

BALANCING THE BUDGET FOR OUR CHILDREN AND GRANDCHILDREN

(Mrs. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, keeping promises is what it is all about, no more excuses, no more Washington gimmicks. It is time to do the right thing for America's future. Balancing the budget; that is what we have to do.

Just a few days ago we took an historic step by taking a vote to balance the budget. Unlike the past, when Americans were treated to empty promises and broken commitments, we are delivering.

A balanced budget is more than an accounting gimmick. It is about the future of my grandchildren and my colleagues' grandchildren, and it is about lower interest rates, it is about lower car loans, and it is about removing the crushing debt from our children and grandchildren.

Alan Greenspan said it best. He said, "Families' real incomes and purchasing power would be significantly improved; they would look forward to their children doing better than they," and that is what it is all about.

Mr. Speaker, when we balance the budget, we are securing the future of our children and grandchildren, and that is what families of America sent us here to do.

TAXPAYER-FUNDED POLITICAL ADVOCACY

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the latest effort to keep the Republican's promise to the American people to end business as usual in Washington. Specifically, I am referring to the Istook-McIntosh-Ehrlich amendment, which would put an end to taxpayer-subsidized lobbying. Currently, over \$39 billion is distributed to nearly 40,000 groups in the form of Federal grants. These funds are distributed under the guise of assisting charities. What these grants really amount to, however, is a taxpayer-funded subsidy to engage in political activity, otherwise known as welfare for lobbyists. Let me present an example of a politically active grantee and the amount that group receives.

The National Council of Senior Citizens receives nearly \$73 million—96 percent of its funds—from taxpayers. What do they do with that money? Well, let me quote from their latest progress report, issued January 1995, in which the National Council of Senior Citizens explicitly states that it "vigorously lobbies the Congress, public officials and other organizations engaged in legislative debate."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see this group, and all of the other groups who

exploit their status as nonprofit organizations, to use their grants for their intended purpose to help those in need. The National Council of Senior Citizens could do much more to assist seniors if they would devote all of their time and money walking the halls of nursing homes, rather than walking the Halls of Congress.

WE SHOULD NOT INTERFERE WITH DELICATE NEGOTIATIONS REGARDING PEACE IN BOSNIA TODAY

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today we will be taking up a resolution dealing with troops in Bosnia. This is highly premature and irresponsible, to be dealing with such a sensitive issue a day before the President is convening a session in Dayton, OH, among the warring parties in Bosnia to construct a peace agreement. We should not be dealing with this issue at a time when negotiations tomorrow will determine whether there will be a peace agreement or not.

Mr. Speaker, the administration deserves credit for coming forth with a peace plan that has brought a partition of this area that appears to be supported by the Serbs, by the Croatians, and by the Moslems. We should not interfere with this very sensitive process, and this legislation should be taken off the Calendar for today.

IT IS TIME FOR THE PRESIDENT TO SIGN A REAL BALANCED BUDGET

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is almost impossible to keep track of where Bill Clinton stands on balancing the budget.

In 1992, candidate Clinton said he would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget.

In his book "Putting People First," candidate Clinton said that the deficit could be cut in half in 4 years.

This year President Clinton has said that the budget could be balanced in 10 years, in 9 years, in 8 years, and, now, 7 years.

Everyone knows that Bill Clinton has been AWOL on the budget. He says one thing one day, another thing another day. Not even leaders in his own party can predict with any degree of accuracy what Bill Clinton will do or say.

Mr. Speaker, the time for excuses and double-talk are over. It is time for the President to show courage and leadership and sign a real balanced budget.

PUTTING GROUND FORCES INTO BOSNIA WOULD BE A WASTE OF AMERICAN LIVES

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

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish my friend from New Mexico was right because the House, as my colleagues know, has not scheduled a vote on Bosnia.

Mr. Speaker, a week and 1 day ago I was visiting the troops in what was Yugoslavia and what now is Macedonia. They expressed concern over the introduction of ground forces into Bosnia.

In addition to all the other reasons not to put ground forces into Bosnia, it seems that from about December 1 until April 1, from 10 o'clock at night until 6 in the morning, the fog is so bad that smart weapons do not work. So we are putting troops in harm's way with no clear-cut purpose where there are three serial killers, one who has killed 15, one who has killed 10, and one who has killed 5. That is a waste of American lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is our job to vote on this issue. Give this Congress the vote. Let us fulfill our constitutional responsibilities.

THE REPUBLICANS ARE DELIVERING ON THE PROMISES THEY MADE

(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, one of the definitive marks of the modern Republican Party is that we believe taxes are too high and that they should be cut. Since the beginning of this Congress, Republicans have put those beliefs into reality and soon they will become law.

For generations, public policy has been based on the premise that government could better redistribute wealth and resources in the economy. People who believed in free markets were written off as economic relics.

Well, the game is up and a generation of economic policy making has literally blown up in the faces of the liberals who created it. We have a massive, but ineffective government and a \$5 trillion national debt. The American people are demanding changes and Republicans are delivering on the promises we made last year to shrink the Federal Government, and, we will not back away from our promise to cut taxes for American families and small businesses.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBERS AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1745

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1745.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT TO UPDATE CLASSIFICATION OF CHILDREN IN U.S. IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 457) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to update references in the classification of children for purposes of U.S. immigration laws, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Texas if he would mind explaining the contents of the legislation briefly or lengthily.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, S. 457 amends the immigration laws to change the term "legitimate child" to a "child born in wedlock," as well as change the term "illegitimate child" to "a child born out of wedlock." This change in terminology does not provide a substantive change in the immigration laws. However, while technical, the change will help to facilitate the adoptions of foreign national children by American couples.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Continuing my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH] for explaining the content of the bill, and for a brief expansion of his remarks I want him to know, and our colleagues, as he would know, the history of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate had already passed something, actually had been in contact with us earlier on it, and that was the consequences then of what happened over in the Senate. We here in the House would have to go through a lengthier procedure in order to arrive at the same final tunnel, so we are simply acceding to the Senate version at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the measure we are here considering changes language dealing with children in the Immigration and Nationality Act and has enormous impact in the area of international child adoption. Passage of this legislation is one of those small but incredibly important successes in improving government for the citizens of the United States in which we

must take pride. Its effect will be felt nationwide.

As noted, S. 457, sponsored in the other body by our former House colleague, Senator Paul Simon of Illinois, is a carbon copy of a bill, H.R. 1204, which I sponsored here in the 104th Congress. The language of H.R. 1204 has been considered and approved in the House by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, chaired by Mr. LAMAR SMITH of Texas, and by the full Committee on the Judiciary, Chaired by Mr. HYDE of Illinois, as part of H.R. 2202, the "Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995" and is awaiting floor action. However, because the Senate acted first on their measure we are obliged to take up S. 457 as the most expeditious route to getting the measure signed into law by the President. This member has no pride of authorship problem, no concerns about credit. My main concern is that we make the changes embodied in the bill as quickly as possible so that families involved in international adoptions will have some relief from the problems they have heretofore encountered. Consideration of the House bill at this time would require referral back to the Senate, possibly adding months of required parliamentary action before achieving the language changes needed, months of unnecessary agony for the families and children we seek to help.

Let me explain to my colleagues in the House just what the language of S. 457/H.R. 1204 does. International adoption has become a very popular method for those individuals who must use the adoption route. However, for the thousands of Americans who pursue them every year (about 15 percent of total U.S. adoptions) international adoptions can be very complicated.

Current U.S. law regarding international adoptions is in a state of some confusion. Our law requires that a child be certified as an "orphan" in order to be eligible for adoption by an American and for an immigrant visa to the United States. This orphan certification can be accomplished in one of two ways: proof that both parents are dead or an irrevocable release for adoption and emigration by a "sole parent". Under U.S. law, a sole parent is defined as the mother of an "illegitimate child". But many countries have stopped using the term "illegitimate" and "legitimate" and instead use "born out of wedlock" and "born in wedlock". Since children born out of wedlock are regarded as legitimate in many countries, and under U.S. law a legitimate child is not eligible for orphan classification based solely on the mother's release (unless the father has died), a problem of definitions occurs which has ground to a halt international adoptions by U.S. families.

The simple solution to this problem is to substitute in the section of the INS Act that defines "child" for immigration purposes the terms "legitimate child" and "illegitimate child" with "child born in wedlock" and "child born out of wedlock". With this change, we can ensure that Americans will be able to proceed with international adoptions that meet the legal definitions of both the host country and the United States.

I have attached a May 31, 1995 letter from the Department of State and the Immigration and Naturalization Service—DOJ—which indicates their strong support for this change. And, in a June 8, 1995, letter to Ms. Mary Thomas, Romanian Children's Connection, Al-

exandria, Virginia, from Maura Harty, Managing Director, Office of Overseas Citizens Services, U.S. Department of State, Ms. Harty states.

As you may also know, the Department of State has included in its Consular efficiency legislation proposal of 1995 a request for an amendment to section 101(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act. This change will prevent U.S. citizens from being disadvantaged by the increasing worldwide trend to declare all children legitimate, regardless of whether born in or out of wedlock. We anticipate this change will relieve the problem at its source.

Additionally, the attached letter from Wendy R. Sherman, Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, to the Honorable Charles E. Grassley, United States Senator, illuminates further on the need for the changes made by S. 457/H.R. 1204 with specific mention that the amendment "should not adversely affect the rights of natural fathers."

Mr. Speaker, I commend the House of Representatives and the other body for its passage of this measure and encourage the President to quickly sign this correction into law.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC, May 31, 1995.

Hon. GEORGE W. GEKAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. GEKAS: We are pleased to learn of your sponsorship through House Bill 1204 of a "technical correction" to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA).

This bill would amend the INA by substituting "a child born out of wedlock" for current language which describes a child as "legitimate" or "illegitimate" under the Act. The substituted terminology will permit a foreign child released unequivocally for adoption to qualify for an immigrant visa.

We are writing to let you know that this legislation has the unqualified support of both the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of State. We hope that it is enacted in the very near future. Thank you for your assistance.

DORIS MEISSNER,
Commissioner Immigration and Naturalization Service,
Department of Justice.

MARY A. RYAN,
Assistant Secretary Bureau of Consular Affairs, Department of State.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY: You have asked whether legislative proposal S. 457 would adversely affect the rights of a foreign child's natural father in the context of an adoption. This proposal would amend Sections 101(b)(1) and (b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), 8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1) and (b)(2), by replacing the words "legitimate child" with "child born in wedlock" and "illegitimate child" with "child born out of wedlock."

INA Sections 101(b)(1) and (b)(2) define the terms "child" and "parent", thereby establishing the conditions that must be met in order for an individual to qualify for U.S. immigration benefits on the basis of a parent-child relationship with a U.S. citizen. Specifically, subsections 101(b)(1)(E) and (F) set