

many of the values that we as Republicans now hold dear to us, fiscal conservatism and a concern for the environment as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am saddened by the loss of Congressman Cleveland. He was a political ally. He was an adviser. But, most important to me, he was a dear friend.

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.

FREE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, according to this morning's paper, the majority leader of the Senate, Mr. DOLE, said, and I am quoting him, concerning a Federal Government shutdown, "I don't believe we should shut down the Government. I think it would be a mistake. I do not believe it should happen. I don't believe it will happen."

I think the majority leader is probably right. The Congress would be insane or close to it to shut the Government down 10 days before Christmas. A lot of folks who are not Federal employees and are nowhere close to Federal employees would regard that as the act that deserved the Scrooge Award of 1995.

But will the Congress overlook the District of Columbia and allow it the short continuing resolution that I am certain will come for Federal employees? My prediction is you will probably let the Government stay open until we get back from the recess.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to explain that for the District, that does almost nothing, because we are not a Federal agency. We are a city of almost 600,000 people, and you cannot run a complicated city, down on its luck, with 2- and 3-week continuing resolutions. You then have to calibrate how much money you spend on the basis of for example, if it is 2 weeks, one-fourteenth, so you do not overobligate. With the city in the financial condition it is in, that should be unthinkable.

There is a very special congressional responsibility, therefore, to release in the next continuing resolution the District's money, raised solely in the District, until such time as an appropriation bill has been signed. I would hope that an appropriation bill will be signed before December 15. But, very frankly, our appropriation is stuck on stupid. It is stuck up here on controversial issues having nothing to do with the wishes of the people of the District of Columbia. So I cannot guarantee that by December 15 our appropriation will be signed.

I have a bill that would allow the District to spend its own money until such time as an appropriation bill is signed. That way we would have the flexibility to run the city. Otherwise, we are put in the position where, if unfunded mandates such as AFDC have to be matched on time, as they do, and a payroll has to be paid on time, as it does, we could overobligate.

The Congress has been most critical of the District for what it says has been overobligation in the past. The last thing the Congress, I am sure, would like to do, is put the District in the position where it is between the hardest rock and the worst hard place, where it had unfunded mandates and funded mandates that it had to meet and had no way to meet them because it can only spend a certain percentage of its funds.

The Washington Post said in an editorial recently:

House Speaker Gingrich, Subcommittee on D.C. Appropriations Chairman Jim Walsh and other Congressional leaders who seek to bring financial order to this city should see the importance of separating the local functions as well as the responsibilities of the Control Board and chief financial officer from Federal stalemates. If their concern for the District's financial stability is genuine, they should press for immediate enactment of a continuing resolution, as well as for protections against any more situations like this.

Shutting the District down, when its own money is here only because the Congress requires it to come here, not because the Congress provides it, is an outrage. I ask this body, if and when such time should come that a continuing continuing resolution is needed to keep Federal agencies going, and if that continuing resolution is a short-term continuing resolution, that you allow the District to spend its own money—and about 80 percent of the money in our appropriation is raised by hard working D.C. taxpayers in the District of Columbia—and that you allow that money to be spent, so that the District will not be thrown into worse financial shape than is already the case.

That is not what this body desires. This body has been working beneficially with the District. So has the Financial Authority. We do not need another setback. I acknowledge that the District is responsible for many of its own problems, but the fact is, it is trying to get hold of those problems now. The District should not be thrown into further disarray because the Congress goes into short-term continuing resolutions, overlooking the difference between HHS, the State Department, and HUD and the District of Columbia.

The District is a living, breathing city that has suffered tremendously throughout this period. It is the innocent bystanders for whom I speak now, not the Mayor, not the City Council and not the Delegate, but the hard working residents who pay taxes in the District of Columbia. Free the District of Columbia.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2684, THE SENIOR CITIZENS RIGHT TO WORK ACT OF 1995

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report to accompany H.R. 2684, the Senior Citizens Right to Work Act of 1995.

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

There was no objection.

ILL-ADVISED MISSION IN BOSNIA SHOULD BE ABANDONED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Friday evening, the Vice President was on ABC News "Nightline." In his comments, the Vice President stated that the task of bringing peace to Bosnia would be done at a minimal risk to American troops. This would be true, but for one provision to which the administration has signed up: namely, the guaranteeing and coordinating of the arming and training of one of the belligerents.

According to testimony by Secretary of State Warren Christopher, our Government policy is supervising—that is, guaranteeing and coordinating—the arming and training of Bosnian Moslem forces. This is a flawed and dangerous policy. It gives the appearance that we favor one side of this bitter internal struggle over another. It makes our Government appear to be a combatant. We cannot be both a combatant and a peacekeeper.

This policy of arming and training Bosnian Moslems—even through a third party, but guaranteed and supervised by us—concerns me greatly. Three points are to be considered:

First, already, there exists a parity between the warring factions, the Serbs on the one hand and the Croat-Moslem Federation on the other. Note the recent battlefield successes by the Federation. Further, the Moslems have been receiving arms by way of Croatia for some time.

Second, our allies are not in favor of arming and training the Moslem forces. The French and British, in particular, are against it. This was pointed out in news reports Thursday morning.

Third, the arming and training of the Moslem forces, quoting the Vice President: "we are going to see that it happens * * * we commit to making sure that is going to happen."

Mr. Speaker, this is a flawed policy. The Vice President concedes that it would be wrong for the American troops to directly arm and train the