I visited a nursing home just recently in my district, the Cobble Hill Nursing Home. I listened to the staff as they talked about the kinds of things they have to do now, and recognized that if we continue to cut the programs, that they will not have the staff to be able to perform those duties.

I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that we realize that as we talk about the budget cuts, that we do not forget that we are talking about quality of care, we are talking about the lives of human beings, and let us not let the debate make the wrong turn. Let us straighten it out and go in the right direction to protect the lives of our people.

EDUCATION CUTS ARE THE LARGEST IN THE NATION'S HISTORY

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, education is one of the priorities that the President and Democrats in Congress have stressed should not be severely impacted during these constant budget battles that take place on the floor of this House of Representatives. Yet, once again, we face a situation where the House-passed spending bill for the remainder of this fiscal year would provide the largest cut in education in the history of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, this is really the work primarily of Speaker GINGRICH and the House Republican leadership, whose radical plan would essentially cut $3.3 billion from the education programs, a 13-percent reduction in funds that schools around the country depend on to educate students of all ages.

The Senate, as was mentioned by one of my colleagues earlier, fortunately has voted to restore most, or about $2.5 billion, of this lost education funding. However, Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill will not prevail if Speaker GINGRICH and his extremist views hold sway.

Today, the House Republicans passed another stopgap funding bill. It is the 11th, I believe, since the beginning of this session. This measure would only keep the Government running for another week. Its purpose is to give House Republicans an opportunity to attack the reasonable education funding levels in the Senate bill. It is nothing more, in my opinion, than another attempt by House Republicans to hold the Federal Government hostage to their agenda.

President Clinton has already said that he will not sign any bill that funds education programs at the House-passed level. He also said that rather than sign any extremist Republican spending plan, he may refuse to sign all stopgap spending bills sent to him after Easter. Thus, if the House Republicans continue to insist on steamrolling through these radical cuts in Federal education programs, we could face yet another Government shutdown.

I believe preserving a strong educational framework was something that traditionally Members on both sides of the aisle, in both Houses in Congress, used to be able to agree on before the current House Republican majority took over. What is happening here is that the Speaker and the House Republican leadership are basically going against this consensus, or shattering the consensus that we have had for years that says that education should be a priority.

If we compare the differences between the House and Senate education proposals, we can see the differences between the radical Republicans here in the House and the more sane, if you will, Republicans in the Senate. The House-passed bill cuts title I programs by $1.2 billion. The Senate restored $815 million of that. The House-passed bill would eliminate the Goals 2000 Education Reform Program. The Senate restores $60 billion for Goals 2000. The House-passed bill cuts $266 billion from the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program. The Senate restores $182 million. The House-passed bill cuts $27.5 million from the School-to-Work Program. The Senate puts back $182 million.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on with this list, but the point is that it is here in the House that the education cuts are being implemented. The fact that Senate Republicans will not go along with that only goes to prove, essentially, that it is the House Republicans that are forcing or taking this stand.

Mr. Speaker, what does it mean back in our States and back in our districts? It means if this House Republican plan goes through, the teachers and teachers' assistants could be laid off, and schools in search of alternative sources of funding could force their local governments to raise taxes in order to maintain the same number of teachers. If alternative sources of funding cannot be found, fewer teachers would need dramatically decreased sizes of classes, and students in need of assistance in areas such as basic reading and writing would be denied the help of their local schools, because education money will have dried up.

Mr. Speaker, there is no mistake about it. If we look at my own State of New Jersey, my own district, the taxpayers simply cannot afford these increases. The local property taxes, the local budgets, are usually turned down, because people do not want to have to pay higher property taxes. It is much more difficult for them if they do not have the Federal funding sources.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that it is time for the House Republican leadership to wake up. There should be no more of these stopgap funding bills for 1 week, 2 weeks, or 3 weeks. They should simply return to the mainstream and joint the congressional Democrats, the President, and now even the Senate Republicans in saying that education is a priority, that there should be adequate funding for it, and that education programs should not be part of this constant battle back and forth which leads us to these stopgap funding plans.

Mr. Speaker, I think that more and more over the next few weeks, as we continue to battle over the budget and over spending priorities, hopefully we will see the House Republican leadership come over to the point of view that says education should remain a priority and should not be something that we cut severely, because it really is the future of America and the future of our young people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the House stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1836

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GOSS) at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2202, THE IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–483) on the resolution (H. Res. 384) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I know that I first want to express my great appreciation to my very good friends who are sitting and standing behind me at this point, and I will be as brief as possible.

I have risen to briefly talk about the rule that we are going to be considering next Tuesday, which the Committee on Rules has reported out just a

couple of hours ago and which I have just filed at the desk.

The issue of reform of both legal and illegal immigration is one of the most contentious debates that we will have, and it will take place next week. The rule that we are considering is one of the most fair and balanced rules that could possibly be offered. In fact, we had over 100, I believe 104, amendments that were filed to the Committee on Rules by noon yesterday, and we spent today considering those amendments, and we have made in order 32 amendments that will be considered.

The issue of illegal immigration is a very difficult and pressing one for my State of California. We in California deal daily with the flood of illegal immigrants who are coming across the border seeking either government services, job opportunities, seeking family members, and it is very important that we take strong and decisive action here at the Federal level to deal with that problem.

In the area of legal immigration, I am very pleased that this legislation will allow us to maintain the highest level of legal immigration in 70 years and that in itself is a very good and positive move, because this country was founded on legal immigration and this country has had tremendous benefits because of immigrants who continue to come to this country today.

In fact, my State of California and other parts of this country are on the cutting edge technologically and in many other areas because of legal immigration.

So I would like to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH], who has worked long and hard throughout the past year and up until just recently, and he has been working, as he said today, nearly 12 hours a day constantly trying to bring this legislation forward.

As we look at the many different amendments that are going to be considered next week when we proceed with this legislation, one of the most controversial and hotly debated has been the proposal that was offered by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CHRYSLER, and my California colleague, Mr. BERMAN, and the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. BROWNBACK, seeking to split the legislation. That is an amendment that will be made to order, will be considered.

So, as we look at the resolution which I have just sent down that will allow us to bring about debate on the issue of legal and illegal immigration, I believe that we are taking a very bold and positive step toward getting the Federal Government to step up to the plate and acknowledge its responsibility. It has been a long time since we have been able to do this, and there are many problems that have taken place because of the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act, IRCA, that need to be addressed, and I am pleased that we will in time be doing that.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that I anxiously look forward to a very interesting debate which will be far-reaching and allow every single proposal that has come forward to be considered and discussed.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 14, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID DREIER to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through Tuesday, March 19, 1996.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 12:30 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GOODLING for 5 minutes on March 20.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, on March 19 and 20.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UPTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DREIER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. RUSH in two instances.

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. LEVIN in two instances.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

Mrs. THURMAN.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mrs. MALONEY.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mrs. KENNELLY.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NETHERCUTT.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. MARTINI in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. NEAL.

Mr. ESHOO.

Mr. BARCIA.

Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

Ms. MCCARTHY.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. TEJEDA.

Mr. BENTSEN.

Mr. COX of California.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. PASTOR.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2036. An Act to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to make certain adjustments in the land disposal program to provide needed flexibility, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 18, 1996, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2248. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request for an fiscal year 1996 supplemental appropriation for support of the Israeli Government's urgent requirement for counter-terrorism assistance, and to designate the