

over those 40 years we have created scores and scores of programs, programs in education, programs in job training, programs in environment and so on. But this is what the debate has evolved down to.

However, the fundamental question being asked today is how effective are those programs. That is what this new majority continues to ask and has pressured to find the questions and the answers to. Mr. Speaker, for a moment Congress and the American people must really ask today are we paying more and getting less. That really is what the budget debate has been about. Let me, if I can, Mr. Speaker, just give a few examples of what the debate is about and how the American taxpayer is paying more and getting less. I have talked on the floor about these items.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, in education. The education battle is down to not just how much money we throw at education, but what the results are. Part of the debate is these 3,322 bureaucrats out of 4,876 in a Federal Department of Education, over 3,300 right down the street in Washington, earning more than most of our teachers, and most of them have never been in a classroom. This is what the debate is about, how big that bureaucracy is going to be.

The debate is about why our children cannot read, why our scores are lower, the dumbing down of the standards in this country, which are on the front page of even our periodicals.

There are Head Start Programs like in my community, where I have 25 administrators and 25 uncertified teachers, and the administrators are making double what the teachers or the aides are making in our Head Start Program; about an AmeriCorps Program the President has proposed that is a volunteer program that pays more and better benefits than we are giving our veterans, and the GAO says their finances in a year for this \$1 billion project, they are already in a shambles.

Then we turn to job training, another question. Here is an article, a report from the State: \$1 billion in job training in my State, and this evaluation in the last month says that we are spending \$1 billion, and less than 20 percent of the students who enter these job training programs ever complete them and 19 percent ever get a job afterward. Then they get a low-paying minimal job; a total failure in job training programs. That is what this debate is about is changing these programs, improving them, so young people have an opportunity and a job.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, about the environment: Paying more and getting less. We have heard about Superfund. We have heard the President talk about this. Superfund is a great example of a good program gone bad and that we are trying to change. It was a good idea to clean up hazardous wastesites, but it is not a good idea to spend 80 percent of the money on attorneys' fees and studies. It is not a good idea to let polluters

off the hook and not have them pay. It is not a good idea to have very few sites cleaned up. Only a handful of the hundreds and hundreds of sites have been cleaned up.

So these programs are failures. That is what this debate is about. It is a fundamental debate in this House, Mr. Speaker, that we clean up the act of government. We may not get another chance. Mr. Speaker, this is about paying more and getting less, whether it is in education, whether it is in the environment, or whether it is in job training. We should not pay more and get less.

THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE
SHOULD HEAR THEIR LEADERS
SAY THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE
TO PEACE WITH ISRAEL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday the Palestinian Assembly finally took steps to amend their charter, which calls for Israel's destruction. I have been speaking about that for a number of years here on the House floor. The United States aid to the Palestinian entity, which is about a half a billion dollars, is predicated on the removal of those covenants. Just last week I took that to the House floor and said that the date, May 7, is the date by which the covenants must be amended. According to United States law that date is 2 months after the Palestinian elections.

Yesterday the Palestinian Assembly did take steps to remove the covenants. The council amends the Palestinian national covenant by canceling clauses which contradict the letters exchanged between the PLO and the Israel Government. So, in essence, the clauses which contradict the letters exchanged by the PLO and the Israeli Government are those clauses which call for the destruction of Israel.

That is a positive step, although I must say, Mr. Speaker, it would have been far better if they would have been much more explicit and explicitly mentioned the covenants which are revoked. That would have been a lot better. Still, I want to give credit where credit is due.

The second thing to which they agreed was that the Palestinian Assembly would draft a new charter within a few short months. We are going to be looking and we are going to be seeing what is the language in that charter. We want to make sure that the new charter that is drafted has language which is compatible with pursuing peace. I think that is very, very important.

Again, while I commend the Palestinian authority and commend Yasser Arafat for taking steps finally to remove the covenants which call for Israel's destruction, I want them to know that we in the United States Congress

will continue to monitor the situation very closely and continue to watch the new charter which is going to be drafted by the Palestinian assembly.

We do not want double talk. The problem on the Palestinian side for too long has been doublespeak, talking out of 10 or 15 sides of their mouth. If you want peace you need to be unequivocal, you need to state that you want peace, and you need to say it both in English and in Arabic, so it is not only for American public opinion consumption but it is for the home crowd, so to speak. The Palestinian people should hear their leaders say that there is no alternative to peace with Israel. I wanted to say that.

I wanted to also comment on some of the other events in the Middle East. I found it a bit hypocritical that the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva condemned Israel for the bombings in Lebanon, in a totally one-sided and ridiculous resolution, which said nothing about the Hezbollah guerillas which started this whole thing. The United States, to our credit, voted against it. There were only a handful of countries voting against it.

I thought it was especially hypocritical for the U.N. Human Rights Commission to do that, at the same time when the U.N. Human Rights Commission recommendations against the human rights abuse in China were not supported by the majority of countries voting, so it is hypocrisy, again. I think that is a bit ridiculous.

In Lebanon, Mr. Speaker, we ought to call it the way it is. That is, clearly, that the disruption and the hardship on both the Israeli population and the Lebanese population near the border rests solely with Syria, and with Hafiz al-Asad.

□ 1345

Syria, in essence, controls Lebanon. Lebanon has really ceased to exist as a free and independent state. There are 40,000 Syrian troops in Lebanon, and if the Syrian troops wanted to, they could control Hezbollah. They could prevent Hezbollah from wreaking havoc on Israeli civilians just south of the border.

That is what happened again and again during the past few weeks. No government at all can tolerate the wanton shelling of its citizens without some kind of response, and that is exactly what the Israeli Government has done. They have responded to the Hezbollah attacks.

Now, the Israeli attacks have hurt and killed civilians, and it is very, very unfortunate that civilians are maimed or killed. But it should be remembered that the Israeli troops, the Israeli attacks are going after the Hezbollah terrorists, whereas Hezbollah is specifically going after Israeli civilians.

So I say to the Syrian Government and to Mr. Assad, who talks a good game of peace but has shown absolutely zero, the nerve of him to keep our Secretary of State waiting and not

to meet with Secretary Christopher. I think we will watch the events in the Middle East very, very closely, and I am glad that peace seems to be moving forward.

SUCCESSFUL END TO 1996 FISCAL YEAR

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to stand before the House and point out that we are on the verge of a truly historic vote here over the next couple of hours. I believe that this body, in a bipartisan manner, will vote later this afternoon to approve House Resolution 3019, which is the omnibus appropriations spending bill, and that that legislation will mark the end, the successful end to the 1996 Federal fiscal year.

What makes this such a signal event and such a historic occasion is the fact that this bill, coupled with the spending cuts that were made last year in fiscal year 1995 combined, will equal savings to the taxpayer of \$32 billion, resulting in the lowest projected deficit in 14 years and the single largest cut in Government spending since World War II. So I think it is safe to say that this legislation reverses decades before of runaway Federal Government spending.

I want to point out that this legislation follows what we could have considered to be setbacks last year, the defeat in the other body, the U.S. Senate, by one vote of the constitutional balanced budget amendment; the President's veto last year of the House-Senate passed 7-year balanced budget plan. But we did not let those temporary setbacks deter from us our primary goal, which was to put the country on the path to a balanced budget in 7 years or less.

As I look down at my fellow appropriator, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FORBES], I recall that going into these budget negotiations last year we really said a couple things. One, we said the Social Security trust fund would be off-budget, now and forever. No more borrowing from the Social Security trust fund to pay for other Federal spending or to mask the true size of the Federal budget deficit.

Secondly, we said in the negotiations themselves, between the principles, we would have two conditions and two conditions only: first, the budget would have to be balanced in 7 years; and, second, we would have to balance the budget using honest numbers provided by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. No more budget gimmicks or smoke and mirrors.

So we have done that. In this legislation that we will be taking up within a matter of minutes now, we will have achieved and then some the first-year spending reduction targets, the first-year deficit reduction targets to put

the country on a path to a balanced budget in 7 years.

But remember, colleagues, that that only deals with the one-third side of the Federal budget which is discretionary spending. We have this other two-thirds over here which is called mandatory spending, and it is the entitlement programs which have been on automatic pilot for years and growing as a result at an unsustainable rate.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to conclude my remarks by saying that the problem with the Medicare trust funds is not going to go away. I introduce for the RECORD today two editorials that have appeared in northern California newspapers, one appearing in The New York Times' own Santa Rosa Press Democrat saying, "Politics As Usual Won't Save Medicare," and the second appearing on the more liberal editorial page of the San Francisco Chronicle, "Medicare Trust Fund Needs Swift Attention," with the excerpt, "Medicare's Hospital Trust Fund is in even worse shape than officials projected last year."

It is very clear from these editorials, from The New York Times article on February 5 of this year and then just earlier this week, April 23, that the Medicare trust fund is losing money at an alarming rate. There is clearly a trend developing here. We know from the media really, not from the Clinton administration but the media, that the Medicare trust fund lost \$35.7 million last year and so far this year, in fiscal year 1996, has lost \$4.2 billion.

So the point and the message here to my colleagues and to the American people is that Medicare is going broke faster than expected. The President did the wrong thing when he vetoed last year the only serious plan to reform Medicare. That is the plan that we put forward in this body and in the Senate which would have increased Medicare spending per Medicare recipient from \$4,800 today to \$7,300 7 years from now, increased Medicare spending, increased Medicare health care choices for Medicare recipients, and save the program from bankruptcy.

So this is a problem that is not going to go away. The program is continuing to head towards bankruptcy because the congressional Democrats and the President himself are choosing politics or playing politics instead of joining with us in a bipartisan fashion to address this very real problem.

The President should not have vetoed the Medicare Preservation Act. He should have in fact signed it. I dare say that if BOB DOLE was President, he would sign this very important legislation.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3019, BALANCED BUDGET DOWN PAYMENT ACT, II

Mr. LIVINGSTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 3019) making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to

make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-537)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3019) "making appropriations for fiscal year 1996 to make a further downpayment toward a balanced budget, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of the Government for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 101. (a) For programs, projects or activities in the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996, provided as follows, to be effective as if it had been enacted into law as the regular appropriations Act:

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, \$74,282,000; including not to exceed \$3,317,000 for the Facilities Program 2000, and including \$5,000,000 for management and oversight of Immigration and Naturalization Service activities, both sums to remain available until expended: Provided, That not to exceed 48 permanent positions and 55 full-time equivalent workyears and \$7,477,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program, exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year 1995: Provided further, That not to exceed 76 permanent positions and 90 full-time equivalent workyears and \$9,487,000 shall be expended for the Offices of Legislative Affairs, Public Affairs and Policy Development: Provided further, That the latter three aforementioned offices shall not be augmented by personnel details, temporary transfers of personnel on either a reimbursable or non-reimbursable basis or any other type of formal or informal transfer or reimbursement of personnel or funds on either a temporary or long-term basis.

COUNTERTERRORISM FUND

For necessary expenses, as determined by the Attorney General, \$16,898,000, to remain available until expended, to reimburse any Department of Justice organization for (1) the costs incurred in reestablishing the operational capability of an office or facility which has been damaged or destroyed as a result of the bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City or any domestic or international terrorist incident, (2) the costs of providing support to counter, investigate or prosecute domestic or international terrorism, including payment of rewards in connection with these activities, and (3) the costs of conducting a terrorism threat assessment of Federal agencies and their facilities: Provided, That funds provided under this section shall be available only after the Attorney