majority of the American people, but created the extraordinary disparities the gentleman is talking about.

We also, I think, are going to have to, a little bit later, get into trade here, because trade plays into this is a very large part.

Mr. SANDERS. I am delighted that we are being joined by one of the outstanding Congressmen, fighters for working people; I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to congratulate him on the special order and the focus you started with, emphasizing what we have been trying to emphasize all year long, is that the American people are angry. Large numbers of people are angry. Large numbers of voters are angry. Certainly, working-class people are angry, certainly for good reason.

We have to focus on what it is they should be angry about. They focus their anger sometimes in the wrong direction, not understanding the forces at work which make their lives miserable or make them see themselves as sinking in quicksand in terms of their lives are getting no better as they go on working harder, but their wages are less, their wages have not kept pace with inflation, benefits like health care which all the other industrialized nations enjoy and help to stretch your wages because you do not have to pay large amounts of money for health care, are denied to the American workers. They get less fringe benefits, vacation time, family leave.

As you pointed out, countries that we went to war with, and we are glad the war is over and it is all peaceful, but Germany now has a higher standard of living than any nation in the world. I am not criticizing them for creating a higher standard of living for their workers. But workers here have to understand, workers in the industrialized world of 1995, it is possible to have decent salaries and also have 6 weeks' vacation, also have family and medical leave where you get paid, where you take time off. It is possible in an industrialized society to have this and still come out ahead of this Nation in terms of balance of payments.

Because we are in relationship with Germany, we owe them more money than they owe us. The balance of payments is negative on our side, just as in the case of Japan, you also have a standard of living and much more security.

This fact, or that, has just been highlighted by a study, and thanks to the New York Times, certainly emphasized in the mass media of the gap between the rich and the poor in this country which you mentioned before, just has to be looked at more closely.

I have the editorial from the New York Times on the same day that the major article appeared on April 17, 1995. That editorial, you know, says quite a bit. We cannot say it anymore clear than stated here. ''The Rich Get Richer Faster,'' is the title of the editorial, and I want to read a few excerpts from the editorial:

> The gap between rich and poor is vast in the United States, and recent studies show it growing faster than anywhere else in the West. The trend is largely the result of technological forces at work around the world, but the United States Government has done little to ameliorate the problem. Indeed, if the Republicans get their way on the budget, the Government will make a troubling trend measurably worse.

Now, this is the New York Times editorial page talking, not partisan Democrats.

> Some inequality is necessary if society wants to reward investors for taking risks and individuals for working hard and well, but excessive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar and exacerbate social tensions. Extensive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar and can exacerbate social tensions.

I am not going to excuse anybody for the Oklahoma bombing, and I am not going to say that any set of conditions in society justified that kind of murderous act, but I am going to say that when you have a mixture in this country of the culture of the gun where we permit, and another way in which we are different from all other western nations is, the other industrialized nations, is we permit the proliferation of the guns in this society. We encourage a culture of the gun, which leads to a fascination with other, more complicated weapons. When you have an atmosphere like that and you also have the exacerbated tensions, the likelihood that individuals or small groups will go off half-cocked and do outrageous things is greatly increased.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me just go back to another point. We are trying to understand why in America tens of millions of middle-income and working people are living under such stress, and we are trying to understand how it is that every day on the talk shows and here in Congress we hear people attacking minorities, attacking poor people, men attacking women as the cause of the problem, people attacking gay people, attacking immigrants, and yet it is amazing to me how little discussion there is on the issue that the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Oregon and I are talking about, and that is the fact that the wealthiest 1 percent are seeing enormous increases in their holdings in America, that the wealthiest earners, 20 percent earners, now earn more earned income than do the bottom 80 percent, that major corporation after major corporation are throwing American workers out on the street, going to Mexico where they are hiring people at 75 cents an hour, going to China where they are hiring desperate people there for 20 cents an hour. How come we are not allowed to focus our anger on those people, just on the poor, but not on the rich?

I did not read in the Constitution, I did not read in the schoolbooks that we are not allowed to talk about the wealthy and the power that they have over the lives of Americans. But somehow or another there seems to be a fear in this institution, and certainly on talk radio, that, gee whiz, we are not allowed to talk about the wealthy and the power that they have.

How come there is not discussion that the chief executive officers in America today of the Forbes 500 corporations are now earning 150 times what their workers are making? Is that justice? Is that fair? Is that what the American system is supposed to be about? Why are we not discussing and

moving rapidly in raising the minimum wage? How is a worker supposed to bring up a family on $4.25 an hour minimum wage or even $5 an hour?

Mr. DEFAZIO. If the gentleman will yield on that one, that is excellent.

The issue again, the response of the Republican majority in this Chamber is that they will not even allow hearings or legislative consideration; far be it from a Democratic vote on this floor, on the issue of an increase in the minimum wage. They are so afraid of that issue; they know that a large majority of the American people do not believe it is fair that a person who works hard, 40 hours a week faithfully, 50 weeks a year or 52 weeks a year, is below the poverty level. And if that person has children, it is far below the poverty level in this country and not able to have any kind of a decent standard of living.

Why cannot we have that discussion? It seems like everything is slanted the other way.

The tax policy, again, we have just passed huge tax breaks which will accrue to a very small percentage of the people, and they are going to be paid for by cutting Medicare and cutting welfare and other programs.

They will not allow us to have a debate and a vote on the issue of increasing the minimum wage and trade policy. They want to pin the failures of the trade policy on the Clinton administration, who certainly pushed through the NAFTA Agreement and the GATT Agreement, but they pushed them through with a majority of Republican votes and a minority of votes on the Democratic side of the aisle, because many of us knew they were wrong.

And one other point, lest people think that somehow through NAFTA and through shipping our jobs to Mexico, we have somehow at least improved the lot of the Mexican people, the standard of living has dropped 50 percent for average workers in Mexico in the last 6 months. They are threatened with 50 percent inflation, and their wage increases by law will be limited to 10 percent this year.

Interest rates are 80 to 90 percent in Mexico for people who can get credit cards. That is not very many. Bank failures, business failures are up. On May Day they had the largest demonstration in the history of the country.

We have pushed Mexico to the brink with exploitative trade policies, and we are losing American jobs.

Where is this all headed? When will we wake up? When will we come up with a trade policy that is set up to increase the standard of living in this country and in the countries of our trading partners? When will we have a tax policy that is set up for fairness, that helps to bring the disparities down? And when will we increase the minimum wage?

With this majority, never.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman is suggesting a very radical idea. He is suggesting the trade policy in America, and I think this year we have had $160 billion trade deficit.

Mr. DEFAZIO. $163 billion?

Mr. SANDERS. Thank you. We do not hear much about that figure. He is suggesting a terribly radical idea hardly heard on the floor of the House, and that is that maybe trade policy should work for the benefit of the average American worker rather than the head of the large corporations who are trying to take our jobs to Mexico and China.

We are delighted now to welcome a Congressman from upstate New York, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. I have enjoyed the discussion, and thank you very much, particularly the last part.

I think it is very important for us to recognize that although most of the attention has been focused on the budget deficit, and that is a serious problem, it is one we have to deal with, but there are least two other major deficits we have to address.

And those two other deficits are more directly linked to the economic prosperity of the American people, particularly the average wageearner, the average worker, the average family, and those other two deficits are the ones being discussed about a moment ago by our colleague, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO], the trade deficit principally because that trade deficit is responsible for loss of a substantial number of manufacturing jobs. We have lost 1.4 million manufacturing jobs in this country over the course of the last decade and much of that can be attributed to our lack of a trade policy that focuses on the needs of the people in this country rather than other interests that may be within this country or abroad.

□ 1300

And the other deficit is the investment deficit. We are failing to invest in our own future, and the infrastructure of this country, and simple things like roads and bridges. Half of the bridges in the United States are now below standard. Our surface transportation systems are in bad need of repair, in many cases falling apart. We have not had a major investment since the 1950's with the Interstate Highway System. Major deficits in mass transit, major deficit in educational investment, major deficit in training, major deficit in research and development, for the creation of new jobs and new industries, and connected with these two is the exportation of important American technologies, technology that is developed in this country which could be producing the jobs of the future, and we are exporting those technologies. We have exported the jobs, and now we are exporting technologies to other countries.

Mr. SANDERS. I know that when we talk about the issue of jobs and the declining standard of living for the average American worker, what we are extremely mindful of is that for the young workers, especially for those who do not have a college education, their future indeed is very bleak. And one of the points that has to be made when we try to understand anger in America is that for tens of millions of Americans the American dream is fading fast, the dream that, if I work very hard, my kids are going to have a higher standard of living than I do.

Now I know that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has worked hard on a jobs bill which attempts to address some of the issue that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] was talking about. Mr. OWENS, what about a jobs bill?

Mr. OWENS. Well, we introduced a jobs bill as a progressive caucus jobs will as a result of our understanding clearly what the message was on the November 8 election. At the exit polls they clearly pointed out that the No. 1 priority was jobs security. Those who were working are worried about the fact they are making less than they were making before, they cannot keep up with inflation. Many who were working were worried about losing the jobs they have already because of economic downsizing and streamlining, and of course many others are unemployed and work because they have no hope of getting a job. We keep sending manufacturing jobs overseas, chasing the cheapest labor in Bangladesh, out of prisons of China of whatever.

So why not address this as Democrats, even if the Republicans refuse to? They had in the Contract With America something about the Job Creation, Wage Enhancement Act which had not a single thing in it about job creation. It was all about removing regulations, and it was a back door way to make an assault on the kinds of regulations of the environment that are very necessary to protect the health and welfare of Americans.

Our jobs bill talks about creating jobs. In fact, one of the major functions of a modern government has to be the creation of jobs. The economy, stupid, has to be translated into jobs, stupid. You can have a bustling economy. We have a very prosperous economy. The stock market is doing very well. But jobs are not being created.

You know, in addition to economics, we need a new science called ''jobenomics.'' How do you create jobs? We propose an old-fashioned way to create jobs. First of all you recognize the fact that there is plenty of work to be done, it just needs to have some way to pay people to do necessary work. We need public infrastructure to be sort of rehabilitated. Physical infrastructure in terms of bridges, and roads, and schools across the country which need to be repaired or rebuilt, all those things need to be done, and we should

channel the public dollars in that direction instead of wasting our public dollars on obsolete weapons systems and other kinds of things. We should be moving it toward job creation in every way possible.

Mr. SANDERS. In other words what the gentleman is saying is what everybody knows to be true in virtually every city, every town in America. There is an enormous amount of work that needs to be done. We need new environmentally sound sewer systems. We need better landfills. We need to clean up the pollution that exists all around us. We need to rebuild our mass transportation system. What an absurdity that when in terms of mass rail, our railroads, we are already behind Europe and Japan. Amtrak has laid off 5,000 workers rather than adding more workers to give us the best rail system in the entire world.

So, as Progressives, let us summarize some of what we are talking about. For a start, No. 1, the American people are angry and have a right to be angry, but for many reasons that anger has been deflected all over the place. Working people are becoming poorer in America. The gap between the rich and the poor is becoming wider. Twenty years ago the United States led the world in the wages and benefits we provide in our workers. Today we are in 10th place, behind many of the European countries. The hours that those workers in Germany, in France work are going down. They have more leisure time. In America the hours that our people are working are going up an extra month a year.

I say, ''Why shouldn't we be angry? You can't be with your family, you can't be with your kids. You're working an extra month a year in order to make up for the decline in your wages. You're working overtime. You're working two jobs.''

So we believe it is appropriate to raise the minimum wage. Workers should not be working 40 hours a week and falling further and further into poverty. Forty percent of the people in poverty are working full time. So we are concerned about that.

The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] has talked about trade policy. We talk about the Federal deficit. It is important. What about our trade policy? And Mr. DEFAZIO a number of months ago introduced, I think an extremely important piece of legislation. He introduced legislation to repeal the United States connection with NAFTA, to withdraw from NAFTA. I ask, ''Mr. DEFAZIO, why did you introduce that legislation?''

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Well, this was, of course, before the massive collapse and massive bailout by the U.S. Government adding insult to industry. Not only had our predictions come true; that is, that we began to enter into trade deficits with Mexico, therefore exporting U.S. jobs and capital to that country, that the Mexican peso has been devalued, that in fact the government had stolen another election and was continuing to oppress its own people, but we added insult to injury shortly after I introduced the bill, and we are now paying $20 billion for that privilege.

Why? Because a few United States corporations want to go down there to take advantage of that cheap labor, a fact, you know the average Mexican wage has dropped 50 percent in the last 6 months. This looks great to a number of large multinational corporations, foreign corporations flooding into Mexico to use it as an export platform, but with the $863 million dollars trade deficit that we ran with Mexico in one month in February, that means that we exported, according to our own Commerce Department, 20,000 jobs in 1 month, 20,000 United States manufacturing wage jobs exported to Mexico in 1 month, and now we are paying $20 billion of taxpayers' money to bail out their government in order to keep this sinking agreement afloat. It is a failure, and I would like the authors of that to admit that it is a failure, the Republican majority in this House, and the Democratic administration downtown, and the people on Wall Street who shoved it through. Admit, just admit, it is a failure, or admit that it is working the way you want it, which I think is the real truth, which is it is helping a few corporations, but it is hurting American workers, it is hurting Mexican workers, it is lowering standards of living on both sides of the border. That, perhaps, was the real intent. Then I would at least say they are honest, they got what they wanted.

One other quick point on trade. I cannot let what is going on with Japan go by. Here we are locked once again in negotiations with Japan to get them to allow our auto parts, which now a comparable quality American auto part costs about half of a Japanese replacement part. We are trying to break into their market, and the Japanese are saying, as usual, no, and in fact they are telling us that, if we use our sovereignty, if we, in fact, retaliate against them because they are unfairly keeping out comparable quality parts at half the price from their market, that they will go to the World Trade Organization and get sanctions against us, and guess what? All the analysts say they will win because that is the way GATT and the World Trade Organizations were set up. There is nothing in there to go at the unfair trade practices of Japan or other countries that hide them in secret, but only countries like the United States, which have public laws, will be penalized.

So, you know, we are going in the wrong direction, and we are driving down standards of living in this country to benefit a few corporations and our unfair trading partners abroad.

Mr. SANDERS. I find it interesting, the contract of America, the Republican proposal, talks about a whole lot of things, but it is amazing how it manages to miss the most important policy issues that affect the needs of working people. I say, ''I know, Mr. HINCHEY, you have been working hard here fighting for the right of working people. What are some of the initiatives you would like to see taking place?''

Mr. HINCHEY. I would like to follow up with what the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] said about our trade policies and just observe that we are following a trade policy which essentially is described as free trade, open markets, the global marketplace, et cetera, et cetera, on and on, but when you look closely at what is happening, you find that while we, this country, is practicing those principles to a large extent, we are not finding reciprocal practices in many other countries. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] points very correctly to the situation with Japan where they are very clever in the way that they hide the—their techniques of freezing out American goods and American products while we import as much as they can manufacture into this country, and we have been doing it for decades at the cost of American jobs and at the cost of the American standard of living.

What we want to do, what we are all about here, four of us and many other people who share our particular opinions, is simply this. We want attention paid to the American economy. We want jobs created here in the United States, but not low wage jobs. We want jobs created here in the United States that are going to be paying good living wages, and that is why we are for an increase in the minimum wage, and we ought to make it clear that by enacting a minimum wage—and by the way, if the minimum wage, which is now at $4.25 an hour had kept pace with its historical level, it would at this moment be more than $6 an hour, so we are far behind where we ought to be. Not only does the minimum wage, and this is, I think, a very important point, affect those people who are working at the minimum wage, but when you push up the minimum wage, you push up the next lowest, and then the second lowest, and the third and the fourth, et cetera. It has a ripple effect throughout the entire economy, increasing wages and increasing incomes for all Americans.

The Speaker of this House said just recently that the price of labor in the world is set in south China. If we ever buy into that idea, if this House, if this country, ever buys into the idea that the price of labor in the United States of America is set in south China, then we are on the road to destruction. The price of labor in the United States is no more set in south China than the principles and policies of this democratic republic are set in south China or everything else that we believe in is set in south China. It is high time that we divorced ourselves from these crazy notions that the American labor force has

to compete with the least common denominator in slave labor countries around the world and get back to the idea that we can pay our people a good decent living wage so they could provide for their families, send their kids to school and improve their standard of living.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman makes an extremely important point. When you hear somebody get up, and give a speech, and say that we have got to be competitive in the global economy, hang on to your wallets and start worrying very much because what the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY] is saying is that in south China the wages are approximately 20 cents an hour. Well, American workers, are you ready to compete? Do you think maybe we can get down to 18 cents an hour? We can get those jobs back. What about 15 cents an hour? To a large degree much of the discussion of the global economy is just that.

□ 1315

It is asking American workers to lower their wages, give up their benefits, sacrifice our environmental standards in order to compete with desperate Third World countries where people are working for starvation wages. I think, as Mr. HINCHEY indicates, that should not be the paradigm under which we operate. Rather, we should be asking the question, why, in this great country, do we not develop policies which create decent paying jobs for all of our workers, a national health care system guaranteeing health care to all of our people, a fair tax system which takes the burden of taxes off the middle class and asks the wealthy to start paying their fair share of taxes, educational opportunity for all. Is that Utopia? I do not think so.

I want to ask Mr. OWENS a question: Recently, all over America, in my district, you have middle class people, husbands and wives, working 40, 50, 60 hours a week to afford to send their kids to college, because they understand that without a college education the kids are not going to make it to the middle class. That is simply the truth. Without a college education you cannot make it to the middle class.

Mr. OWENS, the Republicans recently have brought forth a proposal which would cut back on college loans, college financial grants. What impact does that have on the aspirations and dreams of the people in your district?

Mr. OWENS. What the Republicans are trying to do in their attempt to fulfill their contract against America, we call it against America, they say with America, in an attempt to do the undoable and bring the budget down to a level of balance by the year 2002, they are going to try to take $12 billion out of the student loan program.

Already we have year after year reduced the number of grants available. The poorest young people going to college, we used to provide more grants. But we have steadily reduced the number of grants, so it is very hard to qualify for a grant. You have to be very poor, because the amount of Pell grants available, the amount of money available for Pell grants is very low. We have deliberately emphasized student loan programs. Because after all, you have time to pay for it after you get out of college and get a decent job. Most of our aid now is in the form of student loans.

Now the Republicans are saying the student loan program should not be subsidized at all. What we do now is while a young person is in college, the interest on the loan is paid for by the Government. That is our contribution as taxpayers towards the student loan program. The students get out, pick up the loan, and they start paying the interest and principal until it is paid off. But the interest during the time they are in college is paid for by the Government, and if you take that away, that raises the amount the students owe. They are expecting to save $12 billion out of the hides of the students when we want to encourage more people to go to college. That is the one answer to our economy, to become more and more sophisticated and educated.

Mr. SANDERS. If we could perhaps wrap it up, I think, in conclusion, the point that we are trying to make, we as three or four members of the Progressive caucus, and there are 36 other members, is that we think to a large degree the Congress of the United States is out of touch with the needs of working people, middle income people, and is here to a large degree to represent the interests of the wealthy and the powerful. We think that much of what is in the Contract With America benefits the people who go to the $1,000 a plate fund-raising dinners. We think there are sensible public policies we can develop—we brought forth some of them this afternoon—that in fact we can raise the standard of living for American people, give people hope for the future, where today there is no hope.

I want to thank both the gentleman from New York, Mr. OWENS and Mr. HINCHEY, for joining me. We will do this again.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

BARBARIANS AT THE GATE

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we just returned from recess this week, and it is a fairly slow week here in the Congress. But next week we will move into the process of finalizing the budget for the coming budget year, which begins October 1. It is a situation which I am quite concerned about.

There is a kind of calm around here before the storm. As far as I am concerned, I feel a sense of dread before a massacre takes place, because that is what I feel is in store; a massacre of very useful programs is about to occur in this budget finalization process that is going to start next week.

We already have a $17 billion rescission package. The majority party, the Republicans in this House, have already reached into this year's budget and pulled back $17 billion, mostly from very good programs. So $17 billion is being cut out of the budget that is now in process, now going on.

The budget year that will end on September 30, they are trying to take out $17 billion. The Senate has passed their version of the rescission package, and a conference is about to occur. There is nothing to feel optimistic about there. They put back a few vital items. I heard the Senate is going to restore the Summer Youth Employment Program. The Summer Youth Employment Program employs millions of young people across the country every summer. That had been wiped out by the Republican-controlled House rescission budget. Now the Senate says they will put it back, and I hope that they do restore that.

But I hope the President vetoes the whole bill. I hope that he understands there are numerous other cuts in that same $17 billion package, for instance, the cutting of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the tune of $7 billion. You cut $7 billion out of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and most of the money that is cut is for low income housing. I hope that the President will veto the whole package. But I dread what is going to happen with that package, that rescission package.

But beyond that, I dread the budget finalization process, because what has happened with the rescissions package is a preview of coming attractions, a preview of where this majority in this House is going.

It is not exaggerating to say that we are about to behold something similar to a group of barbarians burning down a city. It is not exaggerating, because we are going to destroy, and maybe this is a serious flaw, a serious weakness in the Constitution of the United States, that a party in power for 2 years can wreck havoc. It can destroy a great deal.

You can destroy the Department of Education by just denying funding. You can vote the funding out. It is difficult to vote down the authority for the agency, but if you don't fund it, you can destroy it, or so cripple it, until to matter who comes into power the next year, they will have to try to rebuild a crippled agency.

That has been the history of the Department of Education. It has always been a crippled agency. It came into

being with great controversy. Thank God Jimmy Carter created the Department of Education finally. But during the years of Ronald Reagan they tried to destroy the Department of Education, and it has never been able to function fully. But finally it has begun to function and do the kinds of things it needs to do in terms of leadership.

The threat now is in the process of cutting the budget, one of the items that is being targeted by the Republican majority is the Department of Education. We are going to eliminate the Department of Education, in an age when high technology is so important, in an age when we say that every worker, every student, should strive to go to college, and in order to do that they have to come out of high school with the best possible education in order to get a decent job and function in a very complex society. At this time we are hearing leaders in this House talk about eliminating the Department of Education.

An invaluable piece of our civilization is about to be assaulted in this budget making process. A way of life created for Americans by Americans is about to be wrecked. That is how serious this year is.

Why is this year so different from any other? Because the majority party in the House, which is the same as the majority party in the Senate, have made it clear that they want to assault many of the programs that have been created over the last 60 years. They want to get rid of what has been painstakingly developed since Franklin Roosevelt's days. They want to get rid of the kinds of programs that make our society as great as it is. They want to get rid of the kinds of programs that reach out and say to every American that our great wealth, the fact that we are the wealthiest Nation that ever existed in the history of the world, is to be shared not equally, and we are not communists, we are not proposing that everybody should have an equal share, but we are proposing that everybody should have some share of it and some kind of decent living as a result of a prosperous America.

Now there is a barbaric philosophy. And I want to just pause for a minute and say I would like to see us lower our voices and use less extremist language. So I do not want to call my colleagues who propose these doctrines barbarians. I think that is a little extreme. I just want to focus on each act. A decent person can be guilty of a barbaric act. So you have some decent people who, I will not question their decency in general, but they are subscribing to barbaric policies, barbaric actions.

Let me give you one or two examples, and I will come back in more detail later on. It is a barbaric action to propose that we fund a *Seawolf* submarine for about $2.1 billion, and at the same time propose to cut the school lunch programs by about $2 billion. There is controversy about whether the school lunch programs have been cut or not. I think the conservative Congressional Budget Office has put that to rest. The conservative estimate of the conservative Congressional Budget Office is at least $2 billion will be cut from the program. It will lose that much over the 5-year period it is being proposed. So at least $2 billion. I think it will be more like $6 billion, but we will take the more conservative estimate.

You are going to cut school lunches by $2 billion, hungry kids will have less food, and at the same time propose to build a *Seawolf* submarine. What is a *Seawolf* submarine and what does it contribute to anything? Nothing. A *Seawolf* submarine would have been useful in a way with the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Union doesn't exist anymore. No other nation has these submarines.

What I am trying to do is bring this down to a level where it can be clearly understood. When I say a barbaric act has taken place when you propose to fund an obsolete weapon like a *Seawolf* submarine at the cost of $2.1 billion, while at the same time cutting school lunches by a like amount, that is a barbarian's reasoning at work. There is no sense, no compassion.

What will the *Seawolf* submarine do for America? It can do nothing now. It could have been very useful in a war with the Soviet Union. They have very sophisticated submarines; therefore, we had to prepare a more sophisticated submarine. We already have *Seawolf* submarines. Why build one more? The cold war has been over for several years. The Soviet Union is not building any more submarines.

This submarine cannot be used for peaceful purposes. If you do not use it for warfare, you can take the kids on a ride under the sea, you could put it in New York harbor and use it as a tourist attraction. But that is too dangerous. They will not use submarines for tourist attractions, because even the best submarine is risky to the point where you wouldn't take kids for joy rides underneath the sea. So it has no peaceful purpose. yet we are going to build another *Seawolf* submarine.

We are going to continue funding the Central Intelligence Agency to the tune of at least $28 billion, at least $28 billion. We do not know, because it is still secret. The Soviet Union has revealed secrets about their secret intelligence agency, but we haven't divulged the budget to the American people, so we just guess at $28 billion. It is a barbaric act to say we should continue the funding of the CIA at that level, while at the same time you cut the Summer Youth Employment Program, a program that provides jobs for youth during the summer and costs so much less. It is a barbaric act.

□ 1330

I will come back with more examples later on. But this is what we are up against.

I said that we have high-technology barbarians in charge in the House. I would like to retract that and say that the people are not barbarians because they certainly love their families; they do a lot of things that are decent every day. It is not that they are barbarians, but they are committing barbaric acts. We need to pinpoint each act one by one.

In New York City, we have some barbaric philosophy that has been proposed recently. We have this epidemic of barbarity in public service breaking out all over in New York State government, New York City government. We are proposing to give huge tax cuts to the rich while we are cutting programs for Medicare and Medicaid already.

The mayor of New York, I think, has expressed it openly. He has said what most of the leaders in the House of Representatives have not been willing to say. The mayor of New York has come right out and said it:

> Poor people, if they would please get out of town, get out of town and we will not have to be bothered with them. We would like to have policies which do not encourage poor people to stay around.

The mayor of New York City actually came out and said that. In the process of saying he did not say it, he kept saying things which were just as horrible, that as you cut programs and you squeeze neighborhoods and you refuse to build more housing and you cut the hospitals and you make life unbearable for poor people, let them get out of town, let them go. That is the kind of economic cleansing, it is a new statement by a public official of what many others are thinking but they are not stating.

We had a gentleman named Roger Star who was prominent in city civic circles and once served on the editorial board of the New York Times even who years ago said we should pursue a policy of ethnic, of planned shrinkage, that New York City should pursue a policy of planned shrinkage. That is, do not build any housing for the poor, do not bother to create infrastructures in a poor neighborhood for new sewer systems and new water systems, et cetera, do not do those things and do not build and, therefore, you plan, as a result of pursuing those policies, there will be a shrinkage of the city. As you shrink the city and the number of people in it, certainly the number of poor people, the responsibilities of the city go down and you can give tax cuts to the rich and take care of them as a result.

That was a private citizen making that statement. It was horrible enough then, but now we have the mayor of the city, the mayor who was elected by the people to govern all of the people. As you know, we know as elected officials here in the Congress, once we are elected, we are no longer elected to serve the people who elected us or the members of our party, we are elected to serve everybody. This mayor is openly saying that he really does not want to take care of a large part of the population of New York City.

Economic cleansing has been openly admitted, the philosophy. That is a barbaric philosphy. The thinking is barbaric; the policy is barbaric. I will come back to that later on.

What I am trying to say here is that I want to emphasize that the budget-making process that we are about to undertake is the most important thing that this Congress does. It is the most important event that happens in Washington. The budget-making process in any government is very important. I have used the example before of the British Government; the BBC, the British Broadcasting Corporation takes several days, used to take several days to just discuss the national budget. Nothing is more important than the budget-making process, whether you are making budgets at the Federal level or you are making the budget, going through the budget making-process at the State level or the city level.

Citizens should pay close attention because how we spend our money shows what our priorities are, how we spend our money shows what our values are. And how we spend our money determines whether our side is going to function properly or not. So in the budget-making process, all things that are most important to government and society are in motion at that time. Everything of value will be impacted by the budget process. And the budget process takes place first, but the appropriations process follows that and the two are inseparable.

The budget process sets general guidelines, the appropriations process spells out the details and they cannot be separated. The budget and appropriations process are the most important functions of our Government or any other government.

How and why is this budget and appropriations process different from all others? I have said it is different from all others because in power now we have a majority that insists that America is facing a crisis. They have created a crisis atmosphere. They have created a goal that is very difficult to attain, the goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002. If you insist that we have to balance the budget by the year 2002, then you have to take some drastic measures to do that. You cannot accomplish that unless you take drastic measures to cut the existing budget, unless you bring an axe to chop down programs that were created carefully over a 50- or 60-year period.

We had the New Deal. We had the Great Society. And there is a tendency to take all of this for granted. The Great Society was sort of an offshoot of the New Deal. Lyndon Johnson was a disciple of Franklin Roosevelt, and although we might criticize President Johnson for making many connections with foreign policy and with the Vietnam war, we recognize his devotion to the principles of Franklin Roosevelt as expressed through the Great Society programs: The Community Action program, the Medicaid program, the Medicare program; these things did not come from God directly. They did not fall out of heaven. They were created by Democratic administrations, and they represent an expression of the very best that is in America.

America, we have some things in our past and our tradition which we are not proud of, but we certainly can be proud of the tradition that is reflected in the New Deal and in the Great Society because it reflects a reaching out and a caring for all of the people of America and it was all done without a revolution. We have done more for human beings and for the citizens of our Nation without a revolution than other countries have done that had revolutions which professed to have this purpose.

But now we are engaged in a situation where in 2 years, in 2 years the people who have come to power are going to take advantage of a weakness in the Constitution. There are no safeguards in the Constitution against having a 2-year period be a period where you can destroy what was created in 60 years.

There is something wrong with our Constitution. I do not propose to talk about it now. I do not know what the remedy is, but it has just occurred to me as a result of the kind of protestations and the kind of declarations that have been made by the majority Republicans in the House this year, it just dawned on a lot of us that in 2 years you really can have a structure of the policies of the country totally turned around, totally altered. That is a great deal of change to take place in 2 years. It is revolutionary.

I have a suspicion of revolutions. We should always be suspicious of revolutions. Revolutions at best are necessary evils when there is no other alternative. Revolutions always cause almost as much harm as they do good because of the very nature of the upheaval of revolutions means that a lot of people are going to be trampled on, a lot of suffering is going to take place that would not take place if you follow an evolutionary process.

We have in America always followed an evolutionary process, even at the time of greatest crisis during the Depression, the transfer from Herbert Hoover to Franklin Roosevelt was not a revolution. It was an evolution. It was a use of the legislative process at its very best. Franklin Roosevelt did not go into the basement of the White House as Oliver North did and come up with secret plans about how to make the American Government operate in a way which was not approved by the Congress. Franklin Roosevelt came to the Congress, the New Deal legislation was passed in concert with the Congress.

Step by step we worked our way through a very difficult period. We entered World War II, and the same process was followed as we moved through the necessary processes to win World War II under the leadership of Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman. So we have always moved in an evolutionary way. Sometimes you have to speed up the evolutionary process, and sometimes the approach to the evolutionary process has to be comprehensive, across the board you have to move and move fast, but to move in a way that is being proposed now, where an artificial crisis is created, an umbrella of emergency has been created. So we have a situation where extreme changes, extreme radical changes can be justified because we have created a crisis.

Who is it who said that we have to have a balanced budget by the year 2002? What economist has said that that is absolutely necessary to keep our economy healthy? Our deficit is coming down already. Our deficit has never been as great as certain European countries who are not in a panic and not making their people suffer in order to get a balanced budget within a 7-year period. Where did this come from? Olympia? Did some oracle predict that we had to have a balanced budget by the year 2002?

That is an artificial goal. A crisis that is created by setting that, the rationale for it, we still do not know. It is forcing us into a revolutionary mode. You are going to have to make $700 billion in savings. You have to pull out of the process, out of the present budget over a 7-year period, you have to get $700 billion.

My colleagues previously were discussing the Medicare cuts, because one of the places where you have the largest Government expenditures is in health care costs, Medicare being probably one of the highest expenditures.

Medicare is on the chopping block now because if you have to save $700 billion over the next 5 to 7 years, where are you going to get it? It is like slick Willie Sutton who when he was asked, why do you rob banks, said that is where the money is. They are going to take it from Medicare because that is where the money is.

They are going to take it from Medicaid, too. Medicaid is a health care program for the poorest people in the country. And they are going to rob Medicaid, too. But nobody is discussing that because Medicaid does not have any defenders in this capital, in the city of Washington you do not hear from the White House any discussion of drastic cuts that are being proposed for Medicaid. You do not hear them on the Hill, here in Congress, but they are going to cut Medicaid for poor people drastically also.

Cuts are already under way in the States and in cities across America to cut health care for poor people. What is the problem when you start cutting health care for poor people? When the Medicaid program was first developed a statement was made which is still true. The statement is that there is no such thing as bargain basement, second-class health care. Health care is either adequate or it is not adequate. You

cannot have second-class, bargain basement health care, health care where you use old needles to save money because if you use old needles to give injections, you are likely to create more disease than you are to create health.

You cannot have health care where the hospitals do not wash the linen except once a week. You cannot have health care where a doctor makes a diagnosis that a patient needs a certain medication that exists and we know it exists and the doctor decides that that is too expensive for that person. That is not health care. That is making judgments about human beings that nobody should have the right to make.

So health care costs cannot be trimmed and cannot be cut without damaging the health care process. It is either adequate health care or it is not. So when Medicare cuts are made, what we are saying is we are going to give bargain basement health care to poor people and that is going to be inadequate health care. And those of us who are here, those who propose it and those who are against it, we all know that what we are doing is unethical and dangerous, but there are going to be cuts for Medicaid and there are going to be cuts for Medicare if they continue to insist, if they insist that we have to balance our budget in America by the year 2002.

Now, why does it make sense to balance the budget? They offer this homespun logic that says every family balances its budget. You know they have to balance your budget.

□ 1345

That seems like a great truth, something that Einstein might endorse, except any mother, any father, anybody in any family knows that you do not balance your budget, you do not balance your budget year by year. Your mortgage is not paid for in 1 year. Your mortgage is spread out over a long period of time. Otherwise you could not afford, you cannot pay for a house—there are some rich and famous Americans who can, but most of us cannot pay for a house in 1 year. You cannot pay for your car in the same year, either. Most of us cannot pay for a car, so you do not balance your budget.

Balanced budgets are not something that heaven smiles upon because they work in the economy. They are something invented by the Republican majority here as a great good that we should all strive for which does not exist. They say cities and States have balanced budgets. Most cities and States do not have balanced budgets, they have operating budgets that are balanced and then they have capital budgets. They take all the items, like your car and your house and things that have to be paid for over a long period of time, because they are so tremendously expensive, and they put that in a capital budget.

What this Government needs to do, if you want to have an intelligent approach to the budget, is we should have a capital budget for items that cost a lot of money over a long period of time, and an operating budget for the items that you pay for on a yearly basis.

I would be the first to support a balanced budget operating budget if you want to propose it that way, as long as you take the capital items like the building of airports and highways, and if we need new weapon systems in the future, weapon systems are a large expenditure that come out, and you can look at it in a more intelligent way.

However, the people who are in charge now, they have the votes. They say we are going to have a balanced budget. It is dogmatic, it is not scientific, it is not logical, but they have the votes, so they have created a crisis.

I serve as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Alternative Committee on the Budget. We hope that we are going to be able to offer an alternative budget on the floor, and show our vision of where America should be going and how you can deal with the budget versus the vision of the majority that is in control right now. We are going to do that, despite the fact that we have been told that no budget will be allowed on the floor for discussion unless it meets the requirement that has been set forth to move toward balance.

You have to have a balanced budget, a budget which is going toward balance, by the year 2002. That means that since our budgets are really projected on a 5-year period, not a 7-year period, we have to show in our fifth year in our budget that the deficit is down to $59 billion, which means that in 2 more years it will be eliminated completely. We are going to accept their challenge.

I am not sure what the Democratic minority is going to do as a whole, but the Congressional Black Caucus, we will accept that challenge. We will show how, even if you accept the illogical, unscientific approach of the Republican majority, you can produce a budget that will be in balance by the year 2002, and you can still do that without making large numbers of Americans suffer. You can do it without cutting Medicaid drastically; you can do it without cutting Medicare drastically. What you have to do, however, is stop the fantasy, stop the fantasy of increasing the defense budget because you identify with that in some kind of romantic way.

The defense budget cannot be increased while you are making all of these cuts. We do not need to increase the defense budget. We need to cut, instead, the $100 billion for overseas bases. We are still supplying bases in Germany and Japan. These are prosperous nations. They can take care of their own needs if they want to man those bases, or even if they do not need the bases, they are there for the security of Europe as a whole, or the bases are there for the security of Asia as a whole, then Japan should pay their share of maintaining security in the world.

It is about time. They are rich nations, Germany and Japan. Let them pay for the security of Europe instead of an egotistical America. Our ego is costing us billions of dollars, an egotistical sense that we, we should make sure that Europe is secure by paying for the bases in Europe. We should make certain that Asia is secure by paying for the bases in Europe. Ego. That is how Tom Sawyer whitewashed the fence.

Japan and Germany stand back and they chuckle while their economies go forward, while their workers earn higher pay, they have longer vacations, their society is much more secure than ours. They chuckle at our egotism that says we must maintain bases across the world in order to guarantee security and freedom, we must have a huge Navy that guarantees the freedom of the sea lanes of the world.

Why do we have to have a huge Navy to guarantee the freedom of the sea lanes of the world? If we want the freedom and security of the sea lanes to be guaranteed, let us give more support to the United Nations and let us have all nations join together to guarantee the security and the freedom of the sea lanes of the world.

It is our ego that costs us billions of dollars in defense, while other nations sit back and let us do it and chuckle at us while they pour their resources into their economy. They pour their resources into the creation of jobs.

In our budget, if you want to insist on balancing the budget, we say to the Republican majority, then let us balance the budget by cutting those things which are not necessary, like $100 billion in overseas bases.

We have, unfortunately, an attitude, a philosophy, that comes first. The attitude has to be confronted. We have to confront the fact that we are dealing with an elitist attitude, an attitude which says that we want an America which gets rid of all of the people who are a nuisance to those rich and famous who want to have an opportunity to make more and more money faster and faster.

We already have the largest corporations in the world. The Fortune 500 corporations are bigger than most of the countries in the world, their budgets. They have more money, more assets than most of the countries in the world. We already have more billionaires than any other country in the world. We do not have maybe the richest person in the world, maybe Japan or Germany might have him, but we have more people in the category of billionaires than any other nation in the world, yet we want to set conditions which will guarantee that they get rich faster, instead of setting conditions and making policies that guarantee that the pie is shared.

All of us participated in the building of America. Every soldier that died in every war made a contribution. Every person that worked in the factories during the war made a contribution.

Every engineer that took the work of a genius and translated it into some practical application, you know, everybody participated in the building of this civilization and this society.

Everybody deserves some rewards. Not everybody deserves to be rich, but everybody deserves to have a decent opportunity to pursue happiness, the right to the pursuit of happiness. We have forgotten that it is our duty as a government to supply the right to pursue happiness.

Let us just take a moment to look at the study that was reported in the New York Times on Monday, April 17. The study was reported, and I also have an editorial, and I am not sure if it was on the same day, but it was either on the following day or the same day. On Monday, April 17, the article said ''The gap in wealth in the U.S. is called the widest in the West.''

In the previous special order with my colleagues, I mentioned this, and they talked about it, too, we have a situation where the United States has replaced Great Britain as being the nation where the gap between the rich and poor is the widest. There is a chart which shows that over the years, since 1925, in Great Britain, the gap between the wealthiest people and the poorest people has come down steadily, while the gap in America has risen steadily, and we are way above the British at this point. The gap between the average income of the richest and the poor is wider in America than it is in Germany, in Japan, or anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I will include this article which appeared in the New York Times on April 17 for the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 17, 1995]

GAP IN WEALTH IN THE UNITED STATES CALLED WIDEST IN WEST

(By Keith Bradsher)

WASHINGTON, April 12.—New studies on the growing concentration of American wealth and income challenge a cherished part of the country's self-image: They show that rather than being an egalitarian society, the United States has become the most economically stratified of industrial nations.

Even class societies like Britain, which inherited large differences in income and wealth over centuries going back to their feudal pasts, now have greater economic equality than the United States, according to the latest economic and statistical research, much of which is to be published soon.

Economic inequality has been on the rise in the United States since the 1970's. Since 1992, when Bill Clinton charged that Republican tax cuts in the 1980's had broadened the gap between the rich and the middle class, it has become more sharply focused as a political issue.

Many of the new studies are based on the data available then, but provide new analyses that coincide with a vigorous debate in Congress over provisions in the Republican Contract With America.

Indeed, the drive by Republicans to reduce Federal welfare programs and cut taxes is expected, at least in the short term, to widen disparities between rich and poor.

Federal Reserve figures from 1989, the most recent available, show that the wealthiest 1 percent of American households—with net worth of at least $2.3 million each—owns nearly 40 percent of the nation's wealth. By contrast, the wealthiest 1 percent of the British population owns about 18 percent of the wealth there—down from 59 percent in the early 1920's.

Further down the scale, the top 20 percent of Americans—households worth $180,000 or more—have more than 80 percent of the country's wealth, a figure higher than in other industrial nations.

Income statistics are similarly skewed. At the bottom end of the scale, the lowest-earning 20 percent of Americans earn only 5.7 percent of all the after-tax income paid to individuals in the United States each year. In Finland, a nation with an exceptionally even distribution of income, the lowest-earning 20 percent receive 10.8 percent of such income.

The top 20 percent of American households in terms of income—$55,000 or more—have 55 percent of all after-tax income.

''We are the most unequal industrialized country in terms of income and wealth, and we're growing more unequal faster than the other industrialized countries,'' said Edward N. Wolff, an economics professor at New York University. He will publish two papers in coming months that compare wealth patterns in Western countries.

Liberal social scientists worry about poor people's shrinking share of the nation's resources, and the consequences in terms of economic performance and social tension.

Margaret Weir, a senior fellow in government studies at the Brookings Institution, called the higher concentration of incomes and wealth ''quite divisive,'' especially in a country where the political system requires so much campaign money.

''It tilts the political system toward those who have more resources,'' she said, adding that financial extremes also undermined the ''sense of community and commonality of purpose.''

Robert Greenstein, executive director of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a Washington research group, observed, ''When you have a child poverty rate that is four times the average of Western European countries that are our principal industrial competitors, and when those children are a significant part of our future work force, you have to worry about the competitive effects as well as the social-fabric effects.''

Conservatives have tended to pay less attention to rising inequality, and some express skepticism about the statistics of their significance. Marvin H. Kosters, an economist at the American Enterprise Institute here, said he thought the gap, as measured, was being used as a false villain. ''I think we have important sociological problems,'' he said, ''but I don't think this gets at it all that well.''

Murray L. Weidenbaum, professor of economics at Washington University in St. Louis and chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Ronald Reagan in 1981–1982, said he thought the measures tended to overstate the gap by overlooking Government programs like food stamps or Medicaid.

Still, he said he was uncomfortable with greater concentration of wealth ''unless there's a rapid turnover'' in which ''this year's losers will be next year's winners.''

He noted that many wealthy people have bad years and that a lot of middle-class people, like graduate students, briefly look statistically as if they are starving. The United States does have ''very substantial mobility,'' he added.

Mr. Weidenbaum said he doubted that the Republican agenda, if it became law, would have any substantial effect on the gap. He added that the ''static'' impact might be somewhat more concentration, but that the ''dynamic'' impact would produce a bigger economic pie for all to share.

There is no agreement as to why inequality is rising faster in the United States than elsewhere. Explanations include falling wages for unskilled workers as automation spreads, low tax rates on the rich during the 1980's, relatively low minimum wages, the decline of trade unions and the rapid rise in the 1980's of the stock and bond markets, in which rich people are heavily invested.

The most common view seems to be that the United States has witnessed the more extreme effects of several international trends toward greater economic inequality. ''While many of the countries experienced many pieces of inequality, the United States is the one country that seems to have experienced all the pieces,'' said Peter T. Gottschalk, an economics professor at Boston College.

Mr. Wolff's papers are based on data that run through 1989. But Census Bureau figures show that the trend toward greater income inequality continued during the first year of the Clinton Administration. While incomes rose for the most affluent two-fifths of the nation's households as the economy expanded in 1993, the rest of the country suffered from falling incomes, after adjusting for inflation.

''U.S. wage distribution is more unequal than other countries and we do less in terms of tax and transfer policy'' to cushion the disparities, said Timothy M. Smeeding, an American who is director of the Luxembourg Income Study Project. Mr. Smeeding is writing two papers drawing international comparisons of income.

The project, based in Walferdange, Luxembourg, is supported by the national science foundations of nearly two dozen countries including the United States, and has gathered Government data from the member nations showing that the United States has the greatest inequalities in income distribution.

Most economists believe that wealth and income are more concentrated in the United States than in Japan. But while data show that wealth is more equitably distributed in Japan, the Government there has not released enough detailed information to make statistical comparisons possible.

Anecdotal information strongly suggests that Japan has a more equal distribution of income. The chief executives of Japanese manufacturing companies, for example, make an average of 10 times the pay of their workers. American chief executives in manufacturing are paid 25 times more, according to a 1994 study by Towers Perrin, a management consulting company.

Professor Gottschalk said Canada and the Netherlands seemed to have avoided the trend toward relatively higher wages for high-skilled workers because they had sharply increased the number of college graduates. But other trends toward inequality, like a widening wage gap between experienced and inexperienced workers, have affected these two countries, as well.

The time American inequality began to increase is also debated, with various economists putting it anywhere from the mid–1970's to the early 1980's. The double-digit inflation and stock market slumps that followed the quadrupling of oil prices in 1973 temporarily produced greater equality, as the stocks and bonds of the rich lost value. But that effect gradually disappeared, with Mr. Wolff's data showing that the concentration of wealth among the richest has consistently exceeded Britain's level since 1978. British records are especially complete, making such comparisons easier.

The comparison with Britain is all the more striking because President Reagan and

former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher pursued broadly similar economic policies in the 1980's.

Rising housing prices have helped the British middle class and limited the growth in inequality there. Still, Mr. Gottschalk said most evidence indicated that income inequality rose much faster in the United States and Britian than elsewhere.

Richard V. Burkhauser, an economics professor at Syracuse University, said that in studying thousands of people in Germany and the United States over seven-year periods in the 1980's, he found that the two countries had roughly the same level of social mobility.

As part of the Contract With America's tax provisions, the House on April 5 approved an increase in individuals' exemptions from the estate tax, which is the main Federal tax on wealth. By the Treasury's estimate, this could cut in half the number of people subject to the tax, to one-half of 1 percent of the estates of those dying each year.

Republicans have argued that the overall tax-cut provisions would reduce annual tax bills by roughly equal percentages for rich and poor. Democrats say that because the annual tax bills of rich Americans are much larger, reducing them by about the same percentage means that most of the money goes to the rich rather than the poor or the middle class, further concentrating wealth and income.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I will read from the editorial a few excerpts that I did not have a chance to cover before. The New York Times is not a radical publication. The New York Times editorial says the following: ''After years of little change, inequality exploded in America starting in the 1970's. According to Prof. Edward Wolff of New York University, three-quarters of the income gains during the 1980's and 100 percent of the increased wealth went to the top 20 percent of the families.'' In America, the top 20 percent got three-quarters of all the income gains. The 80 percent on the bottom, 8 out of 10, shared the rest.

I continue the quote from the New York Times: ''The richest 1 percent of households control about 40 percent of the nation's wealth.'' One percent versus 99 percent. The other 99 percent take the rest. ''. . . 1 percent control 40 percent of the nation's wealth—twice as much as the figure in Britain, which has the greatest inequality in Western Europe.''

In Britain, which used to have the greatest inequality between the rich and the poor, now we have twice as much inequality in the New World, in America. We fought the British, we got rid of that system, that privilege and wealth. Now we have twice as much inequality as Britain.

''In Germany,'' and I am quoting from the New York Times editorial, ''High-wage families earn about 2.5 times as much as low-wage workers,'' 2.5 times. The number in Germany has been falling. In America the figure is that the high-wage families in America earn four times as much as low-wage families, and the high-wage families' percentage of income is rising.

The difference between the high-wage families and the low-wage families, people who work every day for wages, we are not talking about wealthy people who have stocks and bonds and they get their income from their investments, we are talking about wage earners, people who work every day, the highest wages in America have been going up for the top and down for the bottom, so you have the top wage earners, the difference is four times as great.

I continue to read from the editorial in the New York Times: ''The best guess about the factor behind the burgeoning inequality is technology; the wage gap between high- and low-skilled workers in America doubled during the 1980's. College graduates used to earn about 30 percent more than high school graduates, but now they earn 60 percent more.'' College graduates used to earn 30 percent more than just mere high school graduates, and now they earn 60 percent more.

Why is it barbaric that the Republican budget proposals are going to cut the student loan program by $12 billion over 5 years? Why is it a barbaric act, an act that has no vision, no logic, no science? Because you limit, when you make those kinds of cuts and make it more difficult for people to go to college, you limit the number of people who can enter the high-technology job market, and you cut off the possibilities of their earning livings at that level.

I go back to the New York Times article: ''Prof. Sheldon Danziger of the University of Michigan estimates that trends in private pay rates explain about 85 percent of recent increases in inequality; Reagan-Bush tax cuts for the rich and spending cuts for the poor explain much of the other 15 percent.''

However, even if government is not the main factor, and this is the New York Times, not me, I think government policies are certainly not what makes the economy, but government policies are the main factor in the way a society operates, including the economy. To quote the New York Times, ''Even if government is not the main factor, it could be a part of the solution. Changes in the Canadian economy during the 1980's also hit hard at low-wage workers,'' changes in the Canadian economy.

In Canada, there the government stepped in to keep poverty rates on a downward path. In the United States, poverty rose, but in Canada, poverty dropped, because the government policies were used to intervene in their economy in ways to help the poor.

''House Republicans are now,'' and I am still quoting the New York Times, ''House Republicans are now pushing the Federal budget in the wrong direction. At a time when employers are crying out for well-educated workers, the GOP proposes to cut back money for training and educational assistance. America needs better Head Start, primary and secondary education. It needs to train high school dropouts and welfare mothers. The GOP policy would leave the untrained stranded. That would harm the Nation's long-term productivity—and further distort an increasingly tilted economy.''

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, I imclude the New York Times editorial in its entirety at this point in the RECORD:

THE RICH GET RICHER FASTER

The gap between rich and poor is vast in the United States—and recent studies show it growing faster here than anywhere else in the West. The trend is largely the result of technological forces at work around the world. But the United States Government has done little to ameliorate the problem. Indeed, if the Republicans get their way on the budget, the Government will make a troubling trend measurably worse.

Some inequality is necessary if society wants to reward investors for taking risks and individuals for working hard and well. But excessive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar—and exacerbate social tensions.

After years of little change, inequality exploded in America starting in the 1970's. According to Prof. Edward Wolff of New York University, three-quarters of the income gains during the 1980's and 100 percent of the increased wealth went to the top 20 percent of families.

The richest 1 percent of households control about 40 percent of the nation's wealth—twice as much as the figure in Britain, which has the greatest inequality in Western Europe. In Germany, high-wage families earn about 2.5 times as much as low-wage workers; the number has been falling. In America the figure is above 4 times, and rising.

Interpreting these trends requires caution. Inequality rose here in the 1980's in part because the United States created far more jobs—many low-paid—than did Western Europe. Low-paying jobs are better than no jobs. Rising inequality in the United States has also been caused in substantial part by middle-class families that moved up the income ladder, opening a gap with those below them.

About half of Americans move a substantial distance up or down the income ladder over a typical five-year period. In a mobile society, where workers rotate among high- and low-earning jobs, earning gaps are less frightening because any given job would be less entrapping.

But mobility has offset none of the increased inequality of income. Studies at the Maxwell School at Syracuse University show that mobility in America is not higher than in Germany. Nor does mobility here appear to be higher today than it was in the early 1970's.

The best guess about the factor behind burgeoning inequality is technology; the wage gap between high- and low-skilled workers in America doubled during the 1980's. College graduates used to earn about 30 percent more than high school graduates, but now earn 60 percent more. Prof. Sheldon Danziger of the University of Michigan estimates that trends in private pay rates explain about 85 percent of recent increases in inequality; Reagan-Bush tax cuts for the rich and spending cuts for the poor explain much of the other 15 percent.

But even if government is not the main actor, it could be part of the solution. Changes in the Canadian economy during the 1980's also hit hard at low-wage workers. But there the Government stepped in to keep poverty rates on a downward path. I the United States, poverty rose.

House Republicans are now pushing the Federal budget in the wrong direction. At a

time when employers are crying out for well-educated workers, the G.O.P. proposes to cut back money for training and educational assistance. America needs better Head Start, primary and secondary education. It needs to train high school dropouts and welfare mothers. The G.O.P. policy would leave the untrained stranded. That would harm the nation's long-term productivity—and further distort an increasingly tilted economy.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reemphasize something I read from the editorial earlier:

Some inequality is necessary if society wants to reward investors for taking risks and individuals for working hard and well. But excessive inequality can break the spirit of those trapped in society's cellar—and exacerbate social tensions.

We are not proposing a change in capitalism. We are not proposing an attack on capitalism. Capitalism is the way of the world. It is the best economy that mankind has been able to fashion. But capitalism should be tempered by democratic government. Democratic government should extol the necessity to make sure that there are safety nets, that the wealth is shared. When people go to work for Xerox or IBM or Microsoft, they do not take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. They do not have to be true to the doctrine expressed in the Declaration of Independence. The pursuit of happiness is not a concern of a corporation, per se. The pursuit of happiness of the American people is not their concern. The pursuit of profit is their business. But government must make certain that in the process of pursuing profits, corporations are part of a total society and that policies are promulgated where everybody is properly taken care of, not everybody shares equally but we have public policies which guarantee that everybody will have decent housing, public policies which guarantee that the opportunity to get an education will be provided.

We cannot afford to have a budget like the budget that is about to be proposed by the Republican majority that is going to slash job training programs tremendously, they are going to slash education programs, and, of course, there is a notion existing that they may completely eradicate the Department of Education.

What does it say to the world, to the civilized world, to the other industrialized nations that the United States of America is going to eliminate the Department of Education? What does it say to the other competitors that we have in the world about our future competitiveness? I think they will chuckle and say we are going to have less of a problem with a competitive America in the future if they are going to eliminate a Department of Education at the Federal level which gives a sense of direction for education in the country as a whole.

It is not responsible, we do not have a system like France or Great Britain or most of the European countries, we do not have a centralized system of education. The education budget in this country, most of it is paid for by State and local governments. The proportion of the budget of the Federal Government's share of the budget is about 8 percent now, fluctuating between 8 and 6 percent. Under Ronald Reagan it went down to about 6 percent. But at most it is 8 percent of the total budget. Of the more than $360 billion spent on education from kindergarten to higher education last year, the Federal Government only paid for about 8 percent of that. So it is not our contribution financially that is so important. It is the leadership that the Federal Government offers in terms of giving a sense of direction to where we have to go in the global economy in order to be competitive. It is the leadership of the Federal Government that brought forth a document called ''A Nation At Risk'' where we said this Nation cannot survive unless we pay more attention to how our children are educated in order to be able to compete in the modern world. It is the leadership that led George Bush to put out America 2000, his own program for improving education.

Behind George Bush came President Clinton with Goals 2000. Goals 2000 is not so different from America 2000. They were both at the same conference where the Governors came up with the same six ways to improve education.

We were moving forward, we are moving forward in terms of Federal participation without Federal domination of education. The Federal Government offers leadership. But now I dread the budget that is coming because that budget proposes to eliminate the Department of Education. That is a barbaric act. It would be a barbaric act, an unreasonable act, an unscientific act to eliminate the Department of Education at this time.

I say the barbaric philosophy, people who are committing barbaric acts are a real danger. They are not barbarians themselves but each act should be examined by itself. I think I mentioned before a philosophy of economic cleansing that has been proposed by the mayor of New York City. The mayor of New York City is a nice guy when you get to know him. He is a decent fellow, he has a family, he has kids. I cannot call him a barbarian, but I can think of no more barbaric thinking than to believe that poor people should get out of town, they should leave, in order to make the city's economic situation better. That is barbaric in the extreme. It is a philosophy of ethnic cleansing that has been expressed by an elected official. Those who think it, I consider that bad enough, but this has been expressed and it must be challenged.

The mayor of New York City cannot say to the poor people of New York City, ''You don't belong here.'' He cannot say to the African-Americans in New York City, ''You don't belong here.'' New York City was a major slave port. Millions of slaves were poured into New York City in its early days. As New York City was built starting at the waterfront and moved back up to Central Park, even when Central Park was cleared, there are photographs of slaves working to clear the ground. That city was built in its infancy by slave labor. There is a Negro burial ground that was unearthed as they were building a new Federal building in a downtown section of Manhattan, and the Negro burial ground revealed massive numbers of graves, there must have been epidemic sickness, large numbers of people died, large numbers of children died. In order for there to be so many graves and so many people dying, there had to be many slaves there and they were the ones who cut down the trees, made the lumber, did the construction. Long before the white immigrants came, the slaves who were kidnapped and who were the hostages and not immigrants, they helped to build New York City. And now to say to the descendants of those slaves who built New York City, ''Get out of town, you're not wanted.''

Where will they go? Where will the poor people of New York City go? Who else wants them if New York City does not want them? Will they go to Marietta, GA, where they are building the F–22 fighter plane? The F–22 fighter plane is one of those obsolete weapon systems that we do not need. We do not need a fighter plane more sophisticated than the one we already have because the Soviet Union is not building another one. We have the best already, so why build another one? It is going to cost us $12 billion over the next 5 years to continue creating, building the F–22.

Can you give us some jobs in the F–22 plant in Marietta, GA, which happens to be the Speaker's district? Can you give us jobs for the poor of New York City? Can we send them to Marietta, GA?

Where will they go? Can we send them to Groton, CT, where they are building another *Seawolf* submarine? Can you give the poor people of New York jobs at Groton, CT, where they are building another *Seawolf* submarine?

Can they go to Texas where they made a killing? Texas is responsible for the savings and loan debacle. Half of the savings and loans that collapsed, half the swindles took place in Texas.

But they benefited even from the collapse because, since they have most of the problem in their State, the Resolution Trust Corporation and all of the effort to straighten out the debacle created by the savings and loan swindle, half of it is in Texas. So workers are hired by the Resolution Trust Corporation, by those people who are trying to straighten out the savings and loan mess. They are Texas workers, so Texas benefits twice.

Can we get some jobs for New Yorkers in Texas so that they can benefit from the savings and loan swindle, jobs that are created as we try to straighten it out? Where can the New York City poor people go?

Can they go to Kansas? In Kansas you have families who are farm families, and they have been averaging $30,000 to $40,000 in government checks over the last decade. According to an article in the New York Times, they get $30,000 to $40,000 for doing nothing, except what they do raises the price of food, and we pay more for food in New York because we are keeping the price of farm products high by subsidizing them with taxpayers' money.

There is something barbaric about paying people not to grow food and driving up the price so the poorest people have to pay more money. The farm price program was created by the New Deal, by Franklin Roosevelt, when farmers were poor, to save poor farmers, when large numbers of people lived on the land. But now we have less than 2 percent of the population of the United States living on farms, and we are spending billions of dollars to take care of those pretty well-to-do farmers and the agribusinesses.

I want to read one more editorial from the New York Times about the farm program. This is a program which we all accept nobody wants to cut. Recently the President made a trip to Iowa, and he pledged that he would defend Federal farm subsidies to the end.

The New York Times editorial says that farmers, quoting the New York Times, farmers are the Nation's richest welfare recipients.

> Farmers are the Nation's richest welfare recipients. Full-time farmers typically earn four times as much as nonfarm families.
>
> The Federal Government pays farmers and huge agribusinesses not to grow crops or send food abroad. Mr. Clinton says that is a nifty way to boost exports, but taxpayers who foot the bill might take exception.
>
> The Federal program stifles food production, which jacks up prices and hurts both consumers and the economy. The farm program costs taxpayers about $10 billion a year and adds an equal amount to food bills, driving up the price of milk, fruit, sugar and many other necessities by about 10 percent.

That quote was from the New York Times editorial, which is entitled ''Mr. Clinton Bows to Farmers.''

Many of those farmers live in Kansas, the State of Kansas. Can we send New York City's poor to Kansas to share in the welfare checks that the farmers get? Our welfare checks average no more than $600 for a family of three a month, so surely the welfare recipients in New York would greatly benefit if they could get welfare checks at the level of the checks that are being received by the farmers in Kansas.

Mr. Giuliano should know that there is nowhere else for the poor to go. They will not take them in Kansas; in Texas; in Groton, CT; in Marietta, GA. They have a right to stay in New York City. The inhabitants have a right, the citizens have rights.

If a government cannot take care of the needs of their citizens, they cannot provide decent services, they cannot provide educational opportunities, then that government should resign. The public officials who cannot do that should resign. Do not exhort the people to leave. That is barbaric. That is not ethnic cleansing, it is economic cleansing, since you want all the poor to go.

First we had the tax on the illegal immigrants. Then we had a tax on the legal immigrants. Now we want all poor people to go. That is barbaric. We must resist that kind of barbarism.

In closing, what I am saying is that the budget process is taking place at every level in the country. In New York State, the budget was supposed to be completed and submitted on April 1. Now it is more than a month later and it is not completed because there is a struggle under way in New York State between the elite oppressive minority—you have the same elite oppressive minority with the philosophy that the poor are expendable, that you can throw overboard certain people. You have the high-technology barbarians in control in New York State, and in New York City, in city hall you have the same philosophy in the mayor.

Yes, there are budget cuts that have to be made. Yes, there is a need to balance the budget, and Democrats should not get off the hook. We should come forward with proposals about how the budget should be balanced. We should not hesitate to talk about revenue.

In New York City, the State has always robbed the city blind in terms of revenue, doing very little for the city. They have taken far too much from the city. In New York City, you have a Port of New York City, a Port Authority of New York-New Jersey which owns all the most valuable land where the airport is and the ships dock. Revenue that ought to be going to the city is going to the Port Authority. That ought to be corrected.

In New York City, you have two- and three-family homeowners who pay taxes which are far lower, about one-fourth the taxes that are being paid by the people who live in the suburbs surrounding New York. You have a number of ways that revenue could be increased.

Yes, we do need to decrease expenditures. Yes, we do need to adjust programs. There is not a program that has ever been invented that could not be trimmed, could not be adjusted, could not be refined. All that should take place in an atmosphere of an evolutionary process, and not a revolutionary process which says that ''We are going to destroy, we are going to slash and burn, we are going to have a blitzkrieg attack on all the social programs that were invented, that were developed over the last 60 years.''

We do not need to go into the budget process next week with so much dread, so much fear, so much foreboding. We do not have to look forward to a process that is going to tear down and wreck the best that America has ever built.

□ 1415

It could be very different. We could go forward with a philosophy of FDR ringing in our ears. There is nothing radical or new. The ''FDR's Economic Bill of Rights,'' I ran across it in a magazine the other day, and I will just close with this. Franklin Delano Roosevelt said many years ago:

> In our day these economic truths have become accepted as self-evident. We have accepted, so to speak, a second Bill of Rights under which a new basis of security and prosperity can be established for all regardless of station, or race or creed.
>
> Among these are:
>
> The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;
>
> The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;
>
> The right of farmers to raise and sell their products at a return which will give them and their families a decent living;
>
> The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;
>
> The right of every family to a decent home;
>
> The right of adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;
>
> The right of adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, and sickness, and accident and unemployment;
>
> And finally, the right to a good education.

All of these ideas were espoused by Franklin Roosevelt many years ago. You have heard the Speaker of this House quote Roosevelt and speak of him admirably as a person who created new order in our society. Why does he want to tear down an order that was created by Franklin Roosevelt as we go forward in the budget process and appropriations process? This Nation is great because carefully, painstakingly we built a system that demonstrated we care about everybody in America. Let us not let the oppressive elite minority destroy what has been put there by and for a caring majority.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES DELEGATION OF MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REGULA). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276h, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House as members of the United States delegation of the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group for the first session of the 104th Congress: Mr. BALLENGER of North Carolina, vice chairman; Mr. GILMAN of New York; Mr. DREIER of California; Mr. SALMON of Arizona; Mr. HAYWORTH of Arizona; Mr. BROWNBACK of Kansas; Mr. DE LA GARZA of Texas; Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut; Mr. COLEMAN of Texas; Mr. MILLER of California; and Mr. RANGEL of New York.

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1995—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, and the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit today for your immediate consideration and enactment the ''Immigration Enforcement Improvements Act of 1995.'' This legislative proposal builds on the Administration's FY 1996 Budget initiatives and complements the Presidential Memorandum I signed on February 7, 1995, which directs heads of executive departments and agencies to strengthen control of our borders, increase worksite enforcement, improve employment authorization verification, and expand the capability of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to identify criminal aliens and remove them from the United States. Also transmitted is a section-by-section analysis.

Some of the most significant provisions of this proposal will:

—Authorize the Attorney General to increase the Border Patrol by no fewer than 700 agents and add sufficient personnel to support those agents for fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998.

—Authorize the Attorney General to increase the number of border inspectors to a level adequate to assure full staffing.

—Authorize an Employment Verification Pilot Program to conduct tests of various methods of verifying work authorization status, including using the Social Security Administration and INS databases. The Pilot Program will determine the most cost-effective, fraud-resistant, and nondiscriminatory means of removing a significant incentive to illegal immigration—employment in the United States.

—Reduce the number of documents that may be used for employment authorization.

—Increase substantially the penalties for alien smuggling, illegal reentry, failure to depart, employer violations, and immigration document fraud.

—Streamline deportation and exclusion procedures so that the INS can expeditiously remove more criminal aliens from the United States.

—Allow aliens to be excluded from entering the United States during extraordinary migration situations or when the aliens are arriving on board smuggling vessels. Persons with a credible fear of persecution in their countries of nationality would be allowed to enter the United States to apply for asylum.

—Expand the use of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) statute to authorize its use to pursue alien smuggling organizations; permit the INS, with judicial authorization, to intercept wire, electronic, and oral communications of persons involved in alien smuggling operations; and make subject to forfeiture all property, both real and personal, used or intended to be used to smuggle aliens.

—Authorize Federal courts to require criminal aliens to consent to their deportation as a condition of probation.

—Permit new sanctions to be imposed against countries that refuse to accept the deportation of their nationals from the United States. The proposal will allow the Secretary of State to refuse issuance of all visas to nationals of those countries.

—Authorize a Border Services User Fee to help add additional inspectors at high volume ports-of-entry. The new inspectors will facilitate legal crossings; prevent entry by illegal aliens; and stop cross-border drug smuggling. (Border States, working with local communities, would decide whether the fee should be imposed in order to improve infrastructure.)

This legislative proposal, together with my FY 1996 Budget and the February 7th Presidential Memorandum, will continue this Administration's unprecedented actions to combat illegal immigration while facilitating legal immigration. Our comprehensive strategy will protect the integrity of our borders and laws without dulling the luster of our Nation's proud immigrant heritage.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this legislative proposal by the Congress.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 3, 1995.*

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. DURBIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LAFALCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OWENS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FIELDS of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, 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. DURBIN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SCHUMER in four instances.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. HAMILTON in four instances.

Ms. DELAURO.

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. COYNE in two instances.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. RICHARDSON in two instances.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mr. BERMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. STEARNS.

Mrs. ROUKEMA in three instances.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. PARKER.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

Ms. KAPTUR.

Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. ROGERS.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. MCDADE.

Mr. GILLMOR in three instances.

Mr. LAHOOD.

Mrs. MALONEY.

SENATE BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 268. An act to authorize the collection of fees for expenses for triploid grass carp certification inspections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources;

S. 349. An act to reauthorize appropriations for the Navajo-Hopi Relocation Housing Program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources;

441S. 441. An act to reauthorize appropriations for certain programs under the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources;

S. 523. An act to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of

salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources;

S.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution expressing the concern of the Congress regarding certain recent remarks that unfairly and inaccurately maligned the integrity of the Nation's law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1995

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 58 of the 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. Tuesday, May 9, 1995, for morning hour debates.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 58, the House adjourned until Tuesday, May 9, 1995, at 12:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 2, 1995]

760. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting two final rule amendments under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

761. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the United States intends to offer a grant transfer to the Government of Colombia for two vessels, pursuant to Public Law 101–231, section 5 (103 Stat. 1959); to the Committee on National Security.

762. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting notification that certain major defense acquisition programs have breached the unit cost by more than 15 and 25 percent, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2431(b)(3)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

763. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the annual report detailing test and evaluation activities of the Foreign Comparative Testing [FCT] Program during fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on National Security.

764. A letter from the Director, Test, Systems Engineering and Evaluation, Department of Defense, transmitting summaries outlining test projects recommended for fiscal year 1995 funding as part of the Foreign Comparative Testing Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2350a(g); to the Committee on National Security.

765. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting notification that the Secretary has invoked the authority granted by 41 U.S.C. 3732 to authorize the military departments to incur obligations in excess of available appropriations for clothing, subsistence, forage, fuel, quarters, transportation, or medical and hospital supplies, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 11; to the Committee on National Security.

766. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting notification that a study has determined contract performance to be most cost effective method of operating the mess attendant function at Andersen Air Force Base, Guam, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on National Security.

767. A letter from the Chairman, SEROP Council, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program Scientific Advisory Board annual report; to the Committee on National Security.

768. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 123 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on National Security.

769. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to section 333(a) National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on National Security.

770. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the 1994 consolidated annual report on the community development programs administered by the Department, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5313(a); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

771. A letter from the Chairman, the Appraisal Subcommittee, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting the 1994 annual report, pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 1103(a)(4) (103 Stat. 512); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

772. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to section 406 of the Mexican Debt Disclosure Act of 1995; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

773. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the status of the Treasury Department portion of the administration's response to House Resolution 80; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

774. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting justification for a national interest determination by the President regarding the Export-Import Bank and the People's Republic of China (DTR 95–18); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

775. A letter from the Executive Director, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board and Acting Chief Executive Officer, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting a report on the activities and efforts of the RTC, the FDIC, and the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board for the 6-month period ending March 31, 1995, pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 501(a) (103 Stat. 387); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

776. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting a study on the impact of the payment of interest on reserves; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

777. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office of Thrift Supervision's 1994 annual report to Congress on the preservation of minority savings associations, pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 301 (103 Stat. 279); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

778. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's 1995 compensation plan, pursuant to Public Law 101–73, section 1206 (103 Stat. 523); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

779. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the 1994 reports of the Department's Advisory Council for Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

780. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Energy, transmitting the annual report of actions under the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 during calendar year 1994, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8482; to the Committee on Commerce.

781. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's annual report for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Commerce.

782. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the annual/quarterly report on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6241(g)(8); to the Committee on Commerce.

783. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on progress for research on outcome of health care services and procedures, pursuant to Public Law 101–239, section 6103(b)(1) (103 Stat. 2198); to the Committee on Commerce.

784. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting a summary of the Department of Energy Programmatic Spent Nuclear Fuel Management and Idaho National Engineering Laboratory Environmental Restoration and Waste Management Programs final environmental impact statement [EIS]; to the Committee on Commerce.

785. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report to Congress for 1993 pursuant to the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1337(b); to the Committee on Commerce.

786. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report to Congress for fiscal years 1991 and 1992 on the effectiveness of programs assisted under the Lead Contamination Control Act of 1988; to the Committee on Commerce.

787. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 14th report on the activities of the Multinational Force and Observers [MFO] and certain financial information concerning U.S. Government participation in that organization for the period ending January 15, 1995, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3425; to the Committee on International Relations.

788. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the removal of items from the U.S. munitions list, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

789. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a memorandum of justification under section 610 of the Foreign Assistance Act to meet United States Government commitments to African peacekeeping efforts in Liberia; to the Committee on International Relations.

790. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on training assistance for Rwanda, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2261; to the Committee on International Relations.

791. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2421(e)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

792. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–39, ''Extension of the

Equal Opportunity for Local, Small, and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises Act of 1992 Temporary Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

793. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–40, ''Administration of Medication by Public School Employees Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

794. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–41, ''District of Columbia Campaign Finance Reform and Conflict of Interest Act of 1974 Temporary Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

795. A letter from the Executive Director, District of Columbia Retirement Board, transmitting financial disclosure statements of board members, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–732, 1–734(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

796. A letter from the HUD Secretary's Designee, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting notification of the transfer of the inspector general; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

797. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, National Mediation Board, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

798. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Independent Counsel, transmitting the annual report on audit and investigative activities for the period ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

799. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's estimate of the amount of discretionary new budget authority and outlays for the current year—if any—and the budget year provided by H.R. 889, pursuant to Public Law 101–508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388–578); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

800. A letter from the Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the annual report for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to Public Law 101–12, section 3(a)(11) (103 Stat. 29); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

801. A letter from the Chairman, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, transmitting the audited financial statements of the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation [PADC] for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1994; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

802. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

803. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Shipping Study''; to the Committee on Resources.

804. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal rules of civil procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 104–64); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

805. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal rules of Criminal procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 104–65); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

806. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting the annual report on the operations of the private counsel debt collection project for fiscal year 1994, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3718(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Director, Administrative office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the annual report on applications for court orders made to Federal and State courts to permit the interception of wire, oral, or electronic communications during calendar year 1994, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 2519(3); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

808. A letter from the President, The Foundation of the Federal Bar Association, transmitting a copy of the association's audit report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(22), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

809. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal rules of appellate procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072 (H. Doc. No. 104–66) to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

810. A letter from the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal rules of bankruptcy procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075 (H. Doc. No. 104–67) to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

811. A letter from the U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting a report of amendments to the sentencing guidelines, policy statements, and commentary, together with the reasons for these amendments, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(p); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

812. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting determination that funding under title V (subsection 501(b)) of the Stafford Act, as amended, will exceed $5 million for the response to the emergency declared as a result of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal building in Oklahoma City, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5193; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

813. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems [NPIAS], 1993–97, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

814. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the interim report to Congress on the Commercial Vehicle Information System [CVIS] feasibility study, pursuant to section 4003 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

815. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to section 1111(b)(4) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

816. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, National Weather Service, transmitting the national implementation plan for modernization of the National Weather Service for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 102–567, section 703(a) (106 Stat. 4304); to the Committee on Science.

817. A letter from the Chairman, National Research Council, transmitting a report entitled ''Evolving the High Performance Computing and Communications Initiative to Support the Nation's Information Infrastructure,'' containing recommendations about the conduct, impact, and support of information technology research; to the Committee on Science.

818. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report covering the disposition of cases granted relief from administrative error, overpayment and forfeiture by the Administrator in 1994, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

819. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 81st quarterly report on trade between the United States and China, the successor states to the former Soviet Union, and other title IV countries during 1994, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2440; to the Committee on Way and Means.

820. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 1994 annual report to Congress on progress in conducting environmental remedial action at Federally owned or operated facilities, pursuant to Public Law 99–499, section 120(e)(5) (100 Stat. 1699); jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Commerce.

821. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification to the Congress regarding the incidental capture of sea turtles in commercial shrimping operations, pursuant to Public Law 101–162, section 609(b)(2) (103 Stat. 1038); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

822. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled, ''Cocaine Penalty Adjustment Act of 1995''; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Commerce.

823. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the transfer of operating responsibility for air traffic services currently provided by the Federal Aviation Administration on behalf of the United States to a separate corporate entity, in order to provide for more efficient operation and development of these transportation services and related assets, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Budget, and Ways and Means.

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:

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 139. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. 104–111). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

H.R. 961. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; with an amendment (Rept. 104–112). 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. ARCHER (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to properly characterize

certain redemptions of stock held by corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1552. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, regarding false identification documents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLYBURN (for himself, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. GRAHAM):

H.R. 1553. A bill to establish the South Carolina National Heritage Corridor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. COLEMAN:

H.R. 1554. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish a regional office in a community in the United States located not more than 10 miles from the border between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. FRISA, Mr. WHITE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

H.R. 1555. A bill to promote competition and reduce regulation in order to secure lower prices and higher quality services for American telecommunications consumers and encourage the rapid deployment of new telecommunications technologies; to the Committee on Commerce, 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. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. KLUG, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 1556. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to reduce the restrictions on ownership of broadcasting stations and other media of mass communications; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 1557. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1996, 1997, 1998 for the National Endowment for the Arts, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Institute for Museum Services; and to repeal the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 effective October 1, 1998; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 1558. A bill to amend the Goals 2000: Educate America Act to eliminate the National Education Standards and Improvement Council and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. GORDON:

H.R. 1559. A bill to prevent unfair billing and charging practices for information services provided over calls to 800 numbers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MINETA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. DANNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. JACOBS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KLECZKA, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE):

H.R. 1560. A bill to expand U.S. exports of goods and services by requiring the development of objective criteria to achieve market access in foreign countries, to provide the President with reciprocal trade authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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. GILMAN:

H.R. 1561. A bill to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States; to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and related agencies for fiscal years 1996 and 1997; to responsibly reduce the authorizations of appropriations for U.S. foreign assistance programs for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on 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.

H.R. 1562. A bill to consolidate the foreign affairs agencies of the United States in order to achieve greater efficiency and economy in the post-cold war era; to the Committee on International Relations.

H.R. 1563. A bill to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on 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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1564. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and for certain other international affairs functions and activities of the U.S. Government for fiscal years 1996 and 1997, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, 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. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. MONTGOMERY):

H.R. 1565. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend through December 31, 1997, the period during which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs is authorized to provide priority health care to certain veterans exposed to Agent Orange, ionizing radiation, or environmental hazards; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1566. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the credit for clinical testing expenses for certain drugs for rare diseases or conditions and to provide for carryovers and carrybacks of unused credits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 1567. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Professional Trade Service Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, 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. MANTON:

H.R. 1568. A bill to require explosive materials to contain taggants to enable law enforcement authorities to trace the source of the explosive material, whether before or after detonation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 1569. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of crops destroyed by casualty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas:

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the level of participation by the Small Business Administration in certain loans guaranteed by the administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. MOLINARI:

H.R. 1571. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to protect elected and appointed judges against discrimination based on age; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide death benefits to retired public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEY (for himself, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BARR, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. FOX, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. TRAFICANT):

H.R. 1573. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide specific penalties for taking a firearm from a Federal law enforcement officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA (for herself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. KANJORSKI):

H.R. 1574. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to exclude certain bank products from the definition of a deposit; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SOUDER (for himself, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the charitable contribution deduction, to allow such deduction to individuals who do not itemize other deductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. KLUG, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MINGE, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. WALDHOLTZ):

H.R. 1576. A bill to amend section of 207 of title 18, United States Code, to tighten restrictions on former executives and legislative branch officials and employees, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Oversight, 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. STOCKMAN (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. FUNDERBURK, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SALMON):

H.J. Res. 87. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding citizenship in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 2, 1995]

42. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to the closure or realignment of military installations in the Commonwealth; to the Committee on National Security.

43. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, relative to insuring against natural disaster risk; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

44. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, relative to chlorofluorocarbons; to the Committee on Commerce.

45. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to the participation of the Republic of China on Taiwan in the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

46. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Vermont, relative to the adoption of a national population policy; to the Committee on International Relations.

47. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Nevada, relative to mail delivery in the Lake Tahoe Basin; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

48. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the Federal Marine Mammal Protection Act; to the Committee on Resources.

49. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the Puyallup Tribe gaming requests; to the Committee on Resources.

50. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to preserving and enhancing wetlands; to the Committee on Resources.

51. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the proposed sale of the Western Area Power Administration; to the Committee on Resources.

52. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to a constitutional amendment regarding desecration of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

53. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

54. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the U.S. Court of Appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to death penalty appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

56. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to providing the States with a method of offering amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

57. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to prohibiting Federal judges from imposing State and local taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

58. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona, relative to adopting a declaration of sovereignty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

59. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

60. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, relative to the Fort Dodge Friskies Petcare plant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

61. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Georgia, relative to the adoption of the balanced budget amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

62. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, relative to the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

63. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, relative to Federal mandates with respect to the use of helmets by motorcyclists; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

64. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Tennessee, relative to the redesignation of the Mountain Home Veterans Affairs Medical Center; to the Committee on the Veterans' Affairs.

65. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Social Security payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

66. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Washington, relative to unemployment insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

67. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, relative to POW/MIA's; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and International Relations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Ms. MOLINARI introduced a bill (H.R. 1577) for the relief of the estate of Irwin Rutman; 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. 28: Mr. MCCOLLUM and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 38: Mr. TUCKER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. BLILEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WAMP, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCINNIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HEINEMAN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BRYANT of Texas, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 315: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 359: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 438: Mr. COOLEY.

H.R. 553: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 713: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. LUTHER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 752: Mr. HAYES, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BURR, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FUNDERBURK, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 783: Mr. WARD, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 820: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GORDON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. JONES, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 893: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 985: Mr. MCCRERY.

H.R. 997: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CANADY, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HORN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1018: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1023: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1085: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 1242: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 1252: Mr. FATTAH and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1272: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1329: Ms. LOWEY, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1330: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. STOCKMAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TANNER, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1400: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1422: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1504: Mr. EWING, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1512: Mr. HANCOCK.

H.J. Res. 79: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.J. Res. 84: Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, and Ms. NORTON.

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.R. 774: Mrs. SEASTRAND.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of May 2, 1995]

6. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council, city of Buffalo, NY, relative to the funding reductions for the Summer Youth Program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7. Also, petition of the Common Council, city of Buffalo, NY, relative to the funding reductions to public housing; to the Committee on Appropriations.

8. Also, petition of the Common Council, city of Buffalo, NY, relative to the funding reductions to the community schools anticrime funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

9. Also, petition of the Common Council, city of Buffalo, NY, relative to the funding reduction to the 20th community development block grant funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

10. Also, petition of the Common Council, city of Buffalo, NY, relative to the funding reduction to the Home Energy Assistance Program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11. Also, petition of the Common Council, city of Buffalo, NY, relative to the funding

reduction for Buffalo's lead abatement grant; to the Committee on Appropriations.

12. Also, petition of the comptroller of the city of New York, NY, relative to a proposal outlining the peace bond program and the creation of an Ireland Development Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

13. Also, petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, NY, relative to the Summer Youth Employment Program funding; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

14. Also, petition of the Alexandria City Council, Alexandria, VA, relative to a constitutional amendment regarding the desecration of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Also, petition of the National Association of Attorneys General, Washington, DC, relative to vertical restraints guidelines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. Also, petition of the National Association of Attorneys General, Washington, DC, relative to Department of Justice memorandum of understanding on affirmative civil rights enforcement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

17. Also, petition of John Jamian, State representative, Lansing, MI, relative to the 10th amendment to the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

18. Also, petition of the common council, city of Syracuse, NY, relative to the Historic Homeownership Assistance Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

19. Also, petition of the National Association of Attorneys General, Washington, DC, relative to opposing the national lottery proposed by the Coeur d'Alene Indian Tribe of Idaho; jointly, to the Committees on the Judiciary and Resources.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 3, rule XXVII the following discharge petitions were filed:

Petition 4, May 3, 1995, by Mr. Bryant of Texas on House Resolution 127 has been signed by the following Member: John Bryant.