

most are now resisting repatriation; 1,000 volunteers at camps in Indonesia have withdrawn their requests to return, and voluntary repatriation has also ceased in Hong King with 196 of 200 volunteers now refusing to board a scheduled flight to Vietnam.

The U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees and other objective observers lay the blame squarely on this legislation for this violence and for the collapse of orderly voluntary repatriation.

The repatriation of Indochinese boat people determined by the UNHCR to be economic migrants, not political refugees, was bound to be a contentious process under the best of conditions. But when this body refused to strike this dangerous and irresponsible provision, it gave the 40,000 plus boat people in the camps false hope of resettlement in the United States and, thus, created the conditions for violence that we see unfolding throughout Southeast Asia.

This Member fully understands and shares the desire to provide fair and humane treatment to those in the refugee camps. But instead this legislation has led to violence in the refugee camps, caused the collapse of voluntary repatriation, and will also likely encourage another wave of boat departures from Vietnam, putting people at great risk on the high seas and swelling the refugee camp population.

COMMENDING THE DEFENDING NBA CHAMPION HOUSTON ROCKETS

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to commend the defending NBA champion Houston Rockets for their impressive win over the San Antonio Spurs and soaring back to the NBA final in a matchup against the Orlando Magic. The Houston Rockets, who traveled a long journey to this year's NBA finals have beaten the top three teams in the western conference, Utah, Phoenix, and San Antonio.

I believe there were a number of factors which lead this remarkable team to represent the western conference in the NBA finals, both the coaching staff and the players. However, it all starts with the players, Clyde Drexler, Kenny Smith, Robert Horry, Mario Elie, Sam Cassell, and of course, Hakeem Olajuwon, who are out there day in and day out giving it their all.

I would also like to give ultimate praises to the coach of the Houston Rockets, Rudy Tomjanovich. Although the team went through injuries, trades, and player problems, his leadership has enabled the team to stay focused and keep its eyes on the big prize, another NBA championship.

While this will be no easy task for the Rockets, for the Orlando Magic pose a credible challenge. The Rockets players have done what it takes to win, either playing good defense, hitting

treys or going to its heart and soul, in the middle, center, Hakeem the Dream. Everything the Rockets accomplish starts with that.

Needless to say, my money is on the defending NBA champion Houston Rockets.

CONGRATULATING THE SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY VARSITY LACROSSE TEAM FOR CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORIES

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate, once again, the Syracuse University Varsity Lacrosse Team for its victories over tenacious and skilled opponents from Virginia and Maryland on Memorial Day weekend in the 1995 NCAA Lacrosse Championships. This marks the sixth time that Coach Roy Simmons, Jr., his outstanding coaching staff, and the players from Syracuse University have brought this honor on themselves.

This has been a year of ups and downs for the Syracuse team and those of us in central New York who follow their prowess. The lacrosse program has sustained a national reputation worthy of the SU sports program and of any division I academic institution. We in Syracuse are very proud.

It was a poignant set of victories leading to this championship, in light of the death earlier in the season of Roy Simmons, Sr., a well-known Syracusan, the father of Coach Simmons and himself the only other lacrosse coach at SU since 1931. Additionally, Roy, Sr. was president of the city of Syracuse Common Council earlier in his career.

The sign of a true championship is the ability to overcome adversity. Syracuse University's team and coaches came through a rough start of the season and finished with a great win against a strong Maryland team on their home field. In the semifinal they eliminated Virginia, a team that conquered the Orangemen earlier in the year. We salute the 16 graduating seniors and thank them and their undergraduate teammates for some wonderful memories.

Good luck and congratulations, national champs.

EPIDEMIC OF DEAFNESS IN RIGHT EAR AMONG REPUBLICANS WHEN IT COMES TO THE ADVOCACY OF VIOLENCE

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am struck by a terrible national epidemic that appears to have settled on the land. Significant numbers of right-wing thinkers, politicians,

and advocates appear to all have gone deaf in one ear.

Recently, we have heard many of the Republican leaders and conservatives denounce violence, the advocacy thereof. People have talked about movies and other forms of entertainment in speeches which advocate violence. Strangely, however, they only seem to hear one kind of violence. When Gordon Liddy talks about how to shoot Federal law enforcement officials, he gets an award from some of these people. When entertainers who have Republican leanings make movies in which large numbers of people are shot for no apparent reason, that is apparently good.

When people on the left say things that might be equally offensive to many of us, that draws condemnation. Obviously, those who believe in civil liberties, those who believe in free speech, believe in it no matter what the politics of those who say it, so when we have this one-sided effort to criticize people who advocate violence or do not preach family values, but it is only aimed at one side of the spectrum, I am forced to conclude that there is some mysterious ailment in the land which has ended the hearing in the right ear of many of my colleagues.

I hope that the National Institutes of Health, if there is any money left in its budget when the Republicans are through cutting taxes, raising defense, and cutting NIH, I hope they will look at this strange disease which makes it impossible for people to hear the advocacy of violence on the right and condemn it only when it comes from people they disagree with.

TAKING ISSUE WITH STATEMENT THAT U.S. SOLDIERS DIED IN SERVICE OF UNITED NATIONS

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, last year when American soldiers were killed over Iraq, the Vice President of the United States had the temerity to tell the widows and orphans of those men that "they died in the service of the United Nations." Mr. Speaker, I can't think of a more outrageous statement made by any American official in years.

American blood has been spilled on countless battlefields around the globe. Americans have died to protect their homes and families and to save the world from communism not for some faceless U.N. bureaucrat. I never read that Douglas MacArthur told the men at Inchon to hit the beach for the United Nations or that marines at Khe Sahn endured hell wearing blue helmets. America must never surrender its sovereignty to the one world fantasies of Mr. Boutros-Ghali and his acolytes in the White House.

Before Mr. Clinton marches into Bosnia for the United Nations, he should remember what Secretary of State John Quincy Adams said:

We are the friends of liberty everywhere, the guardians only of our own.

Mr. Speaker, I hope they read those words down at the White House before they tell another American family that its husband, father, son, or brother died in the service of the United Nations.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE
CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on Wednesday, May 31, 1995 at 3:30 p.m.: that the Senate agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1158.

With warm regards,
ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE
OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1995.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has been served with two subpoenas issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoenas is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,
SCOTT M. FAULKNER,
Chief Administrative Officer.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE U.S.
COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy the following Members of the House:

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. GEJDENSON of Connecticut.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

JUST THE BEGINNING OF THE
BUDGET PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 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 have just returned from recess, but prior to that we completed a part of a very long process. Most people do not realize it was merely the beginning. The budget and the appropriations process begins with the passage of the budget. The House of Representatives and the Senate have passed the budget, and they will soon reach agreement on that budget.

Most people do not realize the President has no veto power over the budget. That budget does forward without the President having a chance to veto it. He must react to the individual appropriations bills now that will be generated under the guidance of that budget.

In other words, the budget sets the overall ceiling for each one of the areas, and the Committee on Appropriations now can go forward to make expenditures, increasing some programs, decreasing some, eliminating some, putting in new programs. That is all up to the Committee on Appropriations.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think it is safe to say that we can expect, with this well-coordinated majority in power presently, that most of the recommendations made by the Committee on the Budget will probably be included in the appropriations process. The Committee on Appropriations will follow through on most of the recommendations. Therefore, we have a good idea of what the pattern is going to be in terms of the kind of expenditures that are going to be made by this Congress, or the kind of appropriations that are going to be proposed by this Congress.

Each one of the appropriations bills, however, can be vetoed by the President. The public should realize that, that the appropriations bills have to go to the President. Once the Senate and the House have acted and both have agreed in a conference on a bill, it goes to the President, and the President can

veto it. The public should understand that, that the budget process has just begun.

The Committee on the Budget sets the ceiling. The Committee on Appropriations follows through. The President can veto what each Committee on Appropriations sends to him. If the President vetoes an appropriations bill, it will then come back to the House and Senate, and the possibility of an override, Mr. Speaker, I would say is very slim.

I think there are enough people in the House to support the President, to prevent the overriding of a veto of the President. At this moment I am pretty sure there are. Of course, we lose some every day, but even with a few more causalities and a few more Benedict Arnolds deserting the Democratic Party and going over to the Republican Party, we still will have enough to prevent the override of a veto of an outrageous appropriations bill.

Most of these appropriation bills will be outrageous, because we know they will follow the pattern of the budget. We will have outrageous bills which propose to eliminate the Department of Education. No other industrialized nation in the civilized world thinks it can function without a department of education. At a time like this, when we are at a great disadvantage competitively if we do not have the most skilled population, the best educated population we can get, we are proposing to eliminate the Department of Education.

There are numerous other outrageous items in the budget proposals that will be followed through in the appropriations bills, and the President will have to veto them.

Once the House and Senate fail to override a veto, then what happens? I think we are on a course where, by the time we reach September 30, end of this budget year—September 30 ends this budget year—it becomes necessary to have continuing resolutions. If the Government is to continue functioning, we have to have passed continuing resolutions in order to keep the Government going forward at the same rate of expenditure that it had before. That is the critical point.

If there is deadlock or gridlock, deadlock, however we want to put it, between the President and the Republican-controlled Congress, then where do we go from there? Will the Government have to shut down, as it did for a couple of days under President Bush, because the Republican-controlled House refuses to pass a continuing resolution, or the Republican-controlled House and Senate together refuse to pass a continuing resolution? We will have a gridlock. We will have a set of negotiations which will go forward between the President and the Republican-controlled Congress.

I say all this because I think it is very important for the American people to understand that the budget process has just begun. It has begun, and