

[Mr. PALLONE] and the Congresswoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] for allowing me to take some time this evening for a personal explanation.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall votes 701 through 713, on Wednesday, October 11 and Thursday, October 12, 1995, I was unavoidably absent.

On rollcall vote 701, the Scott amendment to H.R. 2405, the Omnibus Civilian Science Authorization Act, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 702, the Jackson-Lee amendment, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 703, the Richardson substitute to the Roemer amendment, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 704, the Roemer amendment, I would have voted "no."

Rollcall vote 705 was a quorum call.

On rollcall vote 706, the Doyle substitute to the Walker amendment, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 707, the motion to recommit to conference committee H.R. 1976, the fiscal year 1996 agriculture appropriations, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 708, adoption of the agriculture appropriations conference report, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 709, the Lofgren amendment to the science authorization, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 710, the Kennedy amendment, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 711, the Brown amendment, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 712, the Brown substitute, I would have voted "yes."

On rollcall vote 713, final passage of the science authorization, I would have voted "no."

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for yielding to me.

□ 2000

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing these very vital points. It just caused me to think of an array of opportunity that we now have to really look at the budget that now can reflect on some new economic numbers, on the gross domestic product. It can reflect upon where we want to go in the 21st century.

Do we really want to cut research and development? Do we want to eliminate housing for people who are now getting on their feet, first-time owners, single parents with children who are getting to be homeowner? Do we want to take away a department, for example, I use that just as an example, even though we have brought down the number of Federal employees, that actually has created billions of dollars of new contracts with our world partners, that has created and would create jobs for our young people?

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman again for emphasizing those priorities that are now in that continuing resolution.

The last one that I wanted to mention, and the one she has already mentioned, is in regard to the environment. Again, the President reiterated that

one of the problems that he has with this Republican budget that was adopted today is that it cuts funding or assumes cuts in funding for environmental programs too much.

Perhaps the best example of that, again, which was alluded to by the gentlewoman, was this appropriations bill. We call it the VA, HUD and other independent agencies appropriations bill, which was supposed to come up today but was pulled from the floor, apparently because the Republican leadership does not have the votes. I want to say thank you for the fact that they do not have the votes because this is a very bad bill, particularly with regard to the Environmental Protection Agency.

What it does with regard to the EPA is essentially decrease EPA funding by about 20 percent. In that funding cut, amongst the money that has been cut, the hardest hit is enforcement, which is cut almost 25 percent.

I have said over and over again on the floor of this House, and will continue to say, what is the point of having good environmental laws if you do not have the money to hire people to go out and enforce those laws? It is like basically saying to the polluters, "It's OK, you can do whatever you want, because we're not going to come after you, we're never going to indict you or punish you for violating the law." That is essentially what this bill says.

It also makes particularly deep cuts in aid to the States for water pollution control. I find that particularly offensive because my district is largely along the Atlantic Ocean and also along the Raritan Bay and Raritan River, and we have benefited tremendously the last few years from Federal funding for upgrading our sewage treatment plants and for other provisions that make it easier for us to enforce our water quality standards.

As a result, in Jersey and particularly in my district the ocean water quality has improved, the bay has improved and the river has improved. That has meant a lot to us economically because we depend on tourism for a good part of our income.

Back in the late 1980's when I was first elected to the House of Representatives, we had our beaches closed for most of the summer because of the poor water quality. That has not happened again because the water quality has improved, and largely because of Federal dollars that went back to the States for water pollution control and also because of improvements in enforcement.

The last thing that this appropriation bill does that I want to mention, it does a lot of horrible things to the environment, but another one that is particularly important to my district and something that I care a lot about is the Superfund Program. It is a number of years ago now that the Federal Government established a Superfund Program, which is essentially what it

is, a Superfund, a large pot of money that is used to clean up the worst hazardous waste sites around the country in all 50 States.

This appropriations bill that gladly was pulled from the floor today, but I am sure is going to come back, it makes a 19-percent cut in funding for the Superfund Program. What that essentially means is that the only sites that will be cleaned up are the ones that are already on the Superfund list. In fact, it actually says that the EPA cannot add a new hazardous waste site to the national priorities list for clean-up unless the State's Governor requests it.

So basically what they are trying to do here, what the Republican leadership is trying to do, either through this appropriation bill or ultimately when they reauthorize the Superfund Program, is to basically say, "This is a closed shop. We're not going to establish any more Superfund sites," in an effort to try and save money.

That is not the way to go about handling a program which has been very important to many States, particularly in my home State of New Jersey, and it is also not a very rational or scientific way to proceed to simply say, "Well, if you didn't get on the list now, we're not going to put you on the list anymore because we don't have any more money to pay for cleanup."

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to conclude by saying I know that this budget bill passed today. It is a bad bill. The President is going to veto it. As the gentlewoman from Texas said, we hope that in the continuing resolution we establish the priorities, which are to preserve Medicare, to provide adequate funding for Medicaid, to provide enough funding so that we can have a good Student Loan Program and that we can protect the environment.

I am hopeful that after the President vetoes this bill, serious negotiation will take place to emphasize those priorities and not use this budget as a way to simply provide more money for wealthy Americans through tax breaks.

BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly great to be here today talking about what has been going on in this House in a truly historic time. This is the first time in a generation that the executive branch and the legislative branch have come together and decided that we were going to do what Americans have had to do for over 200 years, and, that is, balance our checkbook, to only spend as much money as we take in, and to stop stealing from our children and our grandchildren and future generations.

I think a lot of people have heard the numbers before. They have heard that this is a country that is now \$5 trillion in debt. We are a Government that spends \$4 for every \$3 that we take in, we are a Government that continues to steal from future generations and our children and grandchildren.

I have got a 7-year-old boy and a 4-year-old boy. Right now the debt that they are holding on their head is \$20,000. In fact, every man, woman, and child right now is \$20,000 in debt if we divide that \$5 trillion by the number of people that are in this country.

If you want to drive it home and figure out how much my 7-year-old boy Joey and my 4-year-old boy Andrew will be owing in taxes over the course of their lifetime if we continue down the same failed path that we continued down when the Democrats were in control for 40 years and if we followed the President's plan, my children and your children, your grandchildren would owe \$187,000 simply in interest on the Federal debt. That is money that they would be paying over the course of their lifetime, as their taxes continue to escalate.

We cannot say it enough, that today and this past week and over this past year we have drawn a line in the sand. We have ignored the polls. We have ignored the pundits. We have ignored everybody that said, "You can't do it. You can't balance the budget. Washington will not let you, the bureaucrats will not let you, the President will not let you."

In fact, it was 1 year ago that the President, the man who is on the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and who has been telling the American people for the last 2 weeks that he has always been for a balanced budget, it was that same President who 1 year ago introduced his budget, 1994 style, to the American people.

He introduced that budget that continued to allow deficits to skyrocket continually into the future. Ninety-nine Senators voted on that budget 1 year ago and all 99 Senators voted "no" on the President's plan.

I guess they are pretty smart over there in the other body. They followed the President once. The Democrats followed the President in this Chamber and in the Chamber over there when in 1993 the President introduced his blueprint of what he wanted America to look like.

Do you remember what that blueprint said? It said that President Clinton wanted to raise taxes, he wanted to raise spending, and he wanted to continue to let the deficit soar.

The fact of the matter is his 1993 plan raised taxes more than any other President in the history of this country. He claimed it was the largest deficit reduction plan of all time. The fact of the matter is that if you look at it through the life of it, deficits soared at the end, because he put off all the cuts until the very end.

Now he says, "Well, we've brought the deficit down some in the past few years."

Well, sure, if we wanted to tax Americans and continue to tax Americans and continue to tax Americans, we could bring the deficit down, too. Of course we would continue down the same failed path that we have continued down before and would continue to punish people for being productive, would continue to take their savings away from them, would continue to tax seniors.

This is a thing that has amazed me the most about the debate, that the President and Members from the liberal side could look with a straight face at the American people and say, "We want to protect senior citizens." Because the fact of the matter is that when they had their budget in 1993, when they had their chance to make a difference, what did they do? The first thing they did was they raised taxes on senior citizens. How much? Well, they made senior citizens pay taxes on 85 percent of their Social Security benefits. But that was not enough. Nosiree, Bob. They decided that if you are a senior citizen and you actually want to be productive with your life after you start drawing Social Security benefits, well, productivity is something that liberals cannot put up with, so we are going to have to tax you.

They lowered the earnings limit from \$34,000 to \$11,000, basically told senior citizens if you work, we are going to punish you.

So let us fast forward. That is 1993. If they wanted to raise taxes on seniors, I guess that was their business. They paid for it. Not a single Republican in 1993 voted for the largest tax increase in the history of the world, Bill Clinton's tax increase, and the Democrats' tax increase, not one Republican voted for it and we saw what happened last year. The Republicans said,

Elect us and we're going to lower your taxes and we're going to balance the budget, we're going to save future generations from the debt that is now crushing us.

We did that. We got rewarded for it. There was an unprecedented landslide. I refuse to believe, despite what the President says, despite what the Democrats say, I refuse to believe that Americans now are against a balanced budget, or that Americans now believe, 1 year later, that they are not being taxed enough, or that 1 year later Americans believe that they are not being regulated enough.

But if you get past the rhetoric and you look at what the President has done and what liberal Democrats in this Chamber have done, they have continued to espouse higher taxes, more regulations, and a balanced budget is nowhere in sight. I know it has got to be confusing to some who do not live in Washington and are lucky enough to live outside the Beltway, but the fact of the matter is that the President has changed his mind so much on

the balanced budget that it is hard to keep track.

Back in 1992, he promised he would balance the budget in 5 years. By my count, he has another year or two. Well, that changed very, very quickly. We all remember the horror that Americans watched as they watched the President tell us that, yes, he had promised a balanced budget plan, and, yes, he had promised a middle-class tax cut. In fact, we remember him in New Hampshire holding up the plan when people ridiculed him. He said, "You laugh at me but I've got the plan right here."

But then we watched when Governor Clinton got elected and became President Clinton. What was the first thing he did? He got on the airwaves and said,

Well, I know what I said in the campaign, I know, I know, but, listen, we've been looking at the numbers and we're not going to be able to give you the middle-class tax cut.

It gets worse. "We're going to have to raise your taxes." It gets worse. "We're going to have to pass the largest tax increase in the history of this country."

Well, obviously Americans were upset. He paid for it in the polls, he paid for it by renegeing on his promise to balance the budget in 5 years and in the off-year election, the Republicans and conservatives were swept into power across this country.

How did the President respond?

□ 2015

He was in the denial stage, and he denied that Americans really wanted a balanced budget, that it was not a priority.

He introduced a budget plan that did not balance the budget. Then he moved forward and later on he came in an he said, "Well, maybe we can balance the budget. Maybe we can balance it in 10 years." In fact, he went up to New Hampshire, which was coincidentally the site of the first primary, and somebody told him that he needed to support a balanced budget. So he said, "I support a balanced budget."

Then he came back to Washington. His advisers got a hold of him. We said, "No; no, no; maybe I do not support a balanced budget." Then he went back up to New Hampshire. They said, "Mr. President, do you support a balanced?" He said, "Yes, we can balance the budget." Then he came back down to DC, changed his mind. "No, we can't."

Finally he put out a plan that he says will balance the budget in 10 years. Unfortunately, it was about \$200 billion short. We run deficits of \$200 billion well into the future. The plan did not balance the budget.

House Democrats were enraged, enraged that the President of the United States would actually dare to put forward a plan to balance the budget. The ranking member of Appropriations got on the floor, and like many others, was very up upset. What did he say? He said, "We are upset about the fact that

the President proposed to balance the budget." But what we found is if you do not like the President's position on any issue, just be patient, wait a couple weeks, it is sure to change, and sure enough, 2 weeks later it changed again, and he went from 10 years, saying we can do it in 7 years. Then he went to 9 years and 8 years and it was sort of hard to nail down the President exactly on what number he thought.

Finally, the House Republicans said we demand a balanced budget in 7 years using true numbers, that too much is at stake, and we did that.

Now they are starting to try to weasel out of it again and are now saying, "Well, I know we have said that we will commit to 7 years, but it is 7, maybe 8 years."

Well, we are sending a message to the Democrats, to the President on the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue and to all Americans, the freshman class of the 104th Congress will not compromise. We will balance the budget in 7 years using true figures or we will not go along with any plan. It is that simple. It is that simple.

Why do we need to do it? We need to do it to ensure future generations have unprecedented economic growth. We need to do it to stop driving up the deficits, and we need to do it to save, protect, and preserve Medicare.

I have got to tell you I am new to Washington. I have never been elected to office before this year. I have got to tell you one of the most shocking things to me has been the demagoguery that has flown around on this issue of Medicare. The President came out himself in April of this year saying that Medicare was going bankrupt. The trustees reported that. Three members of his own Cabinet are on the Medicare trustees. They said Medicare is going bankrupt. If you do not do something about it, you are going to pay because the system is going to go bankrupt in the year 2002.

Well, we sent a CR to the President that reflected our plan to save, protect, and preserve Medicare, and the President got on the TV and said he could not sign that CR, that he was going to veto it and, he was going to send all the Federal employees out, that he could not have Medicare destroyed like this, it was unbelievable, these mean-spirited Republicans, and the press bought into it. And judging by some of the polls, a lot of Americans bought into it.

But here is the catch: Our plan was almost identical to the very same plan that President Clinton had been supporting for some time. I mean, can you believe that; look at the news footage of him this past week and last week. You would think that this man had a plan that was radically different from the Republican plan and that the Republicans were mean-spirited and that only Bill Clinton could protect and preserve Medicare and he had to save the senior citizens from the mean-spirited Republicans.

But the unpleasant fact, in fact, they are difficult things to get around, but the facts show our Medicare plan is almost identical to the President's Medicare plan.

Let me tell you something, there is a Washington Post editorial that was written last week on this issue, and the editorial reads at the top, "The real default." Now, the Washington Post has never been an ally of the conservative movement or the Republican Party. But let me tell you something, this, I believe, is probably the most important editorial that has been written by any publication in the past 5 years, because it was after this editorial was written that the White House was finally shamed into backing off from their unabashed demagoguery.

Let me read a little bit to you:

Bill Clinton and the congressional Democrats were handed an unusual chance this year to deal constructively with the effect of Medicare on the deficit, and they blew it. The chance came in the form of the congressional Republican plan to balance the budget over seven years. Some other aspects of that plan deserved to be resisted, but the Republican proposal to get at the deficit partly by confronting the cost of Medicare deserved support. The Democrats, led by the president, chose instead to present themselves as Medicare's great protectors. They have shamelessly used the issue, demagogued on it, because they think that's where the votes are and the way to derail the Republican proposals generally. The president was still doing it this week; a Republican proposal to increase Medicare premiums was one of the reasons he alleged for the veto that has shut down the government—and never mind that he himself, in his own budget, would countenance a similar increase.

This is still the Washington Post talking:

We've said some of this before; it gets more serious. If the Democrats play the Medicare card and win, they will have set back for years, for the worst of political reasons, the very cause of rational government in behalf of which they profess to be behaving. Politically, they will have helped to lock in place the enormous financial pressure that they themselves are first to deplore on so many other federal programs, not least the programs for the poor.

You see, getting Medicare increases under control is not about protecting the rich. The Post has come out before saying the Medicare cuts have no correlation to the tax cuts, that we are saving Medicare, and in saving Medicare we are saving the system. We are making it solvent. It is about helping all Americans, helping get this debt out of the way and the deficit out of the way.

But some people still want to default on leadership, and in the Washington Post article yesterday, written by Matthew Miller, the Post wrote:

Though many of the President's advisers think that the G.O.P.'s premium proposal is sensible and differs very little from his own plan, the President fired sound bites from the oval office daily, taking the low road in ways that only Washington pundits could recast as standing tall.

As the polls show, it worked. The fact of the matter is it worked in the short run.

Many, when asked in this body, many had been asked when is this shutdown going to end, and many were cynical and said, well, it ends when the President's poll numbers start going down. It is not a coincidence that it was late Friday night that the President's approval ratings in this crisis had gone down six points, the next morning Leon Panetta marched on Capitol Hill and actually sat down and started negotiating seriously.

I have got to tell you I have been deeply dismayed by this whole process, deeply dismayed not only by the administration's comments but by what Leon Panetta said. He, of course, said Republicans were terrorists. He said we were holding a gun to the President's head, because we simply insisted that he balance the budget in 7 years.

The fact of the matter is Leon Panetta, time after time after time after time, attached things to the continuing resolutions in the 1980's when he was dealing with a Republican administration. He was not called on it. But that is fine. Then we hear him talking CBO numbers and saying that we should have OMB numbers.

Well, it was President Clinton himself who, in 1993, stood right here in this Chamber and told the American people the CBO estimates were the most accurate estimates and we must adhere to CBO estimates so the American people do not think we are playing games.

Well, we listened to the President. We want to adhere to CBO estimates because they are the most conservative, but as conservative as those CBO estimates are, one important fact remains. When the President, in 1993, stood in this Chamber and said we needed to go by CBO estimates because they were the most conservative estimates, those estimates in 1993 had been overly optimistic for 13 years in a row, which meant the deficit continued to shoot up for 13 years in a row.

We have got to be conservative with our children's and our grandchildren's money. We have got to stop stealing from future generations. We have got to balance the checkbook and stop worrying about short-term political gains. My children's futures depend on it. All of America's children's future depends on it. We have to draw a line in the sand. That is what we have done, and that is why the President finally sat down and adhered to absolutely every demand that we asked and do it here, too.

I would like to turn now and have a good friend of mine, the gentleman from the State of Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] discuss the issue.

Were you not surprised at the turn we saw of the President this past week, how he was at 10 years, we were at 7 years, he wanted OMB numbers, we wanted CBO numbers; he came and compromised. Sure, he compromised with the freshman class. He wanted to balance the budget in 5 years. Now he has come in and said he will balance the

budget in 7 years using CBO numbers, despite what the administration has been saying today. That is what they are committing to. Is that your understanding?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to talk a little bit about this, as both being Members of this freshman class, we have been called extremists, heretics, all kinds of names like that. I do think the American people sent a very clear message a year ago. I think they expect us to fulfill the promises we made.

As you know, if I could, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH], I would like to read a letter that the gentleman helped me draft, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH], and signed by virtually every Member of our freshman class, that we sent down to the White House last week. I think it sort of frames the issue from our perspective and how much impact this ultimately had on the President's decision over the weekend to get serious about negotiating. We do not know. But, hopefully, it had some impact.

If I could, I would like to read at least some excerpts from it.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Some are holding us Freshmen Members of the Republican House Caucus responsible for the actions of the last several days. Permit us to share our perspective on this important issue.

It is unfortunate that 800,000 non-essential federal employees were furloughed. But we believe very strongly that it would be a tragedy of historic proportions if we were to back down now on our commitment to balance the federal budget in seven years. Twelve months ago, the voters of this nation sent a powerful message that we needed to change the way Washington does business. They wanted to put the federal government on a diet, and they wanted us to balance their budget.

There is a misguided belief that the current debate surrounding the balanced budget issue is about politics. Balancing the federal budget, Mr. President, is about principle. This is not about the re-election of the Freshmen Class, it's about preserving the future of our country. In fact, we believe it goes deeper than that. What is at stake here is preserving the basic concept of self-government. If we cannot balance our budget when we are the sole surviving super-power, when we're at peace in the world, when we have a relatively strong economy with low unemployment, then when will we?

We want to resolve this. The American people want us to work together. We have been granted an historic opportunity. Our children would not hold us harmless if we squandered it. This is a moment of truth. This is when "We The People" show whether we have the courage and moral character to stop stealing from our children and grandchildren. Future generations are counting on us to show some leadership and courage. Let us agree on the destination. We can then have a healthy debate about the road map.

It was signed by virtually every member of our freshman class.

□ 2030

We sent that down to the White House Friday because we wanted to send a message that this is not about politics, it is about principle, and it is

about the future of this country and whether or not we have the moral courage and character to do what we all know is right. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] said it. Most of us thought we ought to balance the budget in 5 years or less, and we believed it could be done if we were willing to make some really rough choices. In fact, some might argue that our budget we are proposing today is actually too generous.

But I would also like to read this, because there has been some distortion already today, and, in fact, it started as early as last night, and I was somewhat disappointed in the news conferences at some of the comments made by Mr. Panetta and the President and others about what they duly agreed to. At some point the American people, and, if you would like an extra copy, they can call my office in Washington, drop me a note in care of the Cannon Office Building, I will send them out a copy of exactly what the President and the leaders of the congressional delegation agreed. Too, if I could, I would just like to read this. It is just a paragraph and a half long.

It says:

The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office and the President, and the President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans, and the environment. Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to stimulate future economic growth and to help working families.

Now, that is essentially, in fact, that is word for word, what was agreed to between the House, the Senate, and the President. It says no later than 2002. That means in not more than 7 years.

But no sooner had the ink dried on the paper that it was agreed to on, than already the White House was saying "Well, we did not quite really mean 7 years." I think that is what is frustrating to the Members of the Congress, I think it is what is frustrating to members of the public.

I think the interesting point, there is a story told about Yogi Berra. He has become one of my favorite philosophers. One night Yogi went out by himself to have pizza. He ordered a small pizza. The waitress said, "Do you want that cut into 8 slices or 6?" Yogi said, "Well, I'm not that hungry tonight; just cut it in 6. I do not think I can eat 8 pieces."

That is sort of what the argument is we have been having about the budget lately, because we have not agreed to how big the pizza is going to be. Now we can have the debate, about how much is going to go to the environment, how much is going to go to national defense, how much is going to go to transportation, how much we will spend on welfare, how much we will

spend on Medicaid and other entitlements. At least we finally have agreed on the size of the pizza. How many slices and exactly the way it is sliced, I guess, is not as important to us as the fact we have agreed. We have agreed on a destination. Now let us have a healthy argument about the road map.

Let me say this. Two points need to be made. First of all, as far as we are concerned, this is like the Contract With America that we signed last year. The agreement that was reached last night is a contract with the American people, and we take it very seriously, and we hope the White House will take it very seriously.

Second, and this is even more important, it is now incumbent upon the President and this administration to come forward with a budget plan that they like. Now, they spent the last 6 or 8 weeks telling everybody about the things in our plan they do not like. That is fair enough. That is part of the democratic process. They have every right to criticize some of the things they do not like in our budget plan.

But now it is their responsibility to put their plan on the table. I think we in the Congress and the American people have every right and expect and should demand that they put a plan on the table.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. If the gentleman will yield for 1 minute, I think this is an important point and important distinction. I have heard many say the Democrats do not have the responsibility. The Republicans were elected, they are in charge of the House. The Democrats do not have responsibility to put a plan on the table to save Medicare, which they have not done in the House, or to put forward a budget plan that balances the budget, which the majority of the Members have not done.

But it is important to remember that in 1993, when the Republican Party was in its 39th year in the wilderness, that the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, the same JOHN KASICH who has forever changed Washington, DC, through his leadership on the Committee on the Budget, putting together the first balanced budget in this generation, JOHN KASICH came up with a plan. He had a plan, and the Republicans all supported that plan.

That is extremely important. This year, the Democratic leadership has failed to put forward a plan. All they are doing is complaining, saying what we are doing wrong. But if you look at the minority leader and the whip and everybody in the minority, they voted against every single balanced budget plan. I have to tell you, they have had about six chances this year to vote for a balanced budget.

They voted against a balanced budget, whether it is a Republican balanced budget; they voted against a balanced budget, whether it was a coalition balanced budget plan the conservative Democrats put together. They voted against every budget.

So when I hear them get on the floor or get into press conferences and say "Yes, we support a balanced budget, but this one is mean-spirited," I am sorry, those words just do not ring true to me.

Introduce your balanced budget plan, and then you have a right to get involved with this debate. But if you do not introduce your own plan, if you do not have the nerve, if you do not have the guts, if you do not have the political will to show Americans what your vision of America is and how you want to balance the budget and save the next generation, then just be quiet and sit on the bench. I will yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, that is what has really troubled so many Americans for so long. They have seen a lack of courage and will power in the Congress to actually follow through. It is what I call the "yes, buts". In fact, Representative CHRIS SHAYS the other day said it so clearly, I think, on the House floor here. He said you know, everybody gets up and says we want a balanced budget. Everybody wants a balanced budget. But he said if that were true, we would have a balanced budget. Everybody says yes, I want a balanced budget, but. Yes, but. That is what gets the American people so frustrated.

I have to congratulate Chairman ARCHER of the Committee on Ways and Means as well. He went down the other day and said our plan is not perfect. I do not think anybody on this side of the aisle would argue it is perfect. But there is one thing about our plan that nobody else can say about their plan, because they do not have a plan, but at least we have a plan, and it will work according to CBO scoring.

CBO, as the gentleman says, has been the most conservative over the years. Frankly, I think perhaps too conservative, but I would rather err on the side of conservative when you are talking about balancing the budget and trying to save the future generations of Americans from a debt which is actually going to come crashing down around them.

The gentleman talked earlier about polls. Sometimes we here in Washington get too much influenced by polls. The gentleman talked about one of my favorite newspapers, the Washington Post, which he indicated is not exactly a Republican propaganda organ. Many times in fact so many of those on this side of the aisle take what they say with a grain of salt.

I would like to remind you of a poll done a couple of weeks ago by the Washington Post. Here is what they asked. It was October 30, 1995; that was a little over 2 weeks ago. They asked, "Whom do you trust to do a better job with the main problems facing this Nation over the next few years?" And they said, Republicans, 47 percent; Democrats, 39 percent.

Now, when we took over this House, if I remember correctly, on that same

test ballot question the day before the election, the score was Republicans, 44; Democrats, 41. We only had a 3 percent advantage a year ago, and we picked up 73 seats.

Even more telling, it seems to me, they went on to ask a somewhat different question, but along the same lines; they asked, "Which party better represents your views on national issues?" And this is according to the Washington Post poll taken about 2½ weeks ago. Republicans, 55 percent; Democrats, 25 percent.

I do not know how your phone messages were over the last week during the furlough of Federal employees, but mine were overwhelming. One day we received something like 270 calls saying hang in there, continue back up, do not blink. We had 27 calls which said cave in to the President. I think that is pretty reflective of where the American people were, and I think the American people were well served by our negotiators, because JOHN KASICH and our Speaker and other leaders did not blink.

As a result, we are going to have a balanced budget agreement. We now have a contract with this President, and a contract with the American people, that we are going to do what we said we are going to do. We are actually going to balance this budget.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I appreciate that. I have got to tell the gentleman something. One of the reasons I believe why twice as many people are now saying the Republican Party reflects their views more than the Democratic Party is because the Democratic leadership, at least in this House, has had a total void. They have not told us what they believe in.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield on that point, this is a critical point. They did offer a Medicare alternative. I think it only got about 100 votes. Not even their leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, voted for their plan. On their alternate budget, not even their leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, voted for their plan.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. He did not vote for either plan. I do not believe the whip from Michigan voted for the plan. Yet they will stand there self-righteously and say they support the balanced budget and want to save Medicare. Yet they voted against every plan that will do that.

Let me show you this chart, because this is an important chart. It shows that so many Americans have not realized because of what the President has been saying for the past few weeks. The Washington Post, and again I am quoting from them, this is not a Republican, this is what the Post says, it says:

The Democrats and the President have shamelessly demagogued the Medicare issue despite the fact that our plans are so similar.

This is the Medicare part B premiums over the next 7 years, and as we can see, as you go out 7 years to the year 2002, the Republican and the Democrat premium are the same. Look at

this. You have got \$83 and \$87. There is only a \$4 difference. That is why the Washington Post said that the President shamelessly demagogued on the Medicare issue.

But it is not just Medicare that they are trying to scare Americans on. In my district, we have about as many veterans as any other district in the country. Our area has a long, proud military history, with a lot of veterans. Let me tell you, they are so important to this country.

But if you remember, Secretary Brown has actually started sending out political messages on the pay stubs, saying that the Republican plan for future veterans benefits was going to savage VA benefits and that it was more mean-spirited than the President's plan.

The fact of the matter is, when he came to Capitol Hill under sworn testimony, he had radically different testimony.

This is what he was asked. This is Secretary Brown from the Department of Veterans Affairs. When asked about Mr. SIMPSON's assertion that veterans would suffer more under the Clinton administration's proposed budget than other congressional plans, Mr. Brown said, "He's absolutely right." That is November 8, 1995.

Now, let me tell you, I understand in the Department of HHS and in other areas, I understand that sometimes we are going to have political differences. But we are talking about veterans. We are talking about going out there and scaring the men and women who fought to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States.

This is just an extension of the medicare attack that the Democrats had. We have seen it in Medicare, we have seen it in Veterans Affairs, where they say whatever they want to say, just to scarce people and pick up votes, according to the Washington Post.

Now we are hearing if, and, again, here is a Washington Post quote from November 15, 1995:

The Democrats have been prospecting harder for votes among the elderly and against the Republican proposal than they have for the savings needed to bring down the deficit.

They have done it in education. I heard the last speaker get up here talking about all the mean-spirited cuts that we were going to have in student loans. I do not support cuts in students loans. Just because I do not want to turn over all the power to the Federal bureaucracy, which is what they are proposing, does not mean I am against student loans.

The fact of the matter is, under our plan this year, we spend \$24.5 billion on student loans. Over our 7-year plan, that doubles or actually goes up 50 percent to \$36.4 billion. I did not go to Oxford, I am not a Rhodes Scholar, I am just a dumb country lawyer, as they love saying in my part of the country, but the fact of the matter is even where I went to school, if you go from

\$24 billion to \$36 billion, that is an increase.

Also, when I have somebody standing up here with a straight face telling me that direct student lending, where you have a consolidation of power in Washington, DC, is going to be more efficient than allowing the private sector to handle it and to stay involved in it, goes against history. It goes against 40 years of history.

So, if we are increasing student loans by 50 percent, which we are, those are the straight numbers under the budget proposal, then how can that be a cut? The earned income tax credit goes from \$19 billion in 1995 to \$25 billion through the end of our program. School lunch program goes from \$6.3 billion to \$7.8 billion; student loans again, from \$24 billion to \$36 billion; Medicaid spending from \$89 billion to \$127 billion; and Medicare spending from \$178 billion to \$289 billion.

□ 2045

So let us talk about new math, real math, and not Washington math, where a spending increase is called a spending cut.

I yield back to the gentleman.

M. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, a long time ago, one of our founding fathers who served in this body, John Adams, said facts are stubborn things. It is one of my favorite expressions, and I really do believe, as we debate this budget, facts are our friends. I think if we can get the facts to the American people, and again anyone who would like a copy of what Representative SCARBOROUGH has just talked about, where earned income tax credit goes from \$19.8 billion this year to \$25.4 billion in the year 2002; school lunches, where we are making these draconian cuts, actually increases from \$6.3 billion to \$7.8 billion; student loans, again we have been criticized for these big cuts in student loans, we are spending \$24.5 billion this year and we will go to \$36.5 billion in only 7 years; Medicaid, again where people are going to be thrown out of hospitals, Medicaid spending this year \$89.2 billion will go to \$127.3 billion in only 7 years; and, finally, Medicare, where they are using the greatest mediascare tactics, goes from \$178 billion to almost \$290 billion.

If people will get the facts, I think facts are our friends, and even when we talk about these tax cuts for the rich. I must tell the gentleman, and I do not know if I should share this story. Obviously, I will not use his name, but I had a gentleman talk to me the other day, and by all accounts he is rich. He told me last year he earned \$325,000. He will earn about the same amount next year. So he went to his accountant and had the blueprint of the Republican tax plan and he had his accountant go through his taxes and asked him how much of a tax cut will I get next year? Does the gentleman know what the answer was? Zero. Zip. Nada. Nothing.

He will get no tax cut. His kids are grown. He has no capital gains. This is

all dividend income and other income that he has, so he gets no tax cut. So this idea that all rich people will get huge tax cuts is just bogus. Most of the tax benefit will go to those families earning less than \$75,000 a year. And the trouble is, many of our friends and colleagues here in Congress know that to be a fact and yet they will not acknowledge it.

I yield back and perhaps we can pursue a conclusion after we yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I appreciate that. We certainly will, and it is my honor to yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island, who also has a seat with me on the Committee on National Security, and we can work together as a body, Republicans and Democrats alike. He is going to be speaking on something different from what we have been talking about, but something very important and timely today.

I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ATROCITIES
COMMITTED IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Congressman SCARBOROUGH from Florida, for yielding me this time.

Fifty years ago today the Nuremberg trials began. On November 20, 1945, the leaders of Nazi Germany were placed on trial for committing crimes against humanity. The horror of the Holocaust was exposed and the world hoped that it would never ever see such systematic evil perpetrated again.

No one can begin to even compare any evil to that kind of systematic evil perpetrated during the Holocaust, but evil is evil. Tragically, history has proven this optimism wrong. As we all know, the Balkans have been the site of the most recent war crimes in Europe since the end of World War II. As Nuremberg proved, there can be no place for those who commit or order or condone such acts. There can be no tolerance for those who offer refuge for those responsible for such acts.

Recognizing the danger of silence in the face of such tragedy, the United Nations established an international criminal tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. Today I am introducing a resolution condemning the atrocities committed in the former Yugoslavia and expressing the support of this Congress for this war crimes tribunal.

The resolution affirms the following principles:

First, those indicated by the tribunal cannot occupy any position of authority in any government or any entity in the republics of the former Yugoslavia;

Second, that the United States should insist upon the full cooperation of the republics of the former Yugoslavia in bringing those who have been indicted by this war crimes tribunal to justice;

Third, future support for the reintegration of the republics of the former Yugoslavia into the international community should be depend-

ent on their full cooperation and support for this international war crimes tribunal;

Fourth, investigators for their tribunal should be given full access to all the sites, to all the witnesses, and to all the evidence of alleged and suspected war crimes; and

Fifth, the United States should oppose amnesty for any indicated war criminals.

On this, the anniversary, the world hopes for peace in the Balkans, but it is the responsibility of the Congress to say unequivocally that there will be no peace without justice. This century has been marked by many tragedies. If the next century is to be free of such horrors, the responsibility falls on us to lay the foundation today. We cannot erase what has happened, but we can and we must do all that we can to prevent such a recurrence from ever occurring again.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring this resolution, and I thank, once again, my colleague from the State of Florida, JOE SCARBOROUGH, for allowing me this time.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I thank the gentleman from Rhode Island, and I also thank him for his leadership on the National Security Committee, and certainly I have been with him when he has asked some very tough questions to our policy leaders and questioned those who would simply say that we would put Americans in harms's way simply to protect our standing in NATO.

I think we have to have a more hard-nosed approach than simply worry about how we are going to look at NATO, and have to ask what America's role is and what America's vital interest is in that conflict.

Certainly there have been horrors. I saw a picture of a 7-year-old who was blown off his bike by a Serbian mortar shell, and the ABC cameras followed him and he was crying to his parents, "Please don't cut off my leg; please don't cut off my leg." And the news reporter said they did not cut off his leg. But, unfortunately, the young boy died a few hours later.

The horrors are absolutely indefensible, and I would gladly sign on to your resolution, and I thank you for bringing that up. Congress has made some controversial decisions on the Bosnian conflict over the past week or two, but that is certainly something I would hope all Republicans and Democrats alike could come together.

I yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Well, Mr. Speaker, we were talking about balancing the budget, and I think sometimes we have been characterized in the national media as mean spirited and that we are draconian and that this is simply an accounting exercise. But I think sometimes we need to step back and understand that there are going to be enormous benefits to the average American family if we are able to finally, at last, balance the Federal books.

A study was done by DRI McGraw Hill that essentially says that if, and this is pursuant to what Alan Greenspan had said, that if we actually could balance the Federal budget for the first time in over 30 years, it was his opinion that real interest rates would drop by at least 2 percent and that economic growth would be at least 1½ points stronger.

I think people need to understand what that means to the average family in terms of if real interest rates really do continue to come down, as they are now coming down. As a matter of fact, I think just with what we have been doing, and the belief now in the financial markets that we are finally serious, Congress is serious about putting the Federal Government on a diet and limiting the growth of entitlements, we are already seeing the benefits of that.

What this will mean to an average family is, the average cost of a mortgage would drop by \$121 a month. The average student loan repayment would drop by \$4 a month. A car loan would be \$9 a month cheaper. The child tax credit, the economic growth advantages all add up to an increase to the average family of at least \$192 a month.

That may not seem like much to some folks, but to the average family trying to get by on \$30,000 a year, it works out to \$2,300. What we are really talking about is allowing them to keep more of their own money so they can invest and save, and they can be responsible for themselves.

There are enormous benefits if we can simply, for the first time, have the moral courage to say no to some of those interest groups, to limit the growth of entitlements, to actually downsize the Federal Government. We will have eliminated, at least on the House side, over 300 programs. We hope many of those cuts will survive.

There are huge benefits and sometimes those do not get talked about enough. And I would yield back to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. I do not know if the gentleman was with us when we had some of the top investment minds in this country from Wall Street come down and talk to our conference, but what did they tell us? They told us, go ahead. If you have to draw a line in the sand and shut down the Federal Government to make a point to force a balanced budget, go ahead and do that. They said Secretary Rubin is telling you that it will cause financial chaos, but that is not the case.

They told us what will cause financial chaos is if you continue to allow deficits to soar over the next 40 years the way we have allowed them to soar over the past 40 years. It will cause an incredible destructive result on Wall Street and in financial markets around the world.

And, sure enough, did you notice that during the Government shutdown that was supposed to cause such conflict that the stock market reached an all-

time high and that every indicator was positive?

When we talk to the leading traders on Wall Street, what do they say? They say the reason why is because the Congress has finally showed that they are ready to put their house in order. They have finally shown that they are going to stop stealing from future generations and start doing what Americans have had to do for 200 years and balance their checkbook.

They said, please, hold the line. Your message will get out. And at that time we were upset about getting bashed on Medicare. They said, sure, right now there may be short-term political gain for the other side for attacking you for daring to save Medicare, but on Wall Street and in my business, they said if you raise spending by 45 percent, that is not a cut. And they got the numbers out, got the calculators out, and, sure enough, a 45 percent increase in Medicare is exactly what we are proposing.

More importantly than that, it is a moral issue. More important than that, if we look at what we have done since we have been elected, we have caused interest rates to go down 2 percent because we vowed, elect us, send us to Congress, we will keep our word, we will balance this budget, we will save future generations. And they said to us, these Wall Street traders, the top Wall Street minds said to us, give yourself a pat on the back. You are responsible for the interest rates dropping 2 percent because you finally have gotten serious about balancing the budget. You have finally dared to make a difference. You have finally stood up to special interests. You have finally stood up to bureaucrats. You have finally said good riddance to the tax-and-spend policies that have destroyed this country for the past 40 years.

I think, more importantly, and I cannot say it enough, it is not merely an economic issue. We could be the richest country in the world, but if we failed to be decent, we would be a failure. We have heard the quote before, America is great because America is good. And when America ceases to be good, then it will cease being great. And what is great about stealing money from the future generations?

I do not care how people want to gloss over the fact, when we spend money that we do not have, when we are \$5 trillion in debt, when the Japanese and the Germans and people on Wall Street are holding these bonds, who is going to pay those bonds off, if not us?

□ 2100

If not us, it will be my 7-year-old, Joey, my 4-year-old, Andrew. It is going to be your children. It is going to be grandchildren of those people that watch the House every day. It is going to be future generations.

For all the talk about how mean spirited we are, it seems to me that we have offered the only compassionate plan to save future generations from

the mean spiritedness of the liberal/socialists that have been running this institution for too long and putting forward tax-and-spend proposals that steal from your children and my children and their children.

This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is about having the discipline and the decency to finally balance the budget and allow our children to have a better future than we even had. That is what it is all about: For Americans to make sure that we can ensure that when we pass the torch to the next generation, that that generation will be assured that they will have the opportunities that we had.

That is not good enough. We want them to have a better life and more opportunities that we ever had. That is what every parent wants. That is what and that is why I am so proud to be part of an institution with Republicans and Democrats alike that this past week stood up, drew a line in the sand and said, "Enough is enough. We are going to get our financial House in order."

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield, I would say one of my favorite heroes in world history was Winston Churchill. My wife needle-pointed for me one of my favorite quotes from Winston Churchill, which I have in my office. It says, "Success is never permanent. Failure is seldom fatal. The only thing that really counts is courage."

The thing that I feel proud about, what has happened in this Congress in the last 11 months, and particularly in this past week, we finally demonstrated some courage. I do not know if the American people have responded to that or whether they ever will. But you said this is really a moral issue. This is an un-American issue.

If we look historically, the people who started throwing tea in Boston Harbor, who started this great revolution that started this great American experiment in self-government, the reason, partly, they did that was because they did not believe in taxation without representation.

If we get down to the nub of it, when we talk about borrowing from future generations the way we have for so many years in this Government, it is taxation without representation, because we are taxing people who cannot even vote yet and it is morally wrong. We know it is wrong.

I live in the Midwest and we have an awful lot of farmers in the Midwest. Most of us are no more than one or two generations removed from the farm, and farmers know this. Most farmers, what they want to do is pay off the mortgage and leave their kids the farm. But if we look at it from a societal standpoint, what our previous Congresses have been doing in Washington is they have been selling the farm and leaving the kids the mortgage. I think all Americans know in their bones that it is wrong.

I hope that all Americans will begin to realize that those days are over and

we have begun to change the paradigm and we are going to make this Government do what they have to do every single week and every month, and that is live within their means. That is the American thing to do and the morally right thing to do.

I am proud to be a part of this Congress and part of the group of freshmen, and if we take the credit, so be it. And if we take the blame, so be it. But some day I hope that future generations of Americans will look back and say, "Finally, they had the courage to do the right thing."

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. This past weekend while we were in session on Saturday, during lunch I went down and had lunch with the gentleman from Ohio [JOHN KASICH] the budget director, and what you said reminded me of our conversation when you said you do not know whether the Americans will reward us for this. You do not know whether we are going up in the polls.

I turned to Mr. KASICH and I said, "How do you think this is going to turn out?" And he said, "JOE, I don't care. That is not relevant. We are going to balance this budget. I don't care if we get defeated. If I get defeated because of balancing the budget, what a grand and glorious way to go out."

Mr. Speaker, that is the way I feel. It has been such an honor this past week to see the freshman class on Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday and Thursday of this week, when poll numbers shot up for the President and down for us, it was so great to talk to them and not a single one said they were going to budge.

Reporters would come and say, "What about the poll numbers?" And we would cut them off and say, "That does not really matter. The polls do not matter. What matters is we keep our word."

Mr. Speaker, if I could read what we passed tonight, it is a commitment to a 7-year balanced budget and this is the language I would like to end on:

The President and Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office. The balanced budget agreement shall be estimated by the Congressional Budget Office based on the most recent current economic and technical assumptions.

Mr. Speaker, it goes on and has some more verbiage in there. But what a great honor that tonight we truly were a part of history. We have started down the path that James Madison and Thomas Jefferson and our Founding Fathers intended for us. As James Madison, one of the framers of the Constitution said,

We have staked the entire future of the American civilization not upon the power of government, but upon the capacity of the individuals to govern themselves, control themselves, and sustain themselves according to the Ten Commandments of God.

Tonight we started down that path. We dared to make a difference. We dared to balance the budget. I am going to be very proud tomorrow when I fly home and get off the plane and see my 7-year-old and 4-year-old and know that we had a part in history and a part in ensuring that their history will be even brighter than our own. That is all we can ask.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

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. ROEMER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UPTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIM, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous materials:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

On November 19, 1995:
H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, 104th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, for morning hour debate.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the House adjourned until Tuesday, November 28, 1995, at 12:30 p.m.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,

Washington, DC, November 13, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Section 303 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. §1384(b)), I am transmitting the enclosed notice of proposed rulemaking for publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Congressional Accountability Act specifies that the enclosed notice be published on the first day on which both Houses are in session following this transmittal.

Sincerely,

RICKY SILBERMAN,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995: Procedural Rules

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

Summary: The Executive Director of the Office of Compliance is publishing proposed rules to govern the procedures for consideration and resolution of alleged violations of the laws made applicable under Part A of Title II of the Congressional Accountability Act (P.L. 104-1). The proposed rules have been approved by the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance.

Dates: Comments are due within 30 days after publication of this notice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Addresses: Submit written comments to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, Room LA 200, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive notification of receipts of comments are requested to include a self-addressed, stamped post card. Comments may also be transmitted by facsimile ("FAX") machine to (202) 252-3115. This is not a toll-free call. Copies of comments submitted by the public will be available for review at the Law Library Reading Room, Room LM-201, Law Library of Congress, James Madison Memorial Building, Washington, D.C., Monday through Friday, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:00 p.m.

For Further Information Contact: Executive Director, Office of Compliance at (202) 252-3100. This notice is also available in the following formats: large print, braille, audio tape, and electronic file on computer disk. Requests for this notice in an alternative