all inside the United States, power marketing administrations, strategic oil reserves, all of which are within the United States of America, but the material girl's overseas trips are also expensive. They are as high as $720,000 each. Several of these trips have expenses that are unaccounted for, some as high as $150,000. One of these trips, the same luxury jet that Madonna uses, Secretary O'Leary took 51 staffers and 68 guests. It cost the taxpayers $560,000. There is only about $70,000 that is currently unaccounted for.

That is why the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and myself have requested the Government Accounting Office to do an audit, so we hope it will be done early next year. I think it is time that we stop this misuse of taxpayers' money and account for the expenses that we cannot account for at this point.

Mr. Speaker, this excessiveness, this mismanagement, this extravagance, is just the tip of the iceberg. It started off with GAO report that highlighted problems about management at the Department of Energy. They lacked focus, they had an admission a minute.

Then there was Vice President GORE's National Performance Review, who said within the Department of Energy the environmental management group was 40 percent inefficient and it was going to cost taxpayers $70 billion over the next 30 years if something is not done. Then we found out there were 529 public relations employees at the Department of Energy, one personal media consultant for the Secretary of Energy herself; and then there was the private investigative firm, which she paid $56,500 to find out who the unfavorable were in the press and in Congress. I was number four on the list. Then there was her personal friend that she hired at $95,166 year plus $12,000 living expenses for the department conflict resolution officer.

We have a lot of redundancy in Government, and we need to eliminate that out of the Department of Energy too. Two-thirds of the budget comes through the Department of Defense. There is duplication of effort within the labs. There is the nationalized oil fields at Elk Hills, CA. We have private companies that extract oil from the earth. There are the Power Marketing Administrations that also are duplicative of the private sector.

That is why I am leading the task force to eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency, to remove the waste, consolidate the duplication, transfer to the private sector that which they do best, and eliminate the parts of Government that are unnecessary. Each time the material girl, Secretary O'Leary's mismanagement comes to the press, this effort gains support. It highlights the fact that something must be done.

This process of verifying has uncovered something else, though, that is probably worse than anything you have heard so far. That is that the material girl has transferred from the Department of the Interior $500,000 to the government of India to prepare the Taj Mahal for her arrival. Five hundred thousand dollars. What is so upsetting to me about this is that I can only think of the deficit we are running this year. I can only think of the budget we are dealing with. To spend $500,000 to prepare the Taj Mahal for her arrival is taking away from our children's future. It is borrowed money that they are going to have to pay back. It is wrong. It is time to stop this wasteful spending.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency. The only way we can do that is to continue with this effort and this legislation. It is needed to balance the budget and it will stop the unnecessary spending.

□ 1445

SOCIAL POLICIES SHOULD REFLECT LATEST BIOMEDICAL KNOWLEDGE

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of H.R. 2748, a bill to prevent the potentially devastating consequences of discrimination based on genetic information. I ask my colleagues to join us in support of this critical legislation. Currently 26 of our colleagues have cosponsored the legislation.

As Chair of the Women's Health Task Force of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I closely followed reports earlier this year that increased funding for breast cancer research had resulted in the discovery of the BRCA1 gene-link to breast cancer. While the obvious benefits of the discovery include potential lifesaving early detection and intervention, the inherent dangers of access to genetic information are just becoming evident.

There is increasing concern that individuals will be denied access to health care and that employers might screen employees to eliminate those who could cause a rise in group premiums. The following actual cases document the cause for concern:

A 24-year-old healthy and insured woman is asked to sign a lifetime waiver exempting her from breast cancer coverage because of familial tendencies.

An insured, previously healthy man suffered a heart attack. After DNA-based testing revealed a hereditary form of high cholesterol, his insurance company refused to pay the hospital bills or cover future treatment for cardiovascular disease.

As our knowledge and understanding of the biomedical genesis of human health and disease increases, our social policies and ethical responsibilities need to be adjusted accordingly.

H.R. 2748, the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination in Health Insurance Act of 1995 contains four major provisions. It prohibits insurance providers from: First, denying or canceling health insurance coverage; or, second, varying the premiums, terms and conditions of health insurance coverage on the basis of genetic information; third, requesting or requiring an individual to disclose genetic information; and fourth, disclosing genetic information without the prior written consent of the individual.

The bill is uniquely focused, comprehensive, timely and includes effective enforcement mechanisms. It is focused on the issues of insurance discrimination and privacy as they relate to genetic information. It comprehensively covers all types of insurance providers including self-funded and ERISA plans. It is timely in that it tackles insurance discrimination and privacy issues related to genetic information before they become epidemic. It provides both State and Federal measures to ensure effective enforcement.

Grave concern about these issues and enthusiastic support for the bill has come from the American Cancer Society, the National Breast Cancer Coalition, and the Council for Responsible Genetics. The National Action Plan on Breast Cancer, the NIH–DOE Working Group on Ethical, Legal and Social Implications of Human Genome Research and the National Advisory Council for Human Genome Research have joined together to address the issue of genetic discrimination and health insurance. Their work has resulted in development of four policy recommendations. Those recommendations provide the foundation for Federal legislation to prevent discrimination on the basis of genetic information. This bill encompasses those recommendations.

This bill, which addresses the profound questions about who will have access to genetic information and how this information will be used by others, is critically important to the health and well-being of this Nation's women, men and children and our future generations.

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

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

NO FUNDS FOR THE TREASURY

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House debated H.R. 2621, a bill which would, in my opinion, force a default of the U.S. Treasury on U.S. debt and forestall payment, not only of principal and interest on U.S. debt for

the first time in our history, but also forestall payments on Social Security, Federal and military pensions. In fact, this bill was advertised as one which would protect Social Security and Federal and military pensions, but in fact, the end result would be causing a default and leaving the Treasury with no funds whatsoever to pay those payments to the beneficiaries who have paid into those systems.

During the debate, I referred to a speech which Speaker NEWT GINGRICH made before the Public Securities Association on September 21, 1995, just earlier this year. In this speech is where the Speaker plainly and clearly advocated defaulting on U.S. debt in order to force the President and the Nation to accept his budget and no other budget.

My assertion was called into question by my colleague and friend from Michigan, and therefore, I submit for the RECORD and ask unanimous consent to include the following article from the New York Times as printed on September 22, 1995 entitled ''Gingrich Threatens U.S. Default if Clinton Won't Bend on Budget.''

Mr. Speaker, let me quote a couple of excerpts from this article. The article starts out:

> House Speaker Newt Gingrich threatened today to send the United States into default on its debt for the first time in the Nation's history to force the Clinton administration to balance the budget on Republican terms.

The article goes on to say:

> Clearly, part of Mr. Gingrich's autumn end-game strategy is to force the White House to accept much of this agenda, many parts of which President Clinton has vowed to veto, by holding an increase in the Federal debt limit hostage. Without an increase in the Federal debt, the government will be unable to meet many of the payments due in November for Social Security, military pay, and interest on the Federal Government's $4.9 trillion debt.
>
> Such confrontational techniques have been used in the past, but it has been highly unusual for a high government official or high government leader to suggest, as Mr. Gingrich did today, that default on government payments was not beyond the pale.

Let me quote directly from the Speaker. As we would say, the Speaker speaks. ''I don't care what the price is,'' he said in his speech. ''I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days, not this time.''

What that means, Mr. Speaker, is if we had a default and we had no bonds and we were not able to roll over the debt, that would mean that the Government would run out of money, and what that would mean is when Social Security checks need to be sent out, the Government would not have any money and the Government would not be able to take the Treasury securities, which Social Security invested in, and reinvest those into the market to raise capital. So in effect we would be high and dry; and unfortunately, the millions and millions of Americans who have paid into Social Security and count on that money to come every month would be high and dry, too.

Mr. Speaker, quite frankly, it is appalling, I believe, for this House to play with a time bomb such as the U.S. creditworthiness. We have a triple-A rating, and yet we have this revolutionary new Congress which believes it would be revolutionary to hold the country hostage and throw the Nation into default, to do away with our triple-A rating, to raise interest rates for all Americans, and to withhold the Social Security checks, the Medicare checks, the military checks, the pension checks to Americans who deserve those because they paid into them.

Let me remind my fellow colleagues of the House of the last revolutionary movement which decided to not stand up and pay its debts. It was the Bolshevik movement after the Russian Revolution in 1917, which refused to honor the Czar's bonds because, they said, ''We have a new leadership here and we are not going to honor those.'' Even today, people throughout the world hold those bonds and they are worthless. Even today, the Soviet Union, having broken the bounds of communism, has trouble entering the markets because of what happened back in 1917.

We do not want that to happen to the United States we do not want to see what happens to the United States, what we debated earlier this year with respect to Mexico. We are the greatest nation on the face of the Earth. We are the leader of the free world. We are the strongest economy in the world.

The U.S. Treasury bond is the gold standard for the world. All other interest rates are tied off of it, and yet the Speaker threatens a default and threatens to destroy the creditworthiness of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following article for the RECORD, that was the Speaker's position, and I hope he will renounce it.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 22, 1995]

GINGRICH THREATENS U.S. DEFAULT IF CLINTON WON'T BEND ON BUDGET

(By David E. Sanger)

WASHINGTON.—House Speaker Newt Gingrich threatened today to send the United States into default on its debt for the first time in the nation's history, to force the Clinton Administration to balance the budget on Republican terms.

His comments, a more extreme version of the hardball stance frequently used in past budget showdowns, raised the specter that the looming standoff may begin to rattle financial markets around the world. Mr. Gingrich's remarks came in the middle of a day in which the dollar plunged as much as 5 percent against major currencies before recovering slightly, sending interest rates up sharply. [Page D13.] The Speaker's statement appeared to be one of several factors that added to the markets' unsettled condition.

More broadly, Mr. Gingrich's speech to the Public Securities Association, which represents traders in Government debt, underscored the growing agitation and sense of imminent collision in official Washington as both Democrats and Republicans move toward a confrontation that could shut the Government down this fall.

Throughout the capital, there was a sense that the current had quickened and the rumble of a great waterfall could be heard close ahead. Angry disputes broke out on wildly varying issues. Republicans threatened to block sending American ground troops to enforce the Bosnia peace plan, agreed to vast reductions in the protection for endangered species and Federal lands, and pushed ahead with plans for radical changes in Medicare and Medicaid. Democrats fumed and vowed to do what they could to slow the legislation's breakneck pace.

Clearly part of Mr. Gingrich's autumn end-game strategy is to force the White House to accept much of this agenda—many parts of which President Clinton has vowed to veto—by holding an increase in Federal debt limit hostage. Without an increase in the limit, the Government will be unable to meet many of the payments due in November for Social Security, military pay and interest on the Federal Government's $4.9 trillion in debt.

Such confrontational techniques have been used in the past. But is was highly unusual for a high Government leader to suggest, as Mr. Gingrich did today, that default on Government payments was not beyond the pale.

''I don't care what the price is,'' he said in his speech. ''I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 60 days—not this time.''

Without concessions from the White House across the board, he said, there will not be any increase in the debt ceiling. ''And we'll see how long they will last,'' he added.

Administration officials were still trying tonight to figure out how seriously to take Mr. Gingrich's comments. A few months ago, the Speaker was forced to back away from his off-the-cuff suggestions that the United States should recognize Taiwan as an independent country, a step that would lead to a breach with China.

But Congress has little direct influence over foreign policy. By contrast, its control of the Government's purse strings gave added force to Mr. Gingrich's remarks. Indeed, the Speaker's comments drew a quick and harshly worded response from Treasury Secretary Robert E. Rubin. ''The President won't be blackmailed by the use of the debt limit as a negotiating lever,'' he said in a telephone interview from Miami, where he was giving a speech tonight.

''It would be unprecedented and unwise for anyone in a position of authority to dismiss the consequences of default on the debt of the United States of America for the first time in our history,'' he added. ''Even the appearance of a risk of default can have adverse consequences, and a default itself would increase the cost of debt for the United States Government for many, many years to come. A sovereign country's credit-worthiness is a precious asset not be sacrificed under any circumstances.

Mr. Rubin said he did not expect the United States to default on any debt payment, a step that he has repeatedly called ''unthinkable.'' But even a serious threat of a disruption in payments can move the markets, and may send borrowing costs soaring for the United States.

The Treasury Department estimates that every increase of one percentage point in interest rates would swell the budget deficit by $4.9 billion this year. Republicans, however, argued that interest rates should decline if the ultimate outcome of the dispute between the parties is a big cut in spending.

Aside from all the Sturm und Drange in Washington, the debt limit debate has not yet had much effect, traders said. ''The markets have not yet focused on it,'' said David M. Jones, vice chairman of Aubrey G. Lanston & Company, which trades Government bonds. ''One of the risks is that foreign investors will not understand what is happening here. And if they get nervous, they will just flee until it all sorts out.''

The issue will take on added urgency in the first five days of November, when the Government must pay $50 billion in Social Security benefits, Medicare and pay for active-duty members of the military. On Nov. 15, about $25 billion of interest payments are due.

As Treasury officials concede, a number of financial tricks are available to keep the Government afloat even if the ceiling on debt is not raised. There are temporary debt limits, emergency ''cash management sales'' to keep money flowing in the coffers as short-term loans, and borrowing against other Government reserves. But all of the steps come with a cost, and none can go on for too long. Though the overall Government debt is $4.9 trillion, the Treasury sells about $2 trillion of debt securities every year because so much of the Government's borrowings are ''rolled over'' into new bonds.

The debt limit exists as an institution in Washington because the Constitution mandates that only Congress can authorize borrowings. Before World War I every bond issued by the United States required separate Congressional approval. Today, the raising of the debt ceiling essentially permits the Treasury Secretary to make the day-to-day decisions required to meet the Government's obligations.

40 YEARS OF TAX AND SPEND IS EXTREME

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

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have been called many names, the majority has. We have been called revolutionaries, just a few minutes ago even Bolsheviks maybe, but the main term has been extreme, extreme and mean-spirited, the ''E'' word.

Mr. Clinton has used it, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] has used it, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has used it. It seems like there is a concerted effort to use the ''extreme'' word to describe the mew majority.

Mr. Speaker, the new majority was elected by a majority of the people in this country. I do not consider them extreme; I think they saw something wrong with 40 years of one-party rule in this House. I think they saw something extreme about the spending over 40 years, and something extreme about the rising taxation that this one-party rule for 40 years had placed upon the American people.

What is extreme? What is extreme and mean-spirited about wanting a reasonable balanced budget within 7 years? What is extreme about wanting to reform welfare and end welfare as we know it? What is extreme about a plan to save Medicare from bankruptcy? What is extreme about wanting to reform Medicaid and allow the Governors, just like Governor Bill Clinton wanted, to see a change in Medicaid to save it and to make it more easily administered through the States. What is extreme about wanting to give tax cuts to families when the average family today is paying 40 percent of their income, and some approaching 50 percent, in local, State and Federal taxes? What is extreme about that?

Mr. Speaker, what is extreme about spending $2.5 trillion over the next 7 years, more than what we are spending now? How much more does the President want to spend?

What is extreme is a President that has said over and over again he wants a balanced budget, but he never can bring himself to do it. What is extreme is 40 years of tax-and-spend that has brought this Nation almost to bankruptcy with a $5 trillion debt. What is extreme is putting our children's future in jeopardy.

I have a 13-year-old daughter that, if we continue spending and spending and spending without ever balancing the budget, in the year 2012 every tax dollar will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the debt. What kind of future will she have? What kind of future will she have when she approaches my age in the year 2030? The deficit for 1 year will be over $4 trillion, just for 1 year.

□ 1500

We are talking about the future of this Nation. What is extreme about wanting to save the economic vialibity of this Nation?

It seems that our liberal friends, led by Mr. Clinton, are more concerned about next year than the years after.

Extreme, mean-spirited. I have parents that are both 78 years old. I want to preserve the future of Medicare for them. I am a mainstream American. I came from mainstream America. I was elected by mainstream Americans that saw something critically wrong coming out of this Federal Government.

There are a lot of 78-year-olds just like my parents back in the Second District of Kentucky that want to have Medicare in their future. But because of an extreme point of view from the other side they are willing to see it go bankrupt before they are willing to save it for the future.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS WEEK

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. Speaker, this week has been proclaimed by President Clinton as ''International Human rights Week'' to commemorate the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The United States is a world leader in advancing the cause of human rights and is a signatory to two international treaties that guarantee these human rights, the U.N. Charter, and the International Covenant of Civil and Political Rights. Both of these treaties have been ratified by the U.S. Senate, and are therefore binding.

I call our Nation's attention to Article I of the U.N. Charter and Article I of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights—in both treaties, the right to self-determination of peoples is affirmed.

Self-determination for non-self governing peoples is the foundation from which other human rights are exercised. Guam is a non self-governing territory, and its status as a non self-governing territory whose people are entitled to exercise self-determination is specifically stated in the U.N. Charter. And we should note that Guam was placed on the United Nation's list of the non self-governing territories by the United States over 47 years ago.

Within this context, it should be of great concern to this Congress and to the President that the desires of the people of Guam to exercise their rights and to improve their political status have not been met with the same fervor and the same level of attention that the United States gives to other peoples' problems.

Every year it is always someone else or some other nation who needs to repair its record on human rights and self-determination. But what about Guam? What about our desires for political rights and for our exercise of self-determination by our indigenous people?

As President Clinton stated in his proclamation, ''Peoples throughout the world look to the United States for leadership on human rights.'' Yes. Mr. President, that is correct, and to this I would add that people in the non self-governing colonies of the United States look to you for leadership on human rights. We look to you to respond to Guam's desire to create a new commonwealth within the American political family. And we look to you to respond to our desire to exercise self-determination in deciding our political status.

We ask that the United States fulfill the commitments it made to the people of Guam and to the community of nations when it signed and ratified the U.N. Charter and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and to be responsive to the inherent political commonsense of this Nation to extend full democracy everywhere.

So far, the Federal Government's reaction has been sincere pledges to respond to Guam. And, for a while there, the Clinton administration looked like it had the commitment to respond in a serious way to Guam's efforts. But now we are stuck in neutral because of what surely would look like a comedy of errors, albeit unintentional, on the part of the administration. We have now gone through three status negotiators in 1995 alone. We have been unable to negotiate because there is now no one to negotiate with.

Can you imagine this happening with the Bosnian peace talks? Why would United Nation and international commitments now be meaningless when applied to a United States colony?

I call on the administration today to heed its own words, to live up to the