happen, we can have the situation of apathy. If this occurs, people may not evacuate and serious injury or death can occur if a bomb does exist, and this has to do with the very basic tenets of public safety.

This crime should not be tolerated, and I believe it is important to send a clear message to individuals who engage in making a false bomb threat that there will be repercussions for their actions.

We must continue our efforts to remain tough on crime. We read that by being tough on crime we are seeing the statistics go down, we are seeing everyday life being made better, and we have to work continually. We as lawmakers have to be very sure that we are involved constantly in making sure that we have the most secure environment for the people in these United States. Something as basic as this type of situation should not be tolerated and this legislation would make it known that one cannot in fact take advantage of others and make false bomb threats.

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

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

REAL HISTORY TEACHES REAL LESSONS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss a topic that is being debated today in our media regarding the NBC airing of ''Schindler's List'' on Sunday night.

One of my colleagues has taken offense to the airing of the show because it depicted nudity and violence on TV where our children would watch. I deeply respect my colleague and his point of view, but I have to stand today and first and foremost congratulate NBC News for airing uninterrupted a 3½-hour movie of one of the worst tragedies in our global history.

I must also add that the rating system voluntarily initiated by TV broadcasters was used that night. I must also reiterate that Steven Spielberg, creator of the movie, came on with a personal appeal to allow parents to know that what they were about to see would be graphic, violent, and they should caution their children against watching this show.

Mr. Speaker, this movie is real. The events of the Holocaust are real. This is not fantasy, this is not Disney World, this is not make believe, this happened to real people. Their possessions were taken from them, their clothing was stolen, their lifelong belongings were stolen, and they were executed and murdered by Nazis.

This was not some rating attempt to boost revenues. Ford Motor Co. paid for the entire production of the show that evening without running a commercial, the first time I can remember networks ever giving up commercial rights during a broadcast.

Superbowl, $200,000 for a 30-second ad went like that, a full lineup of commercials during Superbowl, made lots of money. NBC News chose to not take revenue, because America and every person on this planet needs to know the truth about the Holocaust, needs to know what happened, needs to see the historical significance of a tragedy that occurred so that they can become sensitive to the issues that confront us in this country.

It is not enough to talk about anti-Semitism and trying to eliminate it in America; you need to know the roots of the problems of why people have been hurt and harmed. We talk about civil rights. We have to understand from a black person's perspective of where we have been in America, where they were denied access to water fountains, where they were made to sit in the back of the bus, where they were treated as second class citizens. It is only through history will our children learn to become sensitive to the things that can change the course of history.

Yes, it was a tragic, tragic show, and I watched it Sunday night myself, and I have seen it before, and I thought as that movie went on and on how these people felt, how they were herded off to their deaths by a demonic creature who was murdering millions of Jews because they were Jews, and we are not supposed to tell that story.

We are not supposed to air it on TV, we are supposed to pretend it did not happen. We are supposed to make up some whole new story and put people in clothes and not show the gunshot wounds to the head. We are supposed to camouflage all of that destructiveness, that evilness, so that we can show people something that is not even a true portrayal.

Then we have calls for government to make mandatory ratings. So 10 or 20 years from now we may never know what happened. We may not know the tragedies that are going on in Cuba today with Fidel Castro in charge because we are not allowed to talk about it. We cannot portray what is really happening in our globe. I am frightened for the children in our society that are not being told the truth.

But the one thing that I feel so great about in this country is when I look at the young people, they are embracing each other, blacks, whites, Hispanics, Catholics, Jews, Protestants, because they believe in order for this world to survive we must be together as one people, regardless of race, color, creed, or ethnicity, one people.

That is my hope for our future in this country, that we will join together in a spirit of democracy and freedom for each and every one of us, regardless of where we were born, what our last name is or what the color of our skin is. But it will not happen if we cannot tell the truth, it will not happen if we cannot tell it like it is.

So for the government to get in the rating business now and say we are going to have mandatory ratings and take away the historical importance of the show I watched Sunday night and was proud to view simply because it told me something about what happened at that horrible event. So I urge people around America to call and support what NBC showed on Sunday night, because I think that is what America is about, telling the truth.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman.

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, an earlier speaker today referred to the balanced budget amendment that will be on the floor sometime in the near future as being very important for our families, our businesses, the States, and particularly for our families, and I agree with him in that regard that what this vote will be about is very important to the families.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask, what family thinks it makes much sense to say that you have to pay for your house in 1 year that you cannot mortgage over 20 years. You cannot borrow to buy that house, instead you have to pay for it in 1 year. What business could operate if you told it that it cannot borrow, and it cannot amortize over several years for those expensive buildings or pieces of equipment or whatever, but it must pay for them in one. What State government can operate if you told it that it could not borrow or issue bonds for the roads, the bridges, the infrastructure, the water, the sewer systems, the airports that make it grow?

The reality is that if you went to any business, State, or family and said you have to live by the terms of this balanced budget amendment that this Congress is about to put into the Constitution, they would say, you are crazy, because we all know that we have to borrow for those things that bring longer return. We have to borrow for the roads, the bridges, we have to borrow for the business equipment, the shell buildings, the industrial parks, and we have to borrow to put our children through school and we have to borrow for our mortgage.

I was attending a meeting recently at Shepard College in West Virginia in which a student talked about why she had borrowed thousands of dollars, receiving financial assistance, and the reason is because she knew that was her future and that thousands of dollars would be repaid countless times over. That is what this is about.

No business, State, or family would voluntarily accept the terms of this balanced budget amendment that will be voted on by this House, because they know they could not operate under it. It is bad enough that the Federal budget currently operates this way. It is even worse that some would think of putting this into the Constitution of the United States. If you are going to put it into the Constitution of the United States to have this kind of requirement, then set it up like businesses and States and families do. And that is, you have capital budgeting. You permit a separate account for the investments in the roads, the bridges, the water, the sewer systems, the airports.

I was delighted to see last night and to receive a call from the White House last night that President Clinton has created a Capital Budgeting Commission. This is similar to legislation that I introduced and a number of my colleagues here in the House cosponsored last year to set up a commission to look at and evaluate capital budgeting for the Federal budget. This makes possible the investments and the infrastructure, the physical infrastructure that are so crucial, and I look forward to seeing whom the President names to this Capital Budgeting Commission and the report that it makes.

Once again, if you are going to have a balanced budget amendment in the Constitution, at least look at the substitute that I have offered the last two times and will be offering again that would require a capital budget.

Likewise, to take Social Security off budget. The fact is that Social Security runs a $60 billion surplus this year and has for the last few years. That is $60 billion more coming in because of Social Security than Social Security is paying out. That money is necessary for the year 2019 and the years thereafter when you do not have as much coming in. So why should that not be off budget, because if you do not take it off budget then it masks the size of the true deficit.

Every one of my colleagues, I dare say, or almost everyone who has been here longer than 6 months, has voted sometime in the past few years, we do it usually about once a year, to take Social Security off budget. We have passed more resolutions and statutes and budget resolutions and budget language saying Social Security is off budget. So if it ought to be off budget, then why should it not be off budget in a constitutional amendment that deals with balancing the budget? None of this will take it off budget in 2005 or something. What happened to it up until the year 2005?

So those are the reasons that many of us oppose the language that will be voted on here today. Indeed, we have been actively involved in balancing the budget. That is why the budget deficit has dropped from $300 billion to $107 billion, why it is at the lowest point it has been since 1974, why it is the lowest in the industrial world right now, is because of the deficit reduction efforts that have been made over the past several years on a bipartisan basis. But if we are going to have a balanced budget amendment in the Constitution of the United States, then we are saying we are doing it because we want the Federal budget to be balanced like States balance their budgets, like businesses balance their budgets, like families balance their budgets, then for Pete's sake at least put in the same mechanisms by which States, businesses, and families balance their budgets, and that is to have a capital budget, an investment budget to permit borrowing for those long-term items that give you back far more than you ever pay.

□ 1330

DISINFORMATION, MISINFORMATION, AND LACK OF KNOWLEDGE ON THE PART OF EUROPEAN LEADERS REGARDING LEGISLATION OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS]. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DIAZ-BALART] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the privilege of being a member of a delegation from our Congress to the European Parliament. Occasionally meetings take place between parliamentarians from Europe and from the United States. As I say, I had the privilege of being part of our delegation, led by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I had the opportunity to meet with parliamentarians and leaders from various capitals of the European Union to delve, to dive into a number of very difficult challenges facing Europe at this moment.

For example, there was the issue of the necessary peace in Northern Ireland, an extraordinarily difficult challenge for the good people of that area, and the amount of learning that I did was truly, I think, interesting on that very complicated issue because of the importance that this issue holds, not only for, obviously, the people of Ireland but for the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, what was interesting about every single meeting, what was constant about every single meeting that we had with leaders from different capitals in the European Union, is that with regard to our legislation, the legislation that we in Congress here in the United States adopted a year ago on Cuba, there is a tremendous amount of disinformation, misinformation, lack of knowledge, as I say, Mr. Speaker, that was manifested time and time again in meetings that we held with European leaders from throughout the capitals of the European Union.

It was extraordinary that time and time again, we had to explain to the Europeans that the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act passed by this Congress, commonly referred to as the Helms-Burton legislation, when it sanctions foreigners who traffic in stolen property, property stolen by the Cuban dictator, we had to explain time and time again to European leaders that the legislation deals with and applies to only property stolen from American citizens.

I was flabbergasted at the ignorance demonstrated time and time again by the European leaders on this issue. They talked about what they referred to as the extraterritoriality of our legislation. We would tell them that even though we would have liked to see a ban on investment in the slave economy that Castro in Cuba maintains, we cannot do that, and we did not do that in the legislation we passed a year ago; legislation, by the way, Mr. Speaker, which was exactly 1 year ago today, February 26, endorsed by President Clinton after, 2 days earlier, four American citizens or residents of the United States were cruelly, viciously, unjustifiably murdered over international waters in unarmed civilian aircraft by the Castro dictatorship, pursuant to the direct and explicit order previously given by the Cuban dictator.

So it was 2 days after that happened, that act of terrorism, which was subsequently found to be an act of terrorism, totally unjustified, unjustifiable by the United Nations, it was 2 days after that act of terrorism by the Cuban dictator that President Clinton endorsed publicly what was then a bill, legislation pending before Congress, and a few days after that, on March 12, 1996, President Clinton signed the legislation into law.

What was amazing, Mr. Speaker, was that in meeting after meeting Europeans did not know, when they would refer to extraterritoriality, that the only extraterritoriality in this debate, the only extraterritorial conduct in this debate is what the Europeans now are seeking to justify, which is that their investors, they say, should have the right to knowingly go into Cuba and traffic in property stolen from American citizens.

That conduct is extraterritorial, Mr. Speaker. That is not conduct that is taking place in Europe. That conduct which they are seeking to defend, that indefensible conduct, is extraterritorial. It is taking place in another hemisphere, in the Western Hemisphere, specifically in the oppressed island of Cuba. That is the only extraterritorial conduct at issue in this debate, the unjustifiable conduct they are trying to defend.

What our law does, what our law says in its immigration chapter, is that if you are a foreigner who knowingly traffics, deals in property stolen from an American citizen, and after having the opportunity to divest from that