

ERS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. AKAKA], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCCAIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CRAIG] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 39, a joint resolution designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as Emergency Medical Services Week.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 40, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for women and men.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 42

At the request of Mr. BUMPERS, the names of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MATHEWS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 42, a joint resolution to designate the month of April 1993, as "Civil War History Month."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 9

At the request of Mr. EXON, the names of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. KRUEGER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 9, a concurrent resolution urging the President to negotiate a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban.

SENATE RESOLUTION 24

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the names of the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 24, a resolution urging the criminal prosecution of persons committing crimes against humanity, including participa-

tion in mass rapes, in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

SENATE RESOLUTION 35

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 35, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning systematic rape in the conflict in the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 64

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the names of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 64, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that increasing the effective rate of taxation by lowering the estate tax exemption would devastate homeowners, farmers, and small business owners, further hindering the creation of jobs and economic growth.

SENATE RESOLUTION 68

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 68, a resolution urging the President of the United States to seek an international oil embargo through the United Nations against Libya because of its refusal to comply with United Nations Security Council Resolutions 731 and 748 concerning the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103.

SENATE RESOLUTION 70

At the request of Mr. BRADLEY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD], the Senator from California [Mrs. BOXER], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 70, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the need for the President to seek the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

SENATE RESOLUTION 73—TO AMEND SENATE RESOLUTION 62, AGREED TO FEBRUARY 28, 1992 (102d CONGRESS)

Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. INOUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 73

Resolved,

SECTION 1. TRAINING EXPENSES.

Section 21(c) of Senate Resolution 62, agreed to February 28, 1991 (102d Congress), is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed \$3,000 may be expended for the training of

professional staff of such committee (under procedures specified by section 202(j) of such Act)."

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FINANCIAL EXPENDITURES BY SENATE COMMITTEES

DOLE AMENDMENT NO. 50

Mr. DOLE proposed an amendment to the resolution (S. Res. 71) authorizing financial expenditures by the committees of the Senate, as follows:

It is the sense of the Senate that the rate of pay of Senators should be frozen for 11 months.

MITCHELL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 51

Mr. MITCHELL (for himself, Mr. DOLE, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FORD, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HELMS, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. ROBB, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. KRUEGER, and Mr. PRESSLER) proposed an amendment to amendment No. 50 proposed by Mr. DOLE to the resolution, Senate Resolution 71, supra, as follows:

Is the sense of the Senate that the rate of pay of Senators should be frozen for one year.

FREEDOM OF CHOICE ACT OF 1993

SMITH AMENDMENTS NOS. 52-57

Mr. SMITH proposed six amendments to the bill (S. 25) to protect the reproductive rights of women, and for other purposes, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 52

At the appropriate place add the following: In any case in which—

"(1) an induced abortion was attempted with respect to an individual;

"(2) such abortion was unsuccessful; and

"(3) the mother of such individual consented to such abortion—

it shall be the duty of the mother of such individual and the health care provider performing such abortion to provide all available medical aid, together with food and water, in order to sustain the life of such individual."

AMENDMENT No. 53

At the appropriate place, add the following:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent a State from regulating the performance of abortions after the fifth month of pregnancy unless the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term."

AMENDMENT No. 54

At the appropriate place, add the following:

"Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent a State from regulating the perform-

ance of abortions after the fourth month of pregnancy unless the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 55

At the appropriate place, add the following:

“Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent a State from regulating the performance of abortions after the third month of pregnancy unless the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 56

At the appropriate place, add the following:

“Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent a State from regulating the performance of abortions after the second month of pregnancy unless the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 57

At the appropriate place, add the following:

“Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prevent a State from regulating the performance of abortions after the first month of pregnancy unless the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term.”.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING FINANCIAL EXPENDITURES BY SENATE COMMITTEES

REID AMENDMENT NO. 58

Mr. REID proposed an amendment to the resolution (S. Res. 71), supra, as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . ABOLISHING THE COMMITTEE ON AGING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) The Committee on Aging of the Senate is abolished.

(2) Paragraph 3(b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking the item relating to Aging.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 1994, unless the Senate otherwise extends or reauthorizes the committee abolished by this section pursuant to recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

COCHRAN AMENDMENT NO. 59

Mr. COCHRAN proposed an amendment to amendment No. 58 proposed by Mr. REID to the resolution (S. Res. 71), supra, as follows:

Strike all after the first word of the pending amendment and insert the following:

The language on page 30, line 11 through page 31, line 3, is null and void and of no effect.

Sec. . (a) In carrying out the duties and functions imposed by section 104 of S. Res. 4, agreed to February 4, 1977 (95th Congress), and in exercising the authority conferred on it by such section, the Special Committee on Aging is authorized from March 1, 1993, through March 31, 1993, in its discretion (1) to make expenditures from the contingent

fund of the Senate, (2) to employ personnel, and (3) with the prior consent of the Government department or agency concerned and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to use on a reimbursable, or nonreimbursable, basis the services of personnel of any such department or agency.

(b) The expenses of the committee for the period March 1, 1993, through March 31, 1993, under this section shall not exceed \$98,703.25.

(c) Effective April 1, 1993, the Special Committee on Aging is abolished.

INOUE AMENDMENT NO. 60

Mr. INOUE proposed an amendment to the resolution (S. Res. 71), supra; as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. . The Select Committee on Indian Affairs is hereby redesignated as the “Committee on Indian Affairs”.

CHAFEE AMENDMENT NO. 61

Mr. CHAFEE proposed an amendment to the resolution (S. Res. 71), supra; as follows:

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. . (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution and except as provided in subsection (c), the funding level for each of the committees referred to in section 2(a) for the period March 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994, shall be an amount equal to the lesser of—

(1) 95 percent of the amount provided for such committee, excluding funding for non-recurring items, for the period March 1, 1992, through February 28, 1993, under Senate Resolution 62, agreed to February 28, 1991; or

(2) 95 percent of the amount provided for the Committee on Finance for the period March 1, 1992, through February 28, 1993, under Senate Resolution 62, agreed to February 28, 1991.

(b) The funding level for each of the committees referred to in section 2(a) for the period March 1, 1994, through February 28, 1995, shall be an amount equal to the funding levels provided in subsection (a) of this Section (relating to the period March 1, 1993, through February 28, 1994) increased by 1.3 percent.

(c) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the funding level for the Committee on Appropriations for the period March 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994, shall be \$4,861,162, and the funding level for the period March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995, shall be \$4,961,810.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MINERAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND PRODUCTION COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Mineral Resources Development and Production.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 257, the Mineral Exploration and Development Act of 1993.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, March 16, 1993, at 9:30 a.m. in room

SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets NE., Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for inclusion in the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510, Attention: Lisa Vehmas.

For further information, please contact Lisa Vehmas of the subcommittee staff at 202-224-7555.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the status and future direction of the Department of Energy's fusion program, particularly the Department's activities relating to the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor [ITER] Program.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, March 9 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets NE., Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510, Attention: Paul Barnett.

For further information, please contact Paul Barnett of the committee staff at 202-224-7569.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for my colleagues and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the energy needs of the People's Republic of China.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, March 11, 1993, at 9:30 a.m. in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, First and C Streets NE., Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for inclusion in the printed hearing record should send their comments to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510, Attention: Don Santa.

For further information, please contact Don Santa of the committee staff at 202-224-4820.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on the state of the oil and gas industry.

The hearing will take place on Friday, March 5, 1993, beginning at 2 p.m. at the city council chambers, 901 Bagby Street, 2d floor, Houston, TX. Witnesses will testify by invitation only.

Those wishing to submit written testimony should address it to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, room 304, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510.

For further information, please contact Patricia Beneke (202) 224-2383 or Wanda Freeman (202) 224-7556 of the committee staff.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 24, 1993, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on the President's economic proposal and to consider S. 382, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate Wednesday, February 24, 1993, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on mortgage and other lending discrimination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 24, 1993, at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing on "the Federal Government's Investment in New Drug R&D: Are We Getting Our Money's Worth?"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 24, 1993, at 9:30 p.m. on S. 4 the National Competitiveness Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Governmental Affairs Committee be authorized to meet on Wednesday, February 23, at 9:30 a.m. for a hearing on the subject "Proliferation Threats of the 90's."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, 9:30 a.m., February 24, 1993, to receive testimony concerning energy tax options.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 24, 1993, at 10 a.m., for a hearing entitled "Education Goals and Standards."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Armed Services Committee be authorized to meet on Wednesday February 24, 1993, in open session, to receive testimony on United States Government assistance to the former Soviet Union: Status report and in addition, the committee will meet in executive session to consider and act on the nominations for the 1993 Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and the committee rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE PASSING OF PFC. DOMINGO ARROYO, JR., OF ELIZABETH, NJ

• Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, on January 12, 1993, Pfc. Domingo Arroyo, Jr., of Elizabeth, NJ, became the first U.S. soldier to be killed in the Somali relief effort. Private Arroyo, who expected to be discharged shortly from the Marines after 4 years of active duty that included Operation Desert Storm, was part of a patrol that was ambushed by Somali gunmen.

Domingo was born in Puerto Rico. Living in New Jersey most of his life, he came from a close-knit family and was liked and respected by his teachers, friends, and neighbors. The reasons he gave for joining the Marines were moral and selfless. He wanted to help others, he wanted a college education in order to better himself, and he wanted to provide his mother with more desirable living conditions.

A true American, Domingo gave his life in another country, protecting its destitute, defenseless people. In his dedication to his country, to his family, and to his high ideals, he represents the best of our Nation's youth. I mourn his loss. Domingo will be remembered as a hero and honored for his selfless bravery.

At this very sad time, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest sympathy to the family of Domingo Arroyo, Jr. •

• Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, everyone knows that the past few decades have brought many changes to the practice of medicine in the United States. New technology has led to advances in the diagnosis and treatment of illness. Medical knowledge has developed to a point where what we once considered miracles are performed on a daily basis.

There is one man, Robert "Bob" W. Fleming, chair of administration at Mayo Foundation in Rochester, MN, who has experienced firsthand the changes in medicine in the last 40 years—at least at one institution.

Since Bob began his career at Mayo on January 3, 1950, his tenure has been seasoned by several Mayo milestones. In December 1950, a Mayo physician and a Mayo chemist, won the Nobel Prize for the discovery of cortisone. And in 1953, the Mayo Building opened and is now the primary location for patient care at Mayo.

During the 1960's and 1970's Bob led the development of the Mayo appointment system that now handles more than 300,000 patient registrations annually. He also helped develop the organization of Mayo's largest department, the department of internal medicine.

The 1980s brought about many significant changes at Mayo—the merger of Mayo Clinic with Saint Marys and Rochester Methodist hospitals, and the openings of Mayo Clinic Jacksonville and Mayo Clinic Scottsdale. Bob was instrumental in guiding the institution through these changes.

Bob's first position at Mayo was in the insurance and collections department where he worked as an administrator. His early success in that department led him to other administrative positions in several medical and surgical areas. In 1972, Bob was named chair of the Division of Administrative Services for Mayo, a position he held until 1982 when he was named chair of administration.

Bob has worked hard at whatever job he has held at Mayo. His hard work continued in his activities outside Mayo. In fact, at the time he joined Mayo, hockey was his No. 1 priority. He played right wing for the Rochester Mustang's Hockey Team. A job at Mayo was an added bonus.

Others in the Mayo organization noticed his stamina, speed and determination, the same traits he dem-

onstrated on the hockey rink. Soon his capacity for work, keen memory and penchant for organization became well-known. More than 40-years later, his colleagues still credit him with these characteristics.

His 43-year career at Mayo, marked with numerous highlights, will end in February 1993, when he retires. He plans to travel and continue to be involved in the sport that led him to Rochester—hockey. He served as chair of the U.S. Olympic Hockey Committee from 1969 to 1981, and took up the challenge again in 1990. He will continue his service for the 1994 games.

Mr. President, it is with great pride that I recognize the tremendous contributions of Bob Fleming. In the words of those who know him best, "Bob would succeed, no matter what the time or the challenge, because he is truly a leader."●

ARIZONA SPINA BIFIDA ASSOCIATION

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the work of the Arizona Spina Bifida Association. Their tireless efforts on behalf of those afflicted with spina bifida deserve our recognition and our highest praise.

Spina bifida is the most frequently occurring birth defect. In the United States alone a child is born with spina bifida every hour. Very few Americans know about this disease because, until recently, it was often fatal. Medical technology has now advanced to the point where 90 percent of those born with spina bifida go on to live happy, productive lives.

Those born with spina bifida are not without special needs. The physical limitations imposed by the disease are often formidable. To help deal with these limitations, the Arizona Spina Bifida Association has developed the Nation's first Transitional Living Center.

The Center allows people with spina bifida to adjust to living on their own by providing them with the care they need while learning to care for themselves. The center offers the emotional support those afflicted with spina bifida need for the daunting task of facing the world. It gives them a sense of self esteem, builds their confidence, and develops their independence. Most importantly, it teaches them that they are important members of our society with valuable contributions to offer.

Mr. President, I strongly support the efforts of the Arizona Spina Bifida Association. By increasing public awareness, they have helped destigmatize the disease. The Transitional Living Center has brought people with spina bifida into the work force and into the community. The center serves as a model for other areas that wish to help their citizens with this disease learn to live on their own. I ask my colleagues

to join me in commending this outstanding organization.●

COMMENDING JAMES M. RIDENOUR, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

● Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to James M. Ridenour, who recently completed his tenure as Director of the National Park Service. Jim has served our Nation well and leaves behind a strong record of conservation and stewardship of our national parks.

Jim Ridenour was sworn in as the 13th Director of the National Park Service in April of 1989. Raised in Wabash, IN, Mr. Ridenour came to the National Park Service from the Indiana Department of Natural Resources, where he was director from 1981 to 1989. In that post, he managed the State's system of parks, forests, reservoirs, and fish and wildlife areas. He was also responsible for state museums, memorials, and historic resources.

During Jim's tenure as Director of the National Park Service, the number of units of the National Park System increased by 13, to 368. The 13 new units encompass approximately 25,000 acres. While he was Director, new laws expanded existing National Park System units by over 130,000 acres. One of the parks that was expanded was Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, which preserves sandy beaches and dunes that rise as high as 180 feet along the Indiana shoreline of Lake Michigan between Gary and Michigan City.

In 1992, Congress approved Director Ridenour's special resource study initiative, and provided funding in fiscal year 1993 for four such studies. To regain an orderly process for determining which areas should be added to the National Park System, Jim Ridenour requested that Congress fund studies of areas that the professionals of the National Park Service had identified as high priorities for new parks.

A major achievement under Director Ridenour's leadership was an improvement in the concessions program of the National Park Service. A 1990 initiative to reform the management of the private concession businesses that provide goods and services to visitors in the National Park System established five principles: First, protect the natural and historic resources above all other goals; second, provide quality visitor services at a reasonable cost; third, provide concessionaires with a reasonable opportunity for profit; fourth, provide a fair return on fees, investments, and services to the Government; fifth promote competition in concession contracting. In furtherance of this initiative, the National Park Service issued new concessions management regulations and standard concessions contract language in 1992.

Jim Ridenour had many other successes as Director of the National Park

Service, including invigorating the science capabilities of the Service, strengthening the Service's commitment to education through "Parks as Classrooms," undertaking urgent repairs at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and increasing funding for employee housing.

This spring, Jim and his wife, Ann, will return to Indiana where Jim will join the faculty at Indiana University's School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation as director of the Eppley Institute, a new center on the Bloomington campus that will focus on park management, outdoor recreation, and public land use policy.

Those of us who have worked with Jim Ridenour know that he is an exemplary steward of the National Park Service. He combined his deep respect for the Nation's parks with a fair-minded, practical approach to managing park resources. I wish him well in his new endeavor, and welcome the Ridenours back to Indiana.●

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF THE ESTONIAN REPUBLIC

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, February 24, 1993, marks the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Estonian Republic. For two decades Estonia was a proud sovereign nation—until its illegal annexation by the Soviet Union. It was the pride of the Estonian people, and the confidence that they would eventually prevail, that sustained the nation through the dark years spent under Soviet domination.

As the Estonian people built their nation, their time of independence was not easy. Membership in the community of nations at that time meant being battered by the global depression and other social problems, and the resulting instability. Still, independent Estonia had a source of strength not fully utilized in Soviet Estonia—the pride and determination of an independent and free people. During the Soviet period, Estonians in their social and political lives were not allowed to draw on the traditions and the lessons of Estonia's past to help them to deal with the problems of their present. They were not permitted to work together as a community to face these challenges, but rather were forced, as other Soviet peoples were, to spend much of their efforts simply trying to survive as individuals under an alien, dehumanizing, totalitarian system. Only in the privacy of their homes and such cultural events as their world-renowned song festivals were they able to pass on to younger generations the traditions and customs of the Estonian nation.

Now, in the past year and a half, Estonians have had a chance to work together to seek solutions to their problems. Last summer, they took a major

step by establishing the kroon as their new currency and basing it on the German mark. An immediate effect was to make anachronistic that familiar Soviet institution, the hard currency shop. More importantly, it was an encouraging sign to the many foreign companies which have been investing in Estonia. It makes it easier for Estonians to market their highly educated labor force to businesses around the world.

Estonia does face big challenges. The problems with obtaining the raw materials to run their industries, the need to modernize, and the problems with conducting trade with the other former Soviet Republics are difficult challenges. Still, there is much talent within Estonia's borders, and these talents are being unleashed. And thus Estonia is beginning to take advantage of its position—both geographic and economic—to serve and thrive as the bridge between Western Europe and Russia.

We rejoice at the fact that Estonia is able to celebrate another independence day. After years in which the energies of a significant portion of the world were stifled, we profit when new nations emerge and are able to begin contributing their creativity and ideas to the world. I hope that we are now living at a time when we will take advantage of such happy events.●

CONCERNS AND GOALS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

●Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, last week President Clinton spelled out before Congress and America his vision and plan for the future. I believe he gave an effective and inspirational speech which truly spoke to the concerns and goals of the American people. Many of us listening that night were rightly impressed. Unfortunately, in my view, the methods he outlined are not going to help us reach those goals.

I had hoped to be able to report back to the people of Washington State that this President really means business. I wanted to be able to tell the small businessman in Bellevue, the single mother in Pasco, and senior citizen in Sequim that the leadership in Washington finally gets it—they finally understand that our priority should be to balance the budget, to get this economy moving and to put people back to work.

Further, I had hoped that President Clinton would offer an honest and courageous deficit cutting package that my fellow Republicans and I would be able to support. I wanted to help him keep his campaign promise of halving the deficit over 4 years to put us on the road toward true fiscal responsibility. But, unfortunately, after seeing the policies President Clinton has in store for America, I cannot see down that road.

The President has chosen a clear path in this debate over jobs—and that is what this is, a fundamental debate over how to create jobs and economic opportunities. The path the President has chosen, to tax more and spend more, simply will not work. To quote former President Ronald Reagan, "There they go again."

His plan is relatively simple. He will increase Government spending and increase taxes in an attempt to spur the economy and create jobs.

I have three objections to the President's plan. First, I believe we need to start by reducing bloated Government spending rather than increasing it. Second, we should refrain from squeezing more taxes out of over-burdened Americans when the economy is just beginning to recover from recession. Third, raising taxes does not cut the deficit, as we will see using the President's own numbers. In my view, increased taxes, more Federal spending and rising deficits are hardly a recipe for success.

As I travel around the State, listening to the views of the citizens, I am constantly told that Congress needs to show the American people that we can be trusted with the revenues that we have, that we can live within our means. The people know our track record on this issue certainly is dismal.

Instead of adding on more spending, I believe we need to set priorities and make choices. I completely support full funding for Head Start. Universal child immunization is a fantastic idea. And WIC desperately needs more resources. But this country already spends \$1.5 trillion per year. We have the money. We have the resources and can devote more to these worthwhile programs if we so choose. We do not need to add on more spending, we need to make choices.

It is interesting to follow the evolution of President Clinton's plan in this regard. Recently, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Leon Panetta, came before the Senate Budget Committee, of which I am a member, to testify that the administration was looking at ways to cut spending \$2 for every dollar of new or increased taxes. It was a good start. But we have seen that ratio in free fall in the days since. Now it is barely one to one. The administration cannot even find enough spending cuts to match their exorbitant tax increases.

We have heard a lot about these tax increases, disguised by using buzz words like sacrifices and contributions. These words sound innocuous, but the American people now know what they really mean. They mean a higher burden on almost every working family.

As far as this Senator is concerned, relying on tax increases to stimulate the economy misses the point entirely on economic growth. Why?

Higher taxes mean fewer jobs. I cannot think of an example in the history

of this Nation where increasing taxes helped the economy to grow, businesses to prosper, and created new jobs.

The people of Washington are already suffering from a weakened economy due to timber industry setbacks and huge layoffs at Boeing. In addition, they now face a sweeping tax increase proposed by the new Governor. With these facts, I fail to see how additional burdens will help these people get their jobs back or create new ones for them.

The private sector is far better at producing jobs than is the Government bureaucracy. A tax increase will take money out of the hands of small businesses and the individuals in the private sector who are providing jobs in our communities. Raising taxes gives that money to bloated Federal bureaucracies inevitably reducing the numbers of new jobs created.

A perfect example of how increased taxes will impede the cause of job creation can be found in subchapter S corporations. As some of my colleagues and I tried to explain during last year's debate on the Democratic growth package, subchapter S corporations are America's small business owners. By law these small business owners must take all of the firms' profit in as personal income.

So when President Clinton talks about raising the income tax on the so-called wealthy individuals, substitute small businessman every time you hear him. For that is what he will do. He will take money out of the primary job-creating component of our economy, the small business.

Last year, I took the liberty of contacting some of the subchapter S corporations in my State. We discussed how a tax increase will affect their businesses. Overwhelmingly, they told me that tax increases would restrict investment, cut expansion and hamper job creation. The president of one company went so far as to say that new taxes would push her already struggling company over the brink into bankruptcy. How, Mr. President, will taking money out of the pocket of these small businesses create jobs?

Small businesses provide jobs and economic opportunity for over 1.5 million people and create nearly 50 percent of all new jobs in Washington State alone. We need to foster their growth and provide an environment where they can flourish. Higher taxes from the Federal Government will not do that.

Historically, tax cuts, not tax hikes, have led the way to economic growth and higher Government revenues. And while I am not advocating an across-the-board tax cut, I know that the citizens of Washington with whom I talk do not feel that they are taxed too little—they feel they are taxed too much.

My final objection to the President's plan, and maybe the most important one, is that tax hikes would not reduce

the deficit because Congress will not use any new revenues to pay off the deficit. They will see new revenue simply as a license for new programs. These programs will be well meaning and sound great to the voters back home. And they will be funded and the deficit will continue to grow.

I have seen it firsthand. Between 1948 and 1986, for every dollar raised through increased taxes, we saw the Congress spend an additional \$1.58. The latest example happened just 3 years ago. George Bush, faced with unprecedented budget deficits and out-of-control Government spending agreed to a tax hike provided that, for each dollar raised, we would cut spending by \$2.75. Not surprisingly, the spending cuts never materialized. We were left in a worse situation than before.

This time, using the President's own numbers, spending will grow by an additional \$129 billion over the next 5 years, while at the same time taxes will increase by \$328 billion. That still leaves us in 1998 with a deficit of \$240 billion. Further, it will be headed in only one direction—up. As far out as anyone is willing to project, the deficit will keep getting bigger and bigger. Even the President's own numbers project that. More taxes and more spending will not cure our deficit problem.

But, to the sorrow of the American taxpayer, the Democrats are back at it. They still believe that we can tax our way out of a recession. They think that by taking resources away from productive uses and handing it over to Government bureaucrats, somehow, magically, all our problems will be solved.

In the end, Americans know that if they simply end up paying more taxes without real budget cuts, the deficit will continue to grow, people will still lose their jobs and people lucky enough to hold on to their job will lose the ability to support their families on their tax-shrunk paychecks.

That disaster is of great concern to the people to whom I am listening in the State of Washington, and that is the perspective from which I will have to consider the specific proposals that were outlined in President Clinton's State of the Union address.●

RECENT ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak briefly on recent developments in China. As my colleagues know, in recent weeks the Chinese Government has made several significant gestures which have not gone unnoticed in the United States.

Since January 29, three individuals involved in the Tiananmen Square incident—Wang Dan, Guo Haifeng, and Gao Shan—have been released from prison. One dissident involved in the

1979 Democracy Wall movement, Wang Xizhe, has also been released, as has a Catholic priest named the Reverend Zhu Hongsheng. In addition, two other individuals, Li Jinjin and Zhang Weiguo, were granted passports.

I am particularly pleased because four of these individuals—Wang Dan, Gao Shan, Li Jinjin, and Zhang Weiguo—were listed in a letter which Senators PELL and LEVIN and I presented to the Chinese Foreign Minister and Public Security Minister when we visited Beijing in December 1992.

Another equally promising development, Mr. President, is the announcement on February 17 by the China National Petroleum Corporation that 12 land oil fields will now be open to foreign exploration. While United States firms have made several offshore leases with the CNPC, this invitation constitutes the first offer for onshore development, and it creates the potential for very significant economic cooperation between the United States and China.

I sincerely hope that the Chinese Government will continue to act in this spirit, Mr. President. The steps that have been taken thus far in Beijing are encouraging, and they bring China and the United States another step toward improved relations.●

COMMEMORATING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SALT RIVER PROJECT

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President my best wishes go today to one of Arizona's oldest and best known public institutions, the Salt River Project [SRP], as it celebrates 90 years of providing critical supplies of water and power to the people and businesses of central Arizona. In addition to being the state's largest water supplier, Salt River Project has become the Nation's third largest public power utility, with more than 550,000 customers and generation and transmission links throughout the Southwest.

The impact, however, of the Salt River Project goes far beyond the scope of services that it presently provides.

Founded in 1903 by citizens who pledged their land as collateral for Federal funding to construct Theodore Roosevelt Dam, SRP brought Arizona its first reliable supplies of water. With that water and the subsequent construction of additional dams, SRP enabled the early farming settlements of the Phoenix area to flourish and ultimately become a booming metropolis on the leading edge of Sunbelt growth.

Pioneering vision, persistence, and public partnerships have from the beginning shaped SRP's services and mission. Those same qualities have put SRP at the forefront of efforts to improve air quality. As the lead operator of the 2,250-megawatt Navajo Generating Station in northern Arizona, SRP

negotiated an environmentally sound and affordable solution to visibility issues at Grand Canyon National Park. The company received, and justly deserved, recognition from President George Bush in September of 1991 for their leadership on this issue.

This month, SRP announced the exact method to be used in reducing Navajo Generating Station's [NGS] sulfur dioxide emissions by more than 90 percent, an effort that will make NGS one of the cleanest coal-fired power plants in the Nation. In addition, the company was an active leader in forging Federal acid-rain standards of 1990 and has made strong commitments to energy conservation, electric vehicle development, photovoltaics, solar generation, and nonpolluting fuel cell technology.

Mr. President, much more could be said about the SRP's achievements in providing reliable water, low-cost power, high value services, economic development assistance, and community programs, to the areas it serves. SRP, the infrastructure and services it has provided have contributed greatly to the phenomenal development of the Phoenix metropolitan area.

Mr. President, I salute with gratitude and admiration the Salt River Project and its 4,900 employees for 90 years of dedicated service to Arizona customers and communities.●

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS RULES

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit the rules of the Committee on Environment and Public Works to be printed in the RECORD.

The committee rules follow:

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Rule 1. Regular Meeting Days.—The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the first and third Thursday of each month at 10:00 A.M., except that if there be no business before the committee, the regular meeting shall be omitted.

Rule 2. Committee Meetings.—Subject to section 133(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, committee meetings for the conduct of business, for the purpose of holding hearings, or for any other purpose, shall be called by the chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member. Subcommittee meetings shall be called by the chairman of the respective subcommittee, after consultation with the ranking minority member. Notice of a meeting and the agenda of business to be discussed by the committee will be provided to all members not less than twenty-four hours in advance of such meeting. Additions to the agenda after that time may be made with the concurrence of the ranking minority member. Such 24-hour notice may be waived in an emergency by the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member.

Rule 3. Open Committee Meetings and Legislative Mark-up Sessions.—Meetings of the

committee, including hearings and legislative mark-ups, shall be open to the public, except that a portion or portions of any such meeting may be closed to the public if the committee determines by record vote of a majority of the members of the committee present that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such portion or portions—

(1) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(2) will relate solely to matters of committee staff personnel or internal staff management or procedure; or

(3) constitute any other grounds for closure under paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate (as amended by Senate Resolution 9, 94th Congress).

Rule 4. Presiding Officer.—(a) The chairman shall preside at all meetings and hearings of the committee except that in the absence of the chairman the ranking majority member who is present at the meeting shall preside.

(b) Subcommittee chairmen shall preside at all meetings and hearings of their respective subcommittees, except that in the absence of the subcommittee chairman, the ranking majority member of the subcommittee who is present at the meeting shall preside.

(c) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed by subsections (a) and (b), any member of the committee may preside over the conduct of a hearing.

Rule 5. Quorums.—(a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (d), five members, two of whom shall be members of the minority party, shall constitute a quorum for the conduct of business, except for the purpose of reporting any measure or matter.

(b) Quorums for the conduct of business by the subcommittees shall be a simple majority of the membership of the subcommittees with at least one minority member present.

(c) Once a quorum as prescribed in subsections (a) and (b) has been established for the conduct of business, the committee may continue to conduct business.

(d) Notwithstanding the rule prescribed in subsection (a), one member shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

Rule 6. Proxy Voting.—(a) Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures, amendments, resolutions, or any other issue before the committee or any subcommittees. Any member who is unable to attend the meeting may submit a vote on any such issue, in writing or through personal instructions; however, proxies shall not be voted for the purpose of reporting any measure or matter except when the absent committee member has been informed of the matter on which the vote is being recorded and has affirmatively requested that such vote be so recorded. A proxy given in writing shall be valid until revoked, while a proxy given orally or by personal instructions is valid only on the day given.

(b) At the discretion of the chairman, after consultation with the ranking minority member, members who are unable to be present and whose vote has not been cast by proxy may have their positions recorded on any vote on the same business day so long as the vote will not change the outcome.

Rule 7. Public Announcement of Vote.—Whenever the committee, by rollcall vote, reports any measure or matter, or acts upon any measure or amendments thereto, the report of the committee on such measure or

matter shall include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor of and the votes cast in opposition to such measure or matter by each member of the committee.

Rule 8. Announcement of Hearing.—The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall make public announcement and provide notice to members of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any hearings to be conducted on any measure or matter, at least one week in advance of such hearing, unless the committee chairman, or subcommittee chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date, in which event not less than twenty-four hours notice shall be given.

Rule 9. Statements of Witnesses at Hearings.—(a) Each witness who is scheduled to testify at any hearing of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall file a written statement of proposed testimony not later than noon of the last business day preceding the day on which such witness is scheduled to appear. At the time of appearance, each witness shall supply for the use of the committee or subcommittee, 25 copies of any prepared testimony or such greater number as may be requested in the letter of invitation. Except for witnesses from the Federal Government, this rule may be waived with regard to field hearings.

(b) The presiding officer at a hearing may have a witness confine any oral presentation to a summary of a written statement.

Rule 10. Regularly Established Subcommittees.—The committee shall have five regularly established Subcommittees as follows:

Subcommittee on Water Resources, Transportation, Public Buildings, and Economic Development

Subcommittee on Superfund, Recycling, and Solid Waste Management

Subcommittee on Toxic Substances, Research and Development

Subcommittee on Clean Water, Fisheries and Wildlife

Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Regulation

Rule 11. Subcommittee Membership.—Following consultation with the Majority Members and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, the chairman shall announce selections for membership of the subcommittees referred to in Rule 10.

Rule 12. Environmental Impact Statements.—No project or legislation proposed by the Administration shall be approved or other action taken on such project or legislation unless the committee has received a final environmental impact statement relative to it, in accordance with section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, and the written comments of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in accordance with section 309 of the Clean Air Act. This rule is not intended to broaden, narrow, or otherwise modify the class of projects or legislative proposals for which environmental impact statements are required under section 102(2)(C).

Rule 13. Project Approvals.—(a) Whenever the committee authorizes a project, under Public Law 89-298, Rivers and Harbors Act of 1965, Public Law 83-568, Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, or Public Law 86-249, Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, the chairman shall submit for printing in the Congressional Record, and the Committee shall publish periodically as a committee print, a report that describes the project and the reasons for its approval,

together with any dissenting or individual views.

(b) Proponents of committee resolutions shall submit appropriate evidence showing need for review or reports on river and harbor and flood control projects.

Rule 14. Naming of Public Facilities.—No building, structure or facility authorized by the committee, shall be named for any living person, except former Presidents or former Vice Presidents of the United States, former Members of Congress over 70 years of age, or former Justices of the United States Supreme Court over 70 years of age.

Rule 15. Building Prospectuses.—(a) The committee shall act on all prospectuses for construction (including construction of buildings for lease by the government), alteration and repair, or acquisition submitted by the General Services Administration in accordance with section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, and such action shall be completed by the date of May 15 during the same session in which such prospectuses are submitted to Congress. The committee may consider prospectuses submitted for alterations or repairs necessitated by emergency building conditions at any time during the same session of the Congress in which they are submitted. Prospectuses rejected by majority vote of the committee or not contained in any bill reported to the Senate shall be returned to the GSA and must then be resubmitted in order to be considered for action by the committee during the next session of the Congress.

(b) Reports of building project surveys submitted by the General Services Administration to the committee under section 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, shall not be considered by the committee as being prospectuses subject to approval by committee resolution in accordance with section 7(a) of that Act. Projects described in such survey reports shall be considered for committee action only if they are submitted as prospectuses in accordance with section 7(a) and they shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (a) of this rule.

Rule 16. Broadcasting of Hearings.—Public hearings of the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may be televised or broadcast, or recorded for television or broadcast, upon notification in advance to the chairman through the chief clerk. During public hearings, photographers and other reporters using mechanical recording or filming devices shall position and use their equipment in such fashion as will not interfere with the seating, vision, or hearing of Committee Members or staff on the dais, nor with the orderly process of the hearing.

Rule 17. Amendment of Rules.—The rules may be added to, modified, amended, or suspended by a majority of the Committee Membership.♦

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

♦ Mr. BYRD, Mr. President, in accordance with paragraph 2 of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I submit the rules of the Committee on Appropriations to be printed in the Record.

The rules follow:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—RULES¹

I. MEETINGS

The Committee will meet at the call of the Chairman.

¹ Adopted pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the "Standing Rules of the Senate."

II. QUORUMS

1. Reporting a bill. A majority of the members must be present for the reporting of a bill.
2. Other business. For the purpose of transacting business other than reporting a bill or taking testimony, one-third of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum.
3. Taking testimony. For the purpose of taking testimony, other than sworn testimony, by the Committee or any subcommittee, one member of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum. For the purpose of taking sworn testimony by the Committee, three members shall constitute a quorum, and for the taking of sworn testimony by any subcommittee, one member shall constitute a quorum.

III. PROXIES

Except for the reporting of a bill, votes may be cast by proxy when any member so requests.

IV. ATTENDANCE OF STAFF MEMBERS AT CLOSED SESSIONS

Attendance of Staff Members at closed sessions of the Committee shall be limited to those members of the Committee Staff that have a responsibility associated with the matter being considered at such meeting. This rule may be waived by unanimous consent.

V. BROADCASTING AND PHOTOGRAPHING OF COMMITTEE HEARING

The Committee or any of its subcommittees may permit the photographing and broadcast of open hearings by television and/or radio. However, if any member of a subcommittee objects to the photographing or broadcasting of an open hearing, the question shall be referred to the Full Committee for its decision.

VI. AVAILABILITY OF SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

To the extent possible, when the bill and report of any subcommittee are available, they shall be furnished to each member of the Committee thirty-six hours prior to the Committee's consideration of said bill and report.

VII. AMENDMENTS AND REPORT LANGUAGE

To the extent possible, amendments and report language intended to be proposed by Senators at Full Committee markups shall be provided in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member and the appropriate Subcommittee Chairman and Ranking Minority Member twenty-four hours prior to such markups.

VIII. POINTS OF ORDER

Any member of the Committee who is floor manager of an appropriation bill, is hereby authorized to make points of order against any amendment offered in violation of the Senate Rules on the floor of the Senate to such appropriation bill.

THE CHILD SUPPORT TAX EQUITY ACT

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be a cosponsor of the Child Support Tax Equity Act, introduced by Senator BUMPERS. This bill will provide critical assistance to the millions of parents, primarily mothers, and children who are owed child support and who desperately need these funds in order to survive.

Under this provision parents who are owed more than \$500 in child support,

and who make less than \$50,000, will be able to take a tax deduction for the amount of the overdue child support. This reduces their tax liability for as long as the child support remains unpaid. In addition, the parent who has failed to pay legally required child support must list the amount overdue as income and pay taxes on that amount. If the parent fails to pay taxes, then the full weight of IRS enforcement and penalties can be brought to bear against them, a far more formidable threat than our current, often ineffectual, attempts to enforce child support orders.

This measure will accomplish two goals at once. It will provide those children and parents not receiving their court-ordered child support with some much-needed financial relief at tax time. It will also provide yet another avenue for penalizing parents who neglect their child support obligations. In addition, the bill will actually raise revenue over the next 6 years, because the fathers who are delinquent in their child support payments usually make more money than the mothers and children who are owed support. The fathers will, therefore, pay taxes on the amount due at higher rate than the mothers who are getting the deduction.

Despite significant efforts by States and the Federal Government, the child support collection rate hovers around 20 percent. Eighty percent of children for whom support has been ordered are receiving only some or none of the support owed. In many cases, that means the custodial parent cannot pay the rent, provide health insurance or medical care, and that the child does not have clothes to wear to school, or food to eat for breakfast. This provision provides an important new avenue of relief for those parents and children who have not been able to force payment of child support, and a new method of enforcement against parents who are refusing to pay support.

I look forward to working with Senator BUMPERS and Senator DURENBERGER on this important legislation. I look forward to its passage early in this Congress to ensure that this provision becomes law this year.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

• Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 32, the first concurrent resolution on the budget for 1996.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the budget through February 18, 1993. The esti-

mates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues, which are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the concurrent resolution on the budget (H. Con. Res. 287), show that current level spending is below the budget resolution by \$2.1 billion in budget authority and \$0.5 billion in outlays. Current level is \$0.5 billion above the revenue floor in 1993 and above by \$1.4 billion over the 5 years, 1993-97. The current estimate of the deficit for purposes of calculating the maximum deficit amount is \$392.4 billion, \$28.4 billion below the maximum deficit amount for 1993 of \$420.8 billion.

There has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues since the last report, dated February 16, 1993.

The report follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, February 22, 1993.
Hon. JIM SASSER,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The attached report shows the effects of Congressional action on the budget for fiscal year 1993 and is current through February 18, 1993. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 287). This report is submitted under Section 308(b) and in aid of Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, and meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of Section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the 1986 First Concurrent Resolution on the Budget.

Since my last report, dated February 16, 1993, there has been no action that affects the current level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues.

Sincerely,

JAMES L. BLUM,
(For Robert D. Reischauer).

THE ON-BUDGET CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE, 103D CONG. 1ST SESS., SENATE SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993 AS OF CLOSE OF BUSINESS FEB. 18, 1993

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED IN PREVIOUS SESSIONS			
Revenues			849,425
Permanents and other spending legislation	764,283	737,413	
Appropriation legislation	732,061	743,943	
Offsetting receipts	(240,524)	(240,524)	
Total previously enacted	1,255,820	1,240,833	849,425
ENACTED THIS SESSION			
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution baseline estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	(7,928)	962	
Total current level ¹	1,247,892	1,241,794	849,425
Total budget resolution ²	1,249,990	1,242,290	848,890
Amount remaining:			
Under budget resolution	2,098	496	
Over budget resolution			535

¹In accordance with the Budget Enforcement Act, the total does not include \$1,145,000 in budget authority and \$5,988,000 in outlays in emergency funding.

²Includes revision under sec. 9 of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

Note.—Amounts in parentheses are negative.

THE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR THE U.S. SENATE,
103D CONG. 1ST SESS., AS OF FEB. 18, 1993

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget res- olution (H. Con. Res. 287)	Current level ¹	Current level +/- resolution
On-budget:			
Budget authority	1,250.0	1,247.9	-2.1
Outlays	1,242.3	1,241.8	-.5
Revenues:			
1993	849.9	849.4	+ .5
1993-97	4,818.6	4,820.0	+1.4
Maximum deficit amount	420.8	392.4	-28.4
Debt subject to limit	4,671.1	4,099.2	-571.9
Off-budget:			
Social Security outlays:			
1993	260.0	260.0
1993-97	1,415.0	1,415.0
Social Security revenues:			
1993	328.1	328.1	(?)
1993-97	1,865.0	1,865.0	(?)

¹ Current level represents the estimated revenue and direct spending effects of all legislation that Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations even if the appropriations have not been made. The current level of debt subject to limit reflects the latest U.S. Treasury information on public debt transactions.

² Less than \$50,000,000.

Note.—Detail may not add due to rounding.*

TUCSON WELCOMES THE COLORADO ROCKIES

• Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, on Friday, March 5, 1993, my hometown of Tucson, AZ, will host a reception to welcome the newest member of the Cactus League, the Colorado Rockies. The Rockies will hold their spring training at Hi Corbett Field in Tucson.

I would like to join the great people of Tucson in welcoming the Rockies to Tucson. Although the first pitch has not yet been thrown, we are already big fans of our new spring training team. We are excited and honored to be a part of the Rockies' beginning, and I know the weather and the hospitality of Tucson will give the Rockies the boost they need for a successful season. I wish the Rockies the best of luck in the months and years ahead and look forward to a long, productive relationship.

The Rockies' players and management staff will be on hand at the March 5 community reception to enjoy food, fun, and festivities and to mingle with fellow Tucsonans and other fans. Proceeds from the reception will be used to rename the University of Arizona Foundation and Arizona Alumni Association building at my alma mater, the University of Arizona. The building is being renamed to honor a personal friend and fellow graduate of the University of Arizona, Marvin D. Swede Johnson. Swede currently serves as vice president for corporate affairs for the Coors Brewing Co.

For more than 30 years, Swede Johnson was instrumental in shaping the University of Arizona. He held various positions at the university and eventually became vice president for university relations. During his tenure, Swede's straightforward and energetic manner served the university greatly and, more recently, was instrumental in selling Tucson as the spring training

home of the Colorado Rockies. Much of the growth and success of the University of Arizona can be attributed to Swede.

As someone who was once a young baseball fan in Tucson, I especially appreciate Swede's success in helping to bring the Colorado Rockies baseball team to Tucson. The Tucson community is grateful for Swede's efforts, thrilled to be part of baseball history, and excited to watch major league baseball. Tucson eagerly awaits the commencement of the coming season and the chance to support and cheer for our newest home team, the Colorado Rockies. Welcome to Tucson. Now, play ball.●

REPORT ON TRIP TO MIDDLE EAST

• Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, from February 6 to 14, I visited Israel, Egypt, and Jordan in my capacity as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee. My purpose was to discuss the Middle East peace process, to explain the upcoming review of U.S. foreign assistance and the need for reform, and to conduct oversight of U.S. foreign assistance programs in the area. I ask to include in the RECORD at this point the report on my trip which I submitted to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

The report follows:

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC, February 24, 1993.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S.
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR BOB: Enclosed is a report on my trip to the Middle East during the February recess. The trip was of great value in my work as chairman of the Foreign Operations subcommittee, particularly in light of the need to reform the foreign aid program. I believe my discussions with Secretary Christopher on my return, just prior to his departure for the Middle East, were also of importance to his preparations.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman,
Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

CODEL LEAHY VISIT TO ISRAEL, EGYPT, AND JORDAN

Senator Leahy, chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, visited Israel, Egypt and Jordan between February 6-14. Senator Leahy was accompanied by Mrs. Leahy, Ellen Lovell, his Administrative Assistant, and Eric Newsom, majority clerk, Foreign Operations subcommittee. The purposes of the trip were:

To discuss with leaders of Israel, Egypt and Jordan the Middle East peace process, the problem of the deportees and Secretary Christopher's upcoming visit to the region;

To explain the upcoming review of U.S. foreign assistance and the need for reform; and

To conduct oversight of U.S. foreign assistance programs in the area, including the Is-

raeli immigrant absorption loan guarantee program.

In preparation for the trip, Senator Leahy met with Secretary of State Warren Christopher and Deputy Secretary of State Clifton Wharton, Assistant Secretary of State for Near East Affairs Edward Djerejian, Israeli Ambassador Zaimon Shoval, Egyptian Ambassador el Sayed, and Dr. Osama el Baz, Advisor to President Mubarak of Egypt. In addition, Senator Leahy was briefed by U.S. intelligence officials on the Middle East situation.

Upon his return to the United States, Senator Leahy met Secretary of State Christopher and Assistant Secretary of State Edward Djerejian to review his discussions with Middle East leaders and to present Secretary Christopher with his assessment of the situation prior to the Secretary's own trip to the region beginning February 17. Senator Leahy also met Palestinian Spokeswoman Hanan Ashrawi in Washington immediately after his return to continue discussing the views of the Palestinians, and with Israeli Foreign Minister Shimon Peres.

ISRAEL

In Israel, on February 8 Senator Leahy met U.S. Ambassador William Harrop in two separate meetings prior to discussions with Israeli officials. Senator Leahy then met Jewish Agency head Simcha Dinitz and subsequently Finance Minister Avram Shohat to discuss the U.S. loan guarantee program to assist Israel to absorb immigrants, primarily from the former Soviet Union. The discussions centered around Israel's plans for using the loan guarantees, and Senator Leahy's intention to monitor the program closely to ensure full compliance with U.S. conditions in providing the guarantees.

Later, Senator Leahy met with Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin to discuss the peace process and the problem of the deportees. In order to be able to discuss sensitive matters relating to the deportees, the meeting was restricted to the Senator, Prime Minister Rabin and a notetaker from each side. The Senator then proceeded to a meeting with Foreign Minister Shimon Peres to continue discussing the Middle East peace process. Central Bank Governor Jacob Frankel participated in the discussion, and there was a detailed review of the economic and fiscal reform measures Israel needs to carry out to be able to absorb the influx of immigrants and to use the U.S. loan guarantees effectively. Senator Leahy visited the Israeli Knesset and met Likud Party leader Binyamin Netanyahu, also to discuss the peace process and the deportees. Finally, after a brief meeting with former Likud Party Defense Minister Moshe Arens, Senator Leahy met a group of Palestinian peace negotiators at a dinner hosted by Molly Williamson, U.S. Consul General in Jerusalem. This produced an intense discussion of the state of the peace talks, Palestinian concerns about the lack of progress, the problems created by the deportations, and the role the Palestinians hope the Clinton Administration will play.

Unfortunately, plans Senator Leahy had made to visit the Gaza Strip the next day to visit a major AID project there had to be canceled on the advice of Ambassador Harrop because of security concerns. Several Palestinians had been shot by Israeli security forces over the previous few days and there were daily incidents in Gaza. Instead, the Consul General arranged for Senator Leahy to visit several AID projects in the West Bank intended to assist Palestinians. The delegation also toured Israeli settle-

ments in the territory and received briefings from Consulate staff on Israeli settlement activities. Senator Leahy also met West Bank Palestinians to hear their views on Israel's actions and role in the territories and their disillusionment with the peace talks. The delegation also visited a Palestinian refugee camp to listen to Palestinian inhabitants and to see projects AID is carrying out to alleviate conditions.

EGYPT

Wednesday, February 10, Senator Leahy met U.S. Ambassador William Pelletreau in Cairo to discuss Egypt's role in the Middle East peace process. Senator Leahy then had a lengthy meeting with President Hosni Mubarak in which the Middle East peace process was discussed, as well as a general review of the situation throughout the region. President Mubarak indicated he wished to continue the discussion later, and invited Senator Leahy to have breakfast the next morning. Subsequently, Senator Leahy met Chief of Staff of the Egyptian Armed Forces General Halaby and members of his staff and Defense Minister Tantawi to discuss US-Egyptian security relations and U.S. military assistance levels. This was followed by a long meeting with Foreign Minister Amre Moussa to continue in depth discussions of the peace talks and the problem of the deportees. After this meeting Senator Leahy sent a message to Amman, Jordan requesting meetings with King Hussein and the Prime Minister.

The morning of Thursday, February 11, Senator Leahy delayed his plans to travel to Upper Egypt to review AID projects and met with President Mubarak over breakfast to continue discussions about the peace process and other regional matters of concern. The delegation then left for Aswan to inspect and to be briefed on the \$140 million AID project to replace all twelve turbines at the High Dam, one of the largest U.S. aid projects in Egypt. The project appears to be proceeding smoothly. The Delegation then traveled to Luxor where it was met by Peter Dorman, Director of the University of Chicago project financed by AID. The delegation met the American staff over dinner at Chicago House to be briefed on the US-financed programs run by the University of Chicago, and the next day was given a tour of the program by Chicago House staff. In the meantime, messages continued to be exchanged between the delegation and the U.S. embassy in Amman concerning the change in schedule that would permit Senator Leahy to fly to Jordan to meet the King.

JORDAN

February 13, the delegation traveled to Amman, where Senator Leahy first met Ambassador Harrison to get prepared for his meetings with Jordanian leaders. Senator Leahy then met with Prime Minister Bin Shaker to discuss issues related to the peace talks, US-Jordanian relations and U.S. military and economic assistance to Jordan, as well as Jordanian enforcement on U.N. sanctions against Iraq. This was followed by a meeting with King Hussein to continue discussions on the same subjects. The talks continued over lunch hosted by King Hussein and Queen Noor.

PEACE TALKS

All parties recognize that the peace talks are temporarily stalled by the Israeli action to deport over 400 West Bank Palestinians, allegedly supporters of the terrorist Islamic extremist group Hamas. Television images of the Palestinian deportees huddled in freezing weather on a hillside in Lebanon

have aroused public opinion throughout the Arab world, even among secular Arabs not given to supporting Islamic extremists. It has become politically impossible, according to all Arab parties who met with Senator Leahy, for the Palestinian negotiators to return to the talks until there is a more acceptable solution to the deportee issue.

Israel and some Arabs tend to see the problem of the deportees as primarily a difficult but solvable task for diplomacy and not as a mortal danger to the peace process. In this view, the challenge is essentially to find further steps, such as expedited review and return of deportees in an accelerated time period, and that the fortuitous occurrence of the Muslim religious holiday of Ramadan provides the necessary time for diplomacy to produce this solution. Others, especially the Palestinians, argue that the problem of the deportees presents serious risks to the continuation of the peace process. The already building anger among Palestinians over the lack of results from the Madrid talks is now becoming a rage that makes it unlikely the Palestinians can return to the talks unless the problem of the deportees is resolved in a process that will result in compliance with UN Security Council Resolution 799.

It is clear that without a resolution of the deportee issue, there is a major risk to the peace process. All sides agree that the present is a unique opportunity to achieve substantial progress in the talks, but that most of the Arabs, particularly the key parties of the Palestinians and Syria, cannot or do not dare return to the bargaining table without some resolution of the deportee issue tolerable to Arab opinion.

Israel also appears to believe major negotiating accomplishments are possible in 1993, possibly even achievement of a general peace settlement. The Israelis say they understand Israel must take risks to have peace, and they are prepared to take risks for real peace. The Israelis say they accept the land for peace formula, but not all land, and the peace must be genuine, not merely non-belligerency. The Israelis say they are ready to negotiate a self government authority in the West Bank for an interim period of coexistence before negotiations on a final settlement of the status of the territories.

The views of nearly all parties with whom Senator Leahy met in the Middle East indicate that the Arab parties as well as at last ready to make real compromises with Israel, including acceptance of peace treaties and diplomatic relations, if Israel is prepared to withdraw from territories occupied during the 1967 war and subsequently. The Palestinians seem genuinely committed to accept a self government authority that falls short of their initial demands for most of the trappings of sovereignty.

All the ingredients for progress appear to be present, assuming two critical conditions are met: 1. There is some compromise on the deportees that will make it politically (and physically) safe for the Palestinians to resume the talks; and 2. the United States plays a leadership role in bringing the parties together and assisting the process to move forward. The only way to know whether these assumptions are warranted is for the U.S. to engage in a sustained, high level effort to get the Madrid talks resumed and to lend its good offices to helping the sides find solutions. Such a major U.S. diplomatic and political effort cannot be guaranteed success in such a high risk endeavor as the Middle East peace process. But it is absolutely clear there is no chance whatsoever for peace without the leadership of the Clinton administration.

THE ABSORPTION LOAN GUARANTEES

Israel is presently raising the first \$2 billion in financing using the U.S. loan guarantees. The Government plans to concentrate the assistance on building basic infrastructure, job creation and stimulation of economic growth. A central precondition to success in the immigrant absorption effort is thorough economic reform. Israel needs to liberalize its trade and investment regimes, achieve greater privatization of its economy, achieve greater discipline in government expenditures and fiscal policy, and in general reduce the direct role of government in the economy. All these actions will require politically difficult decisions. Failure to achieve reform will undermine the effect of the \$10 billion loan guarantee program, and could drive the cost of the program upward.

Under the arrangement agreed between President Bush and Prime Minister Rabin last summer, the reduction in the amount of loan guarantees to be made available to offset Israeli Government expenditures on settlements will not apply to construction prior to October 1, 1992. This is regrettable because the original Leahy-Kasten Compromise would have made the offset effective as of January 1, 1992. If the Rabin Government does complete or sell the housing units presently under construction or ready for occupancy, the Israeli settler population of the territories could increase significantly, perhaps by as much as 50%.

The Foreign Operations subcommittee plans to hold hearings on the loan guarantee program as part of its oversight responsibility.

REVIEW OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

When the intention of the Congress and the Administration to undertake a top to bottom review of U.S. foreign aid programs was explained, all parties in Israel, Egypt and Jordan reacted with concern. All made the case for continued aid at present or even higher levels in the case of Jordan, though both Israeli and Egyptian leaders acknowledged that they could not expect the U.S. to continue its currently high levels of military and economic assistance indefinitely. Both argued strongly that U.S. assistance has major policy implications, as well as serving national security and economic needs. ●

FIGHTING OBESITY

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, as we all know, obesity is one of the most prevalent diseases in our society, affecting 34 million American adults between the ages of 20 and 74. In addition to the physical strain of added weight, obesity has been shown to be associated with serious illnesses, including diabetes and cardiovascular diseases.

Not long ago, the citizens of a small town in northeast Wisconsin decided to tackle the problem of obesity, and have received a great deal of national attention as a result.

The town is Pound, WI. And on July 8, 1992, the people of Pound volunteered to participate in a 4-month weight loss program sponsored by the Slim-Fast Foods Co.

One hundred and sixty people signed up for the program. After 16 weeks on the plan, 131 people had lost an average of 19.8 pounds—or 1.2 pounds per person per week. The participants accom-

plished this feat by following the Ultra Slim-Fast weight loss plan; an Ultra Slim-Fast shake for breakfast and lunch, 3 low-calorie snacks throughout the day, and a well-balanced low-fat meal for dinner. In addition, participants were encouraged to start a regular exercise routine and make a commitment to change their eating habits. Residents of Pound say that the program has made a real difference in their lives. Their weight loss has made them feel more self-confident and more energetic. And many of them have adopted a new lifestyle, including better eating habits.

I am not here to endorse the Ultra Slim-Fast weight loss plan. But I do believe we should recognize the combined efforts of the citizens of Pound, WI, and the Slim-Fast Foods Co. Working together, they made the community slimmer, healthier, and happier. Indeed, the program was so well received that the mayor of Pound, Richard Adamski, who lost 27 pounds himself, has said: "At this rate, the town of Pound will soon be called Ounces."

The people of Pound, WI, and the Slim-Fast Foods Co. are to be congratulated. Usually there is cause for concern when a small town in our State gets even smaller. In this case, the shrinking of Pound is a cause for celebration.●

CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT BICENTENNIAL HONOR

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize the distinguished law firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft on the occasion of its bicentennial. The firm was founded by John Wells in the city of New York in 1792, just 16 years after the Declaration of Independence was signed and 1 year after the Bill of Rights was ratified. It has been a continuous practice ever since.

In addition to the substantial impact which this firm has had on American law, business, finance, and professions and the arts, its partners have made important personal and professional contributions to American life. Earlier partners of the firm were among the founders of the U.S. Public Health Services, Columbia Law School, the Japan Society, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the New York Public Library, as well as other institutions.

The firm was the first Wall Street law firm, for example, to admit a woman to a partnership. Cadwalader's 105 partners, 18 counsels, 175 associates, and over 400 administrative and support personnel operate in four offices—in lower Manhattan; Washington, DC; Palm Beach, FL; and Los Angeles, CA. The firm owns its own major office building in New York City, a significant expression of confidence in the city in which it has practiced for 200 years.

What has especially impressed me is the firm's approach to celebrating its bicentennial. Its theme looks forward rather than backward—entitled "Our Third Century." In this spirit, Cadwalader has chosen pro bono service as the heart of its celebration.

The firm has advanced a bicentennial lecture series for its clients, friends, attorneys, and staff. Speakers have included corporate, financial, sports, and legal leaders, offering forward-looking views in their fields of expertise.

Cadwalader is now preparing the first legal guide to fighting street drug markets for community organizations and their lawyers in New York City. Its intent is to explain civil, administrative, and other remedies available to rid apartment buildings and streets of the scourge of drug trafficking. The firm is contributing to the labor and time of partners, associates, and summer associates in preparing this document in association with the American Alliance for Rights & Responsibilities. It will serve as an invaluable prototype for other cities across the Nation.

The firm is laying plans for a major forum on care-giving, an area of growing concern not only to the practitioners in all the medical and other helping professions but also, of course, to all the American people.

The firm is making important contributions to education with a substantial college scholarship grant to students in a Brooklyn, NY, high school and by backing up its dollars with teaching and coaching students interested in the law as a career. The firm also made a grant to the century-old Dunbar High School in Washington, DC, to advance the school's Enterprise Program, which prepares students for careers in the U.S. space program.

These are only a few of the pro bono programs being advanced as part of the firm's celebration.

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft has found a thoughtful, generous, meaningful way to celebrate its 200th anniversary. I commend the firm on its extraordinary history and its memorable birthday.●

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

● Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I rise today on the 75th anniversary of Estonian independence to pay tribute to Estonia and its brave people. After more than 50 years of struggle, Estonians have succeeded in gaining the freedom which they so justly deserve.

Estonia's recent fight for independence found its roots in Estonia's previous period of statehood immediately following World War I. On February 24, 1918, Estonia proclaimed its independence, ending several hundred years of foreign dominance and oppression. During this period, Estonia enjoyed full recognition from the community of states. It was recognized by Russia in

1920 and joined the League of Nations in 1921. Estonia strengthened its status as an independent, democratic nation-state by creating a solid economic base and recognizing the human rights of minorities living within its borders.

Like the other Baltic States, Estonia's independence was tragically cut short by the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact between Stalinist Russia and Nazi Germany, which provided for Soviet occupation of the Baltic States. Following the 1940 invasion of Estonia by the Soviets, thousands of Estonians were killed, deported, or otherwise brutally repressed. For more than half of the 20th century, the republic's brief period of independence served only as a symbol to Estonians under Soviet dominance, in Michigan, and around the world, that freedom was an attainable and worthy goal. On September 21, 1991, after the failure of the Soviet coup, Estonia's freedom was restored.

Since the declaration in 1991, Estonia has worked hard and long to repair and reform its battered country. On September 20, 1992, Estonia conducted its first fully free elections, resulting in the election of Lennart Meri as President. Estonia has further solidified its presence on the international scene by joining the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe in September 1991, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development in December 1991, and the International Monetary Fund and World Bank in early 1992.

Estonia has sought to stabilize its economy and reaffirm its independence by establishing its own currency, the kroon, which is pegged to the German mark. The new currency has shown significant success, revealed most notably in the quadrupling of Estonia's foreign-exchange reserves from \$50 million in June 1992 to \$195 million in December 1992. Estonia has also expanded its export base and currently sells only one third of its goods to CIS countries when previously they sold nearly 90 percent of their goods to CIS countries.

Unfortunately, Estonia still faces formidable challenges. Estonia still suffers from a generally weak economy—the result of its former integration with and total dependence upon the Soviet system. This shaky economic picture is exacerbated by tensions arising from Russian ownership of many industrial, telecommunications, and locomotive plants located in Estonia and previously run by the Soviets. Estonians must also confront severe environmental damage inflicted upon them by 50 years of Soviet rule. Finally, Estonia faces the challenge of how to treat the Russian minority which comprises more than 30 percent of the population.

Despite the difficult challenges ahead, the Estonian Republic holds great promise. I fully support efforts to assist Estonia and the rest of the Bal-

tic States as they make the transition from socialist to free market economies. On this 75th anniversary of Estonian independence, let us pledge not to forget Estonia's rich history and culture and to do all we can to help Estonia become a prosperous and free nation. •

TRIBUTE TO G. SCOTT PORTER

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the U.S. Senate to join me in paying tribute to Mr. G. Scott Porter on his 90th birthday. Mr. Porter has devoted his life unselfishly to his family, church, and community.

In 1945, Mr. Porter served as minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Rolla, MO, until his retirement in 1968. Under his leadership the congregation not only grew, but took the challenge of building a new sanctuary, chapel, and Sunday school. Further, they paid off the mortgage in the shortest time of any comparable church of its size.

Mr. Porter also served as the supply minister to the Elk Prairie Presbyterian Church during 1945 to 1968. After his retirement from the Rolla Church, he continued to serve as supply minister for the Elk Prairie Church, as well as churches in Cuba, Sullivan, and Willow Springs, MO, many times driving over 300 miles on a Sunday to conduct services.

While still being an active and dedicated servant of the church, Mr. Porter was a member of the Rolla Masonic Lodge and Rolla Rotary Club, where he served as treasurer until his 85th birthday.

Mr. President, I would like my colleagues to know that this dedicated Missourian is representative of the American patriotism which still exists in this great Nation today. Our Nation has been blessed because of people like Mr. G. Scott Porter. I commend his lifetime of service and extend my appreciation for his compassion toward his fellow man. •

THE WOMEN'S CENTURY

• Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, to celebrate Women's History Month, March 1993, I want to go back to last year, 1992. Commentators, pundits, and political prognosticators called it the Year of the Woman, mainly for the record numbers of women who ran for public office across the country that year—and with considerable success. The Senate benefited from 1992—we are quite fortunate to have four new women Members, for a total of six women—more than the Senate has ever had in its history. The House of Representatives has 19 new women Members for a total of 48.

Some attribute this change to the controversy surrounding Anita Hill's allegations against Clarence Thomas.

But I believe the roots of women's growing involvement in the political process go back much further than that. The Year of the Woman sprang from the efforts of bold women and pioneering organizations that shaped the political, societal and economic forces that changed the status of women in America in the 20th century. I like to call it the Women's Century.

One of these pioneering organizations in my home State of Michigan marked its 75th anniversary on February 12, 1993. The Michigan chapter of the Federation of Business and Professional Women started out with only three members. These three bold women were Emily Butterfield, an architect; Emma Spoor, a publisher; and Grace Wright, a manufacturer's agent. In an attempt to "offset the loneliness of the pioneer business women," they met over lunch in Detroit and founded the Detroit Business Women's Club in 1912.

The nucleus of these three friends soon attracted other pioneering business and professional women from other Michigan cities. Between 1912 and 1918, women in Bay City, Grand Rapids, Saginaw, and Flint formed clubs similar to the one in Detroit to give them a forum to discuss the challenges facing women in business. In 1918, these groups met for their first annual convention. The following year, they joined women in other States to form the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs [BPW].

Mr. President, I invite my colleagues to think about what it must have been like for these pioneers of the early 20th century. These organizations were started in an attempt to combat the loneliness women in business faced. This loneliness was real. Not only were they few in number, but at that time, women were politically, socially, and economically isolated in America. But women fought to break out of this isolation by attacking the barriers that prevented their full participation in American society.

The first barrier—the lack of the right to vote—fell in 1920 with the ratification of the 19th amendment to the Constitution. This ended the political isolation of women. The victory came after a long fight which began back in 1869. The movement was started in that year by bold women like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Lucy Stone who founded organizations dedicated to women's suffrage. In no small way these women made the Year of the Woman possible by giving women the ability to exercise the fundamental means of political participation. Without the ability to wield political power, no group—indeed, no individual—can advance in American society.

The next step was the elimination of the economic isolation of women. The BPW, both nationally and in Michigan,

as well as other women's organizations, were leaders in this fight. In 1918, the Detroit Business Women's Club endorsed the position of equal pay for equal service—amazingly, women are still fighting for this goal. During its second convention in 1920, the BPW recognized the need for better training and education for women as a means to gain the tools for economic success. They established a plan to work in close cooperation with business schools to improve educational opportunities for women. The BPW has continued to work to improve economic opportunity for women through the present day.

Finally, women addressed the social isolation they faced. In 1923, Alice Paul, founder of the National Women's Party, authored the equal rights amendment [ERA] to the Constitution; enactment and ratification of the ERA is essential to ensuring equality for women in both the law and the life of the land. This fight has continued throughout the remainder of the century. The ERA was a rallying point for many of the organizations involved in the women's rights movement of the 1960's such as the National Organization for Women and the Women's Equity Action League. Unfortunately, the ERA is still not law, but women's organizations will continue to fight for its passage.

Mr. President, the country has come a long way since these bold, visionary women set out to change the status of women in American society. And I recognize that the country still has a lot of work to do before we can say that women have reached complete integration and freedom. But without the efforts of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony; or the organization that the three business women from Michigan, Emily Butterfield, Emma Spoor, and Grace Wright helped to start; and without the work of Alice Paul and all the other bold women who came after them, 1992 would have been just another election year. The steps these women took, and the forces of historical, societal, and economic change that they put into motion during this—the Women's Century—deserve special recognition as we celebrate Women's History Month. •

TRIBUTE TO HELEN L. PORTER

• Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I would like to pay tribute to a remarkable lady from Missouri, Mrs. Helen L. Porter, who devoted her life to serving others for many years.

In 1950, Mrs. Porter was employed as a service club director at Fort Leonard Wood. During her years there, she became Ma Porter for literally thousands of draftees who were away from home for the first time in their lives. She talked many an inductee out of going AWOL, when he thought he could not handle the Army.

Mrs. Porter introduced Robert Templeton, a young artist, to people in Rolla and St. Louis. He did hundreds of portraits during the time he was at Fort Leonard Wood and later went on to become an accomplished artist whose works include portraits of Presidents Johnson and Carter.

Mrs. Porter, along with her husband Mr. G. Scott Porter, opened her home to students from the University of Missouri-Rolla without restrictions. Fellowship groups were held on Sunday evenings and during the holidays, everyone was invite to dinner. On more than one occasion, they gave a couple who could not find a place to live a bedroom until they could find permanent housing.

Although Mrs. Porter was working full time, she still was active in many church and community activities. Mrs. Porter was a true lady, and I commend her for her values and principles.

Mr. President, Mrs. Helen L. Porter is sincerely missed by her family and friends, as well as all of those who have benefited from her exacting judgment and her warm friendliness. We salute those whose enthusiasm and deeds bring good to the community in ever-increasing measure. When we give of ourselves, we experience the renewing power of life.●

C-17 PAYLOAD-RANGE SPEC

● Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I ask that an article that appeared in the February 15, 1993 edition of *Aviation Week & Space Technology* entitled, "C-17 Payload-Range Spec Called Outdated," be inserted in the RECORD in its entirety at this point so that I may comment on the remarks attributed to Gen. Ronald Fogleman, commander of Air Mobility Command.

An Air Force general has questioned whether the McDonnell Douglas C-17 transport program should be saddled with a contractual payload-range specification which he called outdated.

Air Force officials estimate the C-17 is 5.5-6% short of meeting the payload-range goal, which was eased two years ago to enable Douglas Aircraft Co. to have a better chance of reaching the goal (*AW&ST* Apr. 15, 1991, p. 74).

Gen. Ronald R. Fogleman, commander of the Air Mobility Command, however, said the current aircraft satisfies virtually all operational requirements—despite the shortfall. He added that he is concerned too much attention may be paid to meeting a single specification.

"From an operational standpoint, the airplane meets my needs," Fogleman said. "We should not change contractual specifications, but we ought to recognize that there is a big difference between a contractual specification and an operational requirement."

"Particularly if the contractual specification was written during the Cold War period, and we were trying to get 10 divisions to Europe in 10 days and we had our KC-135 tanker force engaged in SIOP [single integrated operational plan] war commitment." He added that the command can take the C-17

anywhere in the world at any weight load because the aircraft is air-refuelable. Maximum C-17 payload weight is 172,200 lb.

The current C-17 payload-range specification calls for the aircraft to carry 160,000 lb. of payload over a distance of 2,400 naut. mi. in what is known as a Category 1 mission.

Fogleman said a demonstration flight late last month of a C-17 from Edwards AFB, Calif., to Eglin AFB, Fla., showed the aircraft can carry 160,838 lb. of payload unrefueled over a circuitous route of 2,786 naut. mi. The aircraft, however, flew a Category 2 overland mission which requires less fuel reserves.

Fogleman said the demonstration flight was intended to show the current operational utility of the aircraft rather than to try to meet the payload-range specification.

"Let's quit holding up the whole program focusing on this one contractual specification that has little or no operational utility," Fogleman said. "In other words, if somebody starts talking about taking core thrust reversers out of the engine in order to meet a weight requirement I don't need, and I need core thrust reversers to meet this ground agility, I am not interested."

The current 160,000 lb./2,400 naut. mi. specification was reduced from the earlier payload weight of 167,000 lb. over the same distance two years ago. An earlier 172,000 lb./2,400 naut. mi. specification was relaxed.

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, General Fogleman is quoted as saying, in part,

We ought to recognize that there is a big difference between a contractual specification and an operational requirement' and "[l]et's quit holding up the whole program focusing on this one contractual specification [160,000 lbs/2400 nm] that has little or no operational utility.

I want to remind the general that this "contractual specification with little or no operational utility" was established by the Military Airlift Command [MAC], reviewed by the Air Force Chief of Staff, documented in the system operational requirements document [SORD], validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council [JROC], and incorporated by the C-17 System Program Office [SPO] as a minimum standard.

Ironically, the reduction in performance was justified at the time as reflecting an operational requirement, rather than an arbitrary contractual specification. Maj. Gen. Frank Willis, then MAC's deputy chief of staff for requirements, minimized the relaxation of the specification from 167,000 lbs/2,400 nm to 160,000 lbs/2,400 nm, the third such downward revision, stating, "we figured we would use that capability—the additional 7,000 pounds—10 percent of the time." "There was no decrease in our requirements, just a recognition of our requirements," according to Gen. Hanford Johnson, MAC commander at the time. In fact, at Scott AFB, in May 1991, a general on Hanford's staff briefing C-17 requirements was bold enough to state that he would trade everything for the 160,000 lbs/2,400 nm specification.

Now, with the C-17 yet again unable to meet minimum range/payload re-

quirements, the airlift community is attempting to once again undermine C-17 specifications. Just 2 weeks ago, a member of General Fogleman's staff, also at Scott AFB, also briefing C-17 requirements, characterized the 160,000 lbs/2,400 nm specification as having little or no operational utility. When challenged, he blamed the C-17 SPO for writing a poor specification based on an unrealistic flight profile. Apparently, he was unaware that the SPO had received direct guidance from MAC.

Obviously, it's much easier to score if you can just move the goal line.

We have contract specifications that are justified as hard operational requirements and that are subsequently dismissed as inconsequential when they can't be met. What can we be sure of in the C-17 Program? Not the specifications, and certainly not the cost.

In fact, the only thing that remains clear in this entire exercise is that the Air Force wants this plane no matter what it costs and no matter how short if falls of the Services' actual needs.

This raises in my mind the pressing question "why"? The only conclusion I can reach is that the Air Force has become a captive of the contractor. If this is not so, the Air Force has to prove that it was honestly mistaken in its previous positions instead of deliberately misleading Congress and the American people. I am anxious to see if the Air Force can meet this challenge.●

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, February 25; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date and the time for the two leaders reserved for their use later in the day; that there then be a period for morning business, not to extend beyond 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each; with the following Senators recognized for the time limits specified: that Senator KRUEGER be recognized first during the period for morning business for up to 10 minutes; Senator KERREY of Nebraska for up to 10 minutes; Senator COATS for up to 30 minutes; Senator SPECTER for up to 15 minutes; Senator GORTON for up to 10 minutes; Senator GRAHAM for up to 10 minutes; and Senator WALLOP for up to 5 minutes; that at 11 a.m., the Senate resume consideration of Senate Resolution 71, the committee funding resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, seeing no Senator wishing to speak, if there is no

further business to come before the Senate today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:24 p.m., recessed until Thursday, February 25, 1993, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Secretary of the Senate February 23, 1993, under authority of the order of the Senate of January 5, 1993:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

WILLIAM J. PERRY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE DONALD J. ATWOOD, RESIGNED.

FRANK G. WISNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY, VICE PAUL DUNDES WOLFOWITZ, RESIGNED.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 24, 1993

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Dr. Marshall Lorenzo Shepard, Jr., Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church, Philadelphia, PA, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

God of our weary years, God of our silent tears, we thank Thee for this privilege to come into Thy presence. We pray this day for Thy guidance, for Thy direction, for the indwelling of Thy Spirit. Grant the strength of our resolve, the expansion of our visions, the guidance of our exertions. Grant unto us a better understanding of Thy will and Thy way in our lives that our deliberations may not be in vain. Oh God, in Thy name we ask that Thou would enlarge our petitions, our pleadings, and our prayers. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

A TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. MARSHALL LORENZO SHEPARD, JR.—"CHAPLAIN FOR THE DAY"

(Mr. BLACKWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise today to honor an outstanding gentleman from the city of Philadelphia, Dr. Marshall Lorenzo

Shepard, who has been designated as "Chaplain for the Day."

Dr. Shepard is a beacon of the Philadelphia community who dedicates his life to serving others. As the pastor of the Mount Olivet Tabernacle Baptist Church, his ministry magnificently touches many lives.

Much of his overwhelming success can be attributed to his ability to bring people from all walks of life together in an effort to make our society a better place to live.

In many instances, he has led the struggle for economic development, civil rights, and improved health care in the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Lorenzo Shepard is a man who is not afraid to work hard for the values in which he believes. Through the years, he has tirelessly worked with a variety of organizations aimed at combating such social problems as homelessness, crime, and inadequate health care that plague our Nation today.

Mr. Speaker, with the mention of Dr. Shepard's name, words such as commitment, integrity, and caring come to mind.

As we celebrate Black History Month, I am extremely honored to be in the presence of Dr. Shepard today. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating him as our Chaplain for the Day, and for the significant contributions that he has made to our society.

JANET RENO—GUN CONTROL RADICAL

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, many Members on both sides of the aisle can agree that we do not need an Attorney General who is overly radical on gun control. Janet Reno's position, if enacted, would violate the Constitution and jeopardize innocent people.

Last year, when asked about her position on gun control, Ms. Reno said that,

A waiting period was only a step; that registration was only a step; and that the prohibition of private ownership of firearms was the best way to stop crime.

Even worse—as Dade State attorney, Ms. Reno was involved in a contrived, Dade County grand jury investigation on the gun control issue. The problem? Nowhere in State law is the grand jury given authority to do anything other than investigate persons suspected of being involved in crimes.

In other words, the grand jury was spending taxpayer dollars to further antiquen agendas of politicians. The jury issued a report calling for: First, statewide registration of all firearms; second, titles on ownership of all guns; third, a test for all gun owners; and fourth, insurance that reflects the actual cost of firearm injuries and deaths.

Mr. Speaker, this is too radical for most of us in this body.

SUPPORT SOUGHT FOR BRADY BILL AND EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, last week President Bill Clinton challenged the Congress to approve his economic package. He also challenged all Americans to restore peace in our neighborhoods.

This week the Congress will pour the foundation for the President's economic package by approving the extension of the employment benefits.

For now, there are 1.5 million Americans who receive unemployment benefits. Without congressional reauthorization of the jobless program, these Americans and many more will find themselves stuck while the economy shifts into a higher gear.

We must enact this emergency extension to support these workers until the President's plan helps them get back on their feet.

In addressing the Nation last week, the President also underscored his commitment to the passage of the Brady bill.

"If you pass it, I will sign it," he told the Congress.

The Brady bill would enact a national waiting period designed to thwart gunshop access to handguns by those people most likely to commit crimes: felons and the mentally incompetent.

Handgun violence has smashed the social order of our streets and our homes. Even our children have been felled in the cross-fire. This violence has become so rampant some have accepted it as commonplace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join me as a cosponsor of the Brady bill and to support the extension of the unemployment benefits.

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

MORE SUGGESTIONS FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, over the past several sessions, my Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] and I have been meeting President Clinton's challenge to lay out some cuts, some recommendations as far as spending cuts. And I applaud the President for his decision to move ahead with those cuts before we put into place a so-called stimulus package.

The Congressional Budget Office's recent book, "Reducing the Deficit: Spending and Revenue Options," has this curious recommendation. It says: "Eliminate education programs that have largely achieved their purpose." This novel idea would save \$220 million. Mr. Speaker, and if we were to apply this to other programs think of the hundreds of billions of dollars we could save.

All of the programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission are duplicated by other agencies. Eliminating those could save \$1 billion.

When Medicare was created in 1966, the deductible for physician services was \$50. Today it is only \$100, while most employee health plans have deductibles of over \$200. Increasing the deductible to \$150 and indexing it to inflation will save \$9.3 billion.

In 1984, Congress created the Clean Coal Technology Program as an alternative to legislation controlling acid rain. The 1990 Clean air Act imposed the acid rain mandates anyway, so clean coal subsidies are no longer necessary. Eliminating this program will save \$1.6 billion.

The list goes on and on. Mr. President, we are meeting your challenge.

□ 1210

CUTTING THE NATION'S BUDGET DEFICIT SHOULD BE LIKE A NEW ENGLAND BARN RAISING

(Mr. SWETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, reducing the budget deficit and reorienting our national priorities should be done like a New England barn raising. Yankees helped neighbors raise a barn after one burned down. The whole community turned out. Everyone knew what had to be done. As the building went up, all could see the progress being made. Working together strengthened the ties that bound the community together. The structure did not always look the same at the end as it was envisioned in the beginning, because some changes were made during the construction, but the job got done.

President Clinton has asked us to join together to solve our Nation's economic crisis. To do this, he has given us a plan. But I suggest we use these priorities: First, to make spending cuts, and I am taking up the President's challenge to find as many additional cuts as I can; second, to reallocate current expenditures to their most productive use; and third, as a last resort, to increase taxes.

Just as with barn raising, we must start with the right plan and then work together, measuring progress as we go and making necessary adjustments. If we build together, we will accomplish our goal of solving our Nation's budget crisis.

FIFTY WAYS TO CUT THE BUDGET

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, headlines today say, "Cuts Must Precede Stimulus Spending." I say cuts must precede talk of new taxes as well.

Look at the Grace Commission report, the GAO report, the CBO report, the suggestions of several well-known and respected grassroots organizations which have identified hundreds of billions of dollars of spending cuts to bring down the deficit.

It is still true that the American people are not taxed too little. Congress spends too much.

I am submitting a bill to publicly list 50 ways to cut the budget, ways such as my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], has outlined, 50 actual spending cuts primarily in discretionary spending that total nearly \$190 billion over 5 years. These programs on their face cry out to be reexamined in light of our deficit today in this country.

The President challenged us to be specific. My bill will direct the Committee on the Budget to examine these cuts for inclusion in the fiscal year 1994 budget resolution.

We should focus our debate on justifying our use of public dollars, recognizing the limits of our affordability and chopping out the waste we know is there.

COMMITMENT TO REDUCING THE DEFICIT

(Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in describing to the first lady last week at a health care conference my congressional district in south Florida; I stated that there are 6 million notch babies in the United States and they are all in my congressional district.

This past weekend I spoke to a group of senior citizens in Pompano Beach

about the Clinton plan and what I feel is a serious economic and fiscal condition in the United States and particularly in my district.

I sincerely feel that we, in Congress, have grossly underestimated the commitment of the senior citizens to assist in solving this serious problem. To the person they volunteered to pay their share; whether to freeze COLA's, tax Social Security payments, increase tax rates and even throw in the towel on the notch issue.

The senior citizen is committed; we, in Congress, should likewise dedicate ourselves to the same commitment.

PRESIDENT CLINTON—EXCUSES VERSUS REALITY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, President Bill Clinton got elected by promising Americans that he would not raise taxes on the middle class.

That was the advertisement for the product we were sold, but when we arrived at the store we got tax increases for virtually every American.

President Clinton claims that he just did not know how large the deficit was.

Well, I believe the President knew, it is on the record.

In the July 6, 1992, issue of Business Week, President Clinton responded to a question about why he was backing away from his balanced budget pledge.

He says, "when I began the campaign, the projected deficit was \$250 billion. Now, it's up to \$400 billion." Those are his words. Then, in the next paragraph he goes on to discuss the need for a middle-class tax cut.

In spite of all his talk of honesty in budgeting, we can not get straight answers about where the spending cuts are.

Mr. Clinton, we must reduce spending first before we tax the middle class.

ONE OF THE MAIN DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PARTIES

(Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today we will get one more dramatic demonstration of the difference between the political parties in America.

The House majority will be bringing forward a bill to extend unemployment compensation, and it will be on the whole opposed by Members of the minority. They will seek to cut it back. They will object that we cannot afford it.

Unemployment compensation is one of the defining differences between the approach that the Democratic and Republican Parties take. We have no

doubt that there are millions and millions of Americans unable to work through no fault of their own. We understand that through a combination of cyclical problems and some long-term trends involving international competitiveness there are people being thrown out of work who seek only to be able to do a full week's work to support their families.

The response has been for some time from the Government, while seeking to solve the broader problems, to offer some relief to these people through unemployment compensation for which people are only eligible if they have a work history and were thrown out of work through no fault of their own.

The recession has unfortunately left a residue of significant unemployment which is receding too slowly, and we will try today in an act of compassion and concern to seek to deal with that. That is, of course, also the most effective countercyclical program we can offer.

As we debate today a program to extend unemployment compensation benefits to working people unemployed through no fault of their own, people will see one of the main differences between the parties in America.

CUT SPENDING FIRST

(Mr. HUTCHINSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, it is right here on the cover of Newsweek magazine. Look at it. It says, "Tax, Spend, and Cut," in that order. There is no more succinct summary of the administration's plan than "Tax" in huge letters, "Spend" in big letters, and "Cut" in small letters.

Once again, we see a difference between what the administration says and what it does.

Last weekend, and even yesterday, the President said he is going to cut spending before he raises taxes. Not true.

Look at the Newsweek cover again. Look closely. The first word is "Tax"; the second word is "Spend"; and in very small letters, "Cut."

There is a better way, and Paul Harvey said it best, "Cut spending first."

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION

(Mr. RUSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, in November 1991 and again last July, Congress agreed to provide extended unemployment benefits to workers because it was the right thing to do. Currently, 1.5 million workers are receiving these emergency unemployment benefits. Unless this program is extended, approximately 300,000 people each month

will lose their unemployment compensation benefits.

While economic indicators point to a recovering economy, none of these workers would agree with you. I agree with President Clinton and his economic advisers who label this so-called recovery, a jobless recovery. Where I come from, a jobless recovery means essentially no recovery.

Nine million people are still looking for work. This so-called economic recovery failed to put food on the table for these Americans, or even gas in the tanks of their cars to help them go out and look for work. We must save these families from poverty, homelessness, hunger, and despair.

These workers and their families cannot afford to wait for the economic recovery to save them. I am counting on the quick passage of President Clinton's economic plan to assist these workers in obtaining jobs. In the meantime, Congress has to do our part. We must continue to do the right thing. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 920, the emergency unemployment compensation extension.

□ 1220

FINANCING CAMPAIGN PROMISES

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, David Broder, one of our Nation's most respected political columnists, wrote today in the Washington Post:

Now people are discovering that Clinton really played fast and loose with the facts in last year's campaign. Last October 1, for example, when the Bush campaign ran ads based on the calculation that Clinton would finance his campaign promises only by raising taxes on every family earning more than \$36,500 a year, this is what the Democratic nominee said:

"It is blatantly false. It is a disgrace to the American people that the President of the United States would make a claim that is so baseless, so without foundation, so shameless in its attempt to get votes under false pretenses."

Last week Clinton, unembarrassed, put forward a revised program requiring tax increases that the administration says will affect most families making over \$30,000, one-sixth below the threshold George Bush had forecast. Clinton claims he has been forced to these steps by the unexpected \$346 billion size of the deficit he inherited. But last July, he told Business Week the deficits would approach \$400 billion.

As administration officials have conceded, the higher tax bites actually begin at a figure closer to \$20,000 than \$30,000. These artifices were carefully concealed in Clinton's State of the Union Address, helping him to gain a favorable first public reaction.

But the more that is learned about the plan, the less solid it looks. As much as \$54 billion of claimed spending reductions are actually increases in taxes or fees. More important, major cost-cutting moves are of dubious value.

That is bad politics as well as bad economics. Clinton is likely to get a budget-economic package passed this year. Passing one that just pretends to fix the deficit is no fix at all.

LARRY VILLELLA, A 14-YEAR-OLD PATRIOT

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, as we begin the consideration of President Clinton's economic package, I would like the Members of this body to consider the example set by a young constituent of mine.

Larry Villella is a young 14-year-old from Fargo, ND. Last week he listened carefully as President Clinton set out his economic package. He heard the President discuss the need to get our economy moving and to reduce our staggering national debt.

Larry wrote out a check for \$1,000 and sent it to the President in order to do his part to help the President implement his program.

I believe Larry's public-spirited actions reflect the thoughts of millions of Americans who are willing to do their part in order to get the economy moving again and to meaningfully reduce the deficit.

As Members of the House let us now do our part. Let us rise above partisanship and the pressure of special interests. Let us have the resolve of Larry Villella and do what we need to do, to take the tough steps that need to be taken to meet the critical goals of the President's economic program for this country.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POMEROY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Would the gentleman tell us what happened to the thousand dollars?

PRESIDENT MUST APPOINT PEACE ENVOY TO IRELAND

(Mr. KING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, as the President meets today with British Prime Minister John Major, it is important that we realize the reality of British rule in the north of Ireland. I am proud that a number of my colleagues today, of the ad hoc committee for Irish affairs, who will be addressing the House on this issue, because even though it is not often reported in our media, political defendants in the north of Ireland are denied jury trials, thousands of Catholic homes are broken into by British troops without search war-

rants, British security forces actively collaborate with Loyalist death squads to murder Catholic civilians, and Britain has been condemned by the European Court of Human Rights more times than any country in western Europe for its activities in Northern Ireland.

I was present at a meeting with President Clinton in New York City last April, where he spoke out for human rights in Ireland. Later in the campaign he pledged to send an American peace envoy to the north of Ireland.

I commend the President for making that pledge, and I call upon him today to reaffirm that pledge and make it known to Prime Minister Major that the United States will send a peace envoy to Ireland and that the American Government will no longer tolerate British oppression of the Irish people.

HOUSE SHOULD EXTEND THE EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, today we will take up H.R. 920, which would extend the emergency unemployment compensation program until the summertime. The program now expires on March 6. This measure would give those who have exhausted their regular 26 weeks of unemployment benefits an additional 20 weeks of unemployment to see them through to the time when they can get a new job.

There is in the Nation a 7.1-percent unemployment rate, which, ironically, happens to be higher, during this period of economic recovery, than it was in March 1991, at the very depths of the recession. This suggests that, because of the restructuring of our economy, the downsizing of our industries, the technological changes, that we do have a new and different challenging situation facing American workers.

In the Third District of Kentucky, which I am privileged to represent, we have a 6.0-percent rate of unemployment. Seventeen thousand people in Jefferson County are unemployed. As we look to the long-term improvement in our economy and the structural changes we have to make, we do have short-term responsibilities, and one of those short-term responsibilities could be discharged today by the passage of H.R. 920.

TAX INCREASES ARE NOT THE ANSWER

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are telling me loud and clear that they want spending cuts not tax increases. It is time for the Federal Government to tighten its belt.

President Clinton's economic plan is not a deficit reduction plan, it is a tax and spend plan. In 1994, the first year of the plan there are \$18 of tax increases for every \$1 of spending cuts. This is a far cry from the 1-to-1 ratio we were promised.

For the first 4 years of the Clinton plan the ratio is nearly \$3 of tax increases for every \$1 of spending cuts.

The lack of spending cuts in this package is best exemplified by the fact that in 1997 Federal spending under the Clinton plan will be \$203 billion higher than this year.

This is why I am introducing today a resolution expressing the Sense of the Congress that taxes should be considered only after substantial spending cuts have been enacted and only after a constitutional balanced budget amendment has been passed by Congress. I invite my colleagues to join as cosponsors.

THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PACKAGE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 week ago we were presented with a bold, innovative plan to bring America back to its proud tradition of being a strong, forceful leader in the world economy. Our President has presented us with the opportunity to say to the American people, we will no longer stand by and do nothing while this country slides deeper and deeper into debt, and millions of our fellow citizens lose hope of participating in the American dream. It is a fact that we are working harder for less money, that more families than ever are living in poverty, and that our children are in grave danger of losing their competitive edge. We must do everything in our power to deliberate on this plan in a most unselfish manner, and move with great haste to put it into action. We are at a critical point in our history. Mr. Speaker, let us take the strong measures necessary to reduce the deficit, put Americans back to work, and grow this economy. The plan is before us, the mission is urgent, the time is now.

ONE DEVILISH DETAIL

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton does not want Americans to know the details of

Clintonomics. That is because the devil is in the details and one of those devils is something called imputed rent.

Imputed rent is the rent a homeowner would pay to live in his or her own house, if they were renting it. Under Clintonomics, imputed rent isn't theoretical, it's income.

That is right. If you own a \$200,000 house that would rent for \$1,000 a month your imputed rent is \$12,000 a year. And Clintonomics considers it as income, subject to possible taxation.

Maybe the devil made the President do it, Mr. Speaker. But the American people must beware, what we do not know will cost us dearly.

HEAD START AND JOB CORPS ARE GREAT SUCCESSES

(Mr. FLAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, last week we heard one of the most eloquent speeches made by a President in this House. One of the things that he included in that was that it is time for us to move from entitlements to empowerments. Among the choices that he laid out before us was a decision as to whether or not we are prepared to make investments in our future through two programs that have been extremely competent in terms of providing for our future. Those programs are the Head Start Program and the Job Corps Program. It has been proven that for every dollar invested in the Head Start Program, we get more than a fair share in return, through those young people who are able to function not only in the educational community today but who will be able to contribute in the future.

That is also the same for the Job Corps Program. You might remember that several months ago there was a study out that indicated that those who graduate from the Job Corps Programs are able to go and get jobs and be able to make contributions by virtue of becoming taxpayers in this Nation.

□ 1230

Indeed, we commend the President and urge all those persons who are part of this body to join together to assure that they are fully funded by 1997 so that we can assure that these investments give the kind of return that says that America is as strong as its workers, that America is as strong as those who it educates. Head Start and the Job Corps and good steps in the right direction.

THE NORTHERN IRELAND FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES ACT

(Mr. FISH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, during his election campaign, President Bill Clinton promised Irish-Americans that he would appoint a special envoy to facilitate the peace process in Northern Ireland, and that he would support passage of MacBride Principles legislation at the Federal and State levels.

I rise today, as one of the three chairmen of the Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs, to urge President Clinton to take a strong stand promoting peace and reconciliation when he meets with Prime Minister Major this afternoon.

I further appeal to the President to lend his support to the MacBride Principles legislation which I have introduced in the House, H.R. 672. It is well-established that Catholics in the North are two and a half times as likely as Protestants to be unemployed, and that religious discrimination is the principal cause of this situation. This Congress cannot allow United States companies to be party to religious discrimination in Northern Ireland. We should pass H.R. 672, the Northern Ireland Fair Employment Practices Act.

Mr. Speaker, peace and justice in Northern Ireland would truly be changed, I say to the President.

SEMPER FIDELIS

(Mr. MCHALE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCHALE. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago today United States Marines went into combat, first breaching an Iraqi minefield at dawn, then moving courageously through enemy artillery fire, as they engaged Iraqi tanks throughout 3 days of armored fighting. They fought with the extraordinary courage America has come to expect from U.S. Marines. They fought because the President and this Congress said it was their duty. For those young Marines, the concept of shared sacrifice was not a political slogan, it was a battlefield reality.

Well it is 2 years later and they are home now. Many have returned to civilian life. Some are in college. More than a few have gotten married and have begun to raise the next generation of Americans.

The veterans of Desert Storm have earned more than a welcome home parade. Having placed their lives on the line when this Congress called them to duty, they now have the right to expect some measure of courage on our part. They expect us to sharply cut Federal spending, to reform American health care, to provide assistance for college tuition, and most important, they expect the 103d Congress to expand economic opportunity.

Let us recall the courage of those gulf war veterans and be mindful of the

fact that there are far greater dangers than losing an election. Semper fidelis.

DEMOCRATS SHOULD GET SPECIFIC

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, the theme song of our President should be changed from "Don't Stop Thinking About Tomorrow," to "Yes, We Have No Specifics."

Democrats in the White House and here on the Hill have been demanding cuts from the Republicans to show specific areas we plan to cut. Well, I am not surprised that the Democrats want us to do more than they will do themselves.

The American people and the members of the House Armed Services Committee now realize where the only real cuts are going to take place over the next 5 years, and it is being confirmed in newspapers all over the country. It is in our national defense. Initially it was \$60 billion, then \$76 billion, then \$88 billion, and now if you include the \$7 billion from this year, now \$95 billion.

But guess what, Mr. Speaker? There are no specifics. Not only do we not know the total of those cuts, we have no idea of how the President plans to achieve these goals.

So tell us, Democrats, which new bases are you going to close? Which programs are you going to cancel? How many more uniformed and civilian personnel are you going to throw out of work above the 1 million that we are already furloughing from the military, and what will that do to our recovery that you claim is so weak?

Start thinking about tomorrow today by giving us the specifics we need in the area of national defense.

IN SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT CLINTON'S ECONOMIC STIMULUS AND DEFICIT REDUCTION PROGRAM

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of President Clinton's economic stimulus and deficit reduction plan.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to focus on taxes and ask Americans to look and see what they do not like about the plan.

Well, if your sole perspective is how much will I have to pay, I am sure you can find something you do not like.

I look at it a little differently. I look at the big picture. Let us talk about jobs. IBM, 25,000 laid off. Sears, 50,000 laid off. Boeing, 30,000 laid off.

Who is getting laid off in your neighborhood?

Looking at the effects of 12 years of trickle-down, I believe the President is on the right track when he tries to create 500,000 new jobs and 700,000 summer jobs.

On deficit reduction, remember "Read my lips. No new taxes."

I much prefer President Clinton's honesty. Deficit reduction will require new taxes, but this time it will be tax fairness, with the burden on those most able to pay.

But we are not forgetting spending cuts. The President proposes \$250 billion in spending cuts over 5 years from the White House to Congress that will affect every Federal agency, including the Federal employees in my district. These cuts and others are on the fast track. They will be passed.

President Clinton says, "Stop thinking I and me. Start thinking us and we."

Let us pass the President's proposal.

SPENDING AND TAXES

(Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, when I was out meeting my constituents last weekend, there were two common themes that I heard.

One theme had to do with spending programs.

Many of my constituents feel that any proposed increase in the income tax rate should be applied solely toward our national deficit.

We cannot spend money on new programs or expand existing programs when we are being strangled by our national debt.

Second, in the opinion of many, if Americans had known what they know today about President Clinton's economic stimulus plan, Mr. Clinton would still be Governor of Arkansas and Mr. Bush would be into his second term.

As one teenager put it: It must be great to be a politician; you could say one thing and do the other, give a good speech and have people accept your complete about-face.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 920, UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1993 the emergency authorization for unemployment benefits passed by the last Congress will expire. H.R. 920 will extend unemployment benefits for those out of work for up to 6 months.

Although some say we are in a recovery, the fact is that 9 million Americans remain unemployed. Two million

of these persons have been unemployed for over 6 months. As these persons exhaust their State unemployment benefits they will be eligible for assistance under this extension of benefits.

We have heard a lot of talk about a stimulus package, however, this extension of benefits is the best way to make that stimulus felt by those most in need. Until the economy grows and more jobs are created, the best stimulus we can give to a struggling family is the assurance of a roof over their heads and a meal on their table.

Currently, about 1.5 million Americans are receiving benefits.

Every month between 250,000 and 300,000 people will exhaust their state benefits and need assistance under this act.

The total appropriation for this bill is \$5.6 billion for fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

No additional benefits would be paid beyond 1995.

THE SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a co-chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs, I have been involved deeply in the tragic situation in Northern Ireland. As you know, our bipartisan committee of over 100 Members is dedicated to peace and justice for Northern Ireland. Accordingly, I was pleased to note the level of attention given to the Irish issue during the recent Presidential campaign, including the support of our current President for the MacBride principles as well as the concept of sending an envoy to Northern Ireland.

As Europe tears down both economic and political borders, it is a tragedy that Northern Ireland remains a strife torn region. It is my hope that with the continuing work of the ad hoc committee and the expression of support by President Clinton, the United States can play a vital role in resolving the tragic conflict in Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join with the Irish Affairs Ad Hoc Committee in working for peace and justice, and I offer our support to the President as he fulfills his commitment to our Nation's 40 million Irish-Americans.

□ 1240

WE HAVE TO CHANGE THE DIRECTION IN WHICH OUR COUNTRY IS GOING

(Mr. SARPALIUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. SARPALIUS. Mr. Speaker, I think one of the smartest things that the President did was that he indicated that all of us would be working off of CBO numbers, the same piece of paper. So, to my colleagues that are complaining about this plan, I challenge them, too, to bring forth some cuts that we can look at.

There is concern about taxes. All the American people are concerned about taxes. Today the working people in this country can take their paychecks for January, February, March, April and part of May, and it is gone in taxes. But I have a 19-year-old son, and when he reaches my age, he can take his paycheck for January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, and October, and it will be gone in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the sad thing is that every bit of it will be used to pay for interest on the national debt.

So, we have got to change the direction this country is going, and I commend the President for representing change.

GOODBYE SMOKE AND MIRRORS, HELLO TOP HATS AND RABBITS

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I think all of us know that last fall there was a great deal of discussion about the size of the Federal deficit and the huge national debt that we have in our country. Ross Perot brought national focus in on a very serious problem that affects all of us. He even got 19 million people to vote for him.

And what are we going to do today? We are going to add \$5.7 billion to the national debt. We are going to extend unemployment benefits for the third time and have not made one ounce of effort to find a way to pay for it. For the last 2 years Congress has passed on the chance to provide incentives to the private sector to create new jobs and to get this economy moving, but has extended unemployment benefits three different times.

This last week the President said, "No more smoke and mirrors." I suppose top hats and rabbits are still in the cards.

IT'S TIME TO PUT UP OR SHUT UP

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, last week our President brought before us a program designed to bring to a screeching halt the borrowing and spending that has characterized our economic policies for the past 12 years. He has proposed more than 130 cuts designed to reverse the order of business in this country.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, the time has come for us, the Members of this body, to either put up or shut up and to begin to seek ways that we can bring this country back on the course of economic development that will do all of us and our children great good. This program has in it educational head starts for our children, healthy beginnings, immunizations. It has in it an investment in the future that all of us look forward to with great anxiety.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Members of this House to act responsibly and to do what the President has asked us to do, support his plan or come forward with good suggestions as to what we would have.

LET'S NOT TAKE A GAMBLE ON RENO

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. An Attorney General opposed to the death penalty? That is what we have got in Janet Reno, President Clinton's latest nominee for U.S. Attorney General. But the opposition to the death penalty is perfectly consistent with another stated claim of Ms. Reno. She said, "My highest priority is not to convict criminals, but rather to protect their rights." This quote suggests that Janet Reno values the rights of criminals more than the rights of the law abiding.

Now I would remind my colleagues that we are talking about the U.S. Attorney General, not the public defender.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand firmly in defense of the people who elected us. We must stand in defense of the law abiding and prevent someone like Mr. Clinton's latest nominee from filling the top spot at Justice. I say, "Let's not take a gamble on Reno."

PRIME MINISTER MAJOR'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, Prime Minister John Major will meet with President Clinton today.

There is much of importance to discuss with our ally, the United Kingdom—the crisis in the Balkans, whether he keeps his Airbus subsidies, trade, and maintaining a close working relationship.

But if we are to have a special relationship then we cannot avoid the need for an end to the continuing tragedy in Northern Ireland—the loss of life, the economic devastation, the ongoing conflict.

Yesterday, I reintroduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a

special United States envoy to Northern Ireland to assist both the Governments of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom to find the path to peace.

I am pleased that last year Bill Clinton expressed support for the appointment of an envoy and that the Prime Minister of Ireland has welcomed the concept.

That message should also be conveyed to Prime Minister Major today.

No longer are well meaning plati-tudes from our Government enough.

Let us work to bring peace to a land whose people, both Catholic and Protestant, have given much to this Nation.

Mr. Major must learn that in Northern Ireland, as in Bosnia, peace will come when justice prevails and his troops are withdrawn.

RECIPE FOR ECONOMIC DISASTER

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, wait until America finds out what is in President Clinton's budget package. Just wait until they find out. Ninety-four billion dollars in spending increases, not spending cuts; over the next 5 years, all that budget deficit stuff that he is talking about coming out of their hide with new taxes, new taxes totaling \$328 billion.

We just had a tax increase 2 years ago of \$184 billion, the largest in history. What did that do? Put us into a recession. Now \$324 billion more, and in spending cuts? No cuts. Ninety-four billion dollars in new programs.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are tired of more taxes. They do not want more taxes. That hurts the economy. That costs jobs. That sends businesses overseas. That is something that is a recipe for economic disaster.

What America wants, and I believe they are going to get ultimately, is not more taxes, but meaningful spending cuts. Let us cut the waste out of government instead of taxing more.

PRIME MINISTER JOHN MAJOR'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. MANTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton will meet with British Prime Minister John Major.

In this first meeting between the new administration and the British Government, I urge the President to express his determination to make ending the strife in Northern Ireland a top priority in our relations with the United Kingdom.

During the Presidential campaign, Mr. Clinton demonstrated his sensitiv-

ity to, and understanding of the Irish issue by pledging to support efforts to end anti-Catholic discrimination in Northern Ireland.

Furthermore, he promised to appoint a special envoy to Northern Ireland to facilitate the stalled peace talks there.

I urge President Clinton to take the opportunity of today's meeting to let Mr. Major know that the Clinton administration will not ignore human rights abuses in Northern Ireland but, rather, will take a leadership role in working to ease the strife which has continued there for too long.

I applaud the President's policy on Northern Ireland and look forward to working with him to bring peace to all of Ireland.

□ 1250

BUDGET RESOLUTIONS ARE NON-BINDING

(Mr. LAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a catch 22, the Democrats have found one. I refer to the article in today's Washington Post, whose headline reads, "Cuts Must Precede Stimulus Spending, Hill Tells President."

If deficit reduction is done before the deficit increase—also known as the stimulus package—the stimulus package loses its meaning. But if the stimulus comes first, deficit reduction loses all credibility. What are the Democrats to do?

According to the Post article, the Democrats have concocted a scheme whereby they will claim to have locked in the spending cuts before passing the stimulus, by virtue of passing a budget resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I may be new to this institution, but in my short tenure I have learned one thing: Budget resolutions are not binding on anyone; budget resolutions do not even go to the President for signature. Budget resolutions do not lock anybody in to anything. The fact is, Mr. Speaker the notion of locking in to the spending cuts before passing the stimulus package is pure political chutzpah.

Mr. Speaker, and I am especially disappointed that my Democratic colleagues in the freshman class have apparently been hoodwinked. This plan is a con on the American people.

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION IS RIPPING OFF AMERICAN WORKERS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the RTC overreported the interest earnings

of over 200,000 taxpayers. One woman ended up with \$150,000 in interest earned from \$3,000 worth of income. Now, to the Members of Congress, when did the RTC hire Michael Miliken?

But that is not enough. The RTC then turned around and gives millions and millions of dollars in bonuses to their inner crew. Tell me, when did misfeasance, malfeasance, and nonfeasance, qualify for a bonus in the Federal Government?

This is not the Resolution Trust Corporation. Mr. Speaker, while Congress is extending unemployment benefits, the Rectal Trespass Corporation is ripping off American workers.

CUBA'S ELECTORAL FARCE

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, February 24, 1895, 98 years ago today, the war of independence began in Cuba, the successful war that led to the formation of the Republic of Cuba, a war effort that was assisted in a generous and courageous way by the American people in 1898.

The dictator of Cuba has attempted to stain this patriotic occasion by convening for today the first so-called elections since coming to power in 1959. Today, the Cuban people are being forced to vote for Communist candidates, only one candidate per office, of course, including the supreme candidate, the dictator himself, a candidate for Parliament. Also a candidate for Parliament is his assassin brother, equally despised by the Cuban people.

Mr. Speaker, it is the hope and prayer of all the freedom loving people of the United States, including President Clinton, who has personally expressed this to me, and it is our concrete goal that will become reality, that one day very soon a true election will take place in Cuba, where the people will be able to determine their own destiny in freedom and without the terror and coercion that characterizes today's electoral farce.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION OFFERS RAY OF HOPE TO UNEMPLOYED

(Ms. LONG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LONG. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will consider emergency unemployment benefits for the estimated 2 million jobless worker in our country who will exhaust their regular benefits after March 6.

As if high employment numbers are not enough, the Commerce Department

announced more disappointing news just this morning. Orders for durable goods were down 1.7 percent in January—the largest drop in 6 months. A lack of orders means companies have no need to hire. And for the 9 million Americans currently without jobs, that news further dims their hope for better days in the near future.

The legislation we will consider later today offers a temporary ray of hope. Until the economy begins creating jobs, the assistance included in this legislation will help families to pay their rent and buy groceries. And just as importantly, it helps States to identify those looking for jobs who are likely to need reemployment assistance services to make a successful transition to new employment.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident a full recovery is imminent. Until then, let us offer that ray of hope to those who have lost their jobs and are looking for work.

GRAB YOUR WALLET AND CALL THE SHERIFF

(Mr. COX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, yesterday many of us were touched by the naive innocence of a 14-year-old high school freshman from North Dakota who contributed \$1,000 to President Clinton to help reduce the deficit. President Clinton called him to congratulate him from Air Force One.

Now, according to the Associated Press and USA Today, President Clinton is "taking a look" at asking for similar contributions from the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, consider this: There are about 110 million taxpayers in America. If every one of us does exactly what this young boy did and add an extra \$1,000 to the Federal coffers, that will total \$110 billion, exactly \$59 billion short of paying for just the new spending that President Clinton asked for Wednesday night.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton also told this poor kid that the first thing that he did with his \$1,000 was to get the White House staff lawyers to work on looking to see whether legally the Government could accept the money. So it seems that after we total up the cost of the phone call from Air Force One and the lawyers' fees, the money is already gone. That is a tough lesson for a 14-year-old kid to learn.

Mr. Speaker, one other thing: This boy told ABC's "Good Morning America" he wants to grow up to be a cardiologist. Soon he is going to find out that Hillary Rodham Clinton's national health system is going to put wage and price controls on his future.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope the rest of America's taxpayers do not have to

learn the hard way the same lesson about how the Federal Government works. Next time Bill Clinton asks you for a contribution, grab your wallet and call the sheriff.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would remind Members that all comments should be directed to the Chair.

HUMAN RIGHTS, JUSTICE, AND PEACE IN NORTHERN IRELAND

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, today President Clinton will meet with British Prime Minister John Major. This meeting will afford the President an opportunity to take a stand for peace and human rights in Ireland.

The continuation of discrimination against Catholics in the northern counties and the continuation of documented human rights abuses are very disturbing. The President can make a significant contribution to human rights in Ireland by reiterating his support for the McBride Principles of Fair Employment designed to end anti-Catholic discrimination.

I also wish to applaud the President for his pledge to appoint a special envoy to Northern Ireland to help facilitate the peace process.

The President's pledge to implement an equitable visa policy which recognizes bona fide political refugees and extends to them the protection they rightfully claim will usher in a new generation of enlightened refugee policy. It will send an important signal to those working for freedom and justice around the world that this Nation stands with them.

Mr. Speaker, finally, I share the profound concern of my colleagues that past harassment of law-abiding Irish-Americans by the Department of Justice must end. I know that the President's staunch support for civil liberties will mark a new era in the protection of our common heritage of liberty.

MORATORIUM ON ACQUISITION OF LAND BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

(Mr. POMBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, the people of my district sent me here with a loud and clear message; they want spending cuts. President Clinton asked us for help in finding those specific budget cuts. Congress can and should cut

spending, and I want to do my part. As such, I am putting forth budget cut No. 1.

The Federal Government currently owns more than 760 million acres across this country. In California alone it makes up 48 percent of the State. Yet over the next several years the Federal Government intends to spend almost \$2 billion to purchase more land.

Mr. Speaker, my cut will put a 5-year moratorium on new Federal land acquisition and will save an estimated \$2 billion. Fellow Members, that is real deficit reduction.

□ 1300

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would remind Members that all comments should be addressed to the Chair.

COMPREHENSIVE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased today that the congressional caucus on women's issues is introducing a Comprehensive Violence Against Women Act that is long overdue.

This country has taken the violence against women and shuddered every single year as the numbers got higher and higher, but we have done nothing and tended to treat it as a lesser crime.

When we are told that three out of four women will probably be the victim of a violent crime before they die, by the Justice Department, it is time we act. And so I encourage all sorts of Members to join us in cosponsoring this.

We have seen the rape rate among women double in the 1980's. We have seen domestic violence becoming the leading cause of injury to American women. It is time we stop it.

We are also sending a letter to the Washington Post. As we met yesterday with Hillary Clinton, they put it on the style section. That is one of the problems with dealing with the very serious issues the caucus is dealing with. When we talk about women's health, women's economic status, and violence against women, it gets put on the style section by this city's major paper, and they talk about what we wear.

It is time we move those issues to the front page. It is time that they are taken seriously. And it is time that women lawmakers are given the same play in the paper with their issues that the others are by that newspaper.

A CALL FOR SACRIFICE IN WASHINGTON

(Mr. DICKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, \$567 million is what we have a chance of saving if this body will reduce its appropriations by 25 percent. We have no way of going to the American people and asking for tax cuts and reduction of jobs and creating havoc with their economic lives, unless we do the same.

In Prescott, AR, last week, a Social Security recipient said to me twice, "I wouldn't mind paying my taxes on my Social Security benefits if you all would sacrifice up there."

I thought that was an awfully good thing at first. And the more I started thinking about it, the more I started saying it might be that she felt secure in that, that if she waited for that to happen, she would never have to pay any taxes.

I think this Congress today in this session and as soon as we can ought to reduce our budget, our budget appropriation requests by 25 percent and show the American people that we are willing to sacrifice. And then we can better ask them to sacrifice.

CONTINUED UNEMPLOYMENT CONCERNS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, a recent briefing by the Bureau of Labor Statistics outlined some very important findings about our economy and its so-called recovery. Compared to prior recoveries, the labor market has turned in a poor performance in the last 22 months, since March 1991. That is when the economists declared the recession over.

In looking at the long-term data on economic patterns, the current economic recovery is unique and alarming. In each of the last eight recessions on which we have detailed data, the recession was followed by a period of extensive job growth.

In this recovery, serious unemployment continues. We have an official 7.1-percent unemployment rate.

When discouraged workers and part-time workers looking for full-time work are considered, the rate climbs to 12.5 percent. This does not even include those workers who are underemployed in jobs beneath their education level and previous experience. And more layoffs may be on the way.

This economic hardship demands leadership, which the President has provided in his economic stimulus package.

Let us join him in putting people back to work by supporting President Clinton. Let us do it quickly so we can

have summer jobs available for American citizens.

And in that case, also, I would like to add, those summer jobs which have many teaching jobs in them will provide jobs for women.

MORE BUDGET CUTS

(Mr. SANTORUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I follow my distinguished colleagues from Arkansas and California to offer a series of budget cuts for the President in his quest to find spending cuts here in Washington, DC.

We were challenged, and I think correctly so, to come up with some measures on how we can reduce the size of Government, create management efficiencies, consolidate where necessary, privatize where necessary.

I introduced today on the floor of the House nine bills which accomplish all those things, cut \$16 billion in this year, which I believe is \$20 billion more than the President would cut because he actually increases spending by \$4 billion this year.

We cut \$16 billion this year and \$100 billion over 5 years.

These are real cuts. They are specific cuts. They are line-item cuts, and I am looking forward to working with him in his sincere attempt to do something about this deficit.

A CALL FOR CHANGE

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, on election day, the people spoke for change. Last week, the President spoke for change. Now, Congress must speak for change. Let us end the system that turns congressional races into races for money, where getting money is more important than the issues.

Elections should be an opportunity for all Americans to chart the course of their country. But, to reach that goal, we need reform.

True campaign finance reform can turn politics from America's least favorite spectator sport into America's most important participatory event. Every American can be a player if we build a level playing field.

We can achieve that—with spending limits, public financing, and limits on the huge power of political action committees.

Within the ancient and elaborate walls of this Chamber, the beautiful and urgent work of democracy is performed. But, with campaign finance reform, democracy will also take place within the humble, temporary walls of a voting booth.

I pledge myself to campaign finance reform so that we all will have a voice in the affairs of our Nation.

IN SUPPORT OF THE BRADY BILL

(Mr. TUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share a tragedy from my district with you and my colleagues and to implore Congress to pass the much-needed Brady bill.

In Compton, CA, Monday night, two police officers were shot several times and killed as they responded to a disturbance report.

I cannot adequately express the depth of sadness I feel right now for those two lost young lives. Indeed, the slain officers are heroes—they gave their lives to serve our community.

However, the officers' violent deaths cannot help but disturb me and the families to the core of our souls. Murders are the horrifying reality of senseless disregard for life. Even the assailants are victims, trapped in a vicious cycle of violence.

California, a leader in the gun control fight, requires a 7-day waiting period for handgun purchases. Yet, the law cannot prevent every shooting. To make California's law as strong as possible, we need national gun control law.

The Brady bill can limit such tragedies by requiring a 7-day waiting period and police background checks for handgun purchases.

Passage of the Brady bill may console the families of shooting victims. If the bill saves one innocent life, it is worth our efforts.

EXTENSION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, earlier today we heard quite a bit of discussion on the floor, mainly from the Democratic side, about the unemployment bill that will be before us in a few minutes.

The discussion was Republicans oppose unemployment because they are not compassionate about the unemployed. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The fact is that what Republicans fear about this unemployment bill is it is not paid for. We believe that if we are going to take steps to meet the priorities, such as the needs of the unemployed, we ought to find the money somewhere else in the budget to pay for these and quit adding to the deficit.

The fact is that the bill that comes before us will add over \$5 billion of additional deficit money. What that

means is that our children and grandchildren will pay even more in interest expenses in the future and that means that in the future even more people will go without work.

That is what we cannot continue in this body. What we have to do in this House is begin the process of deciding real priorities. If we are going to do something to help the unemployed, let us find the money to pay for it out of other nonpriority efforts.

If we cannot find such money, then we have to question whether it is a high enough priority to bring to the floor. That is the real question. That is the division between the two parties.

The Democrats simply want to tax and spend. We believe it is time to begin controlling the spending.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 920

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 920, which will extend benefits to unemployed workers who have already exhausted their regular unemployment benefits.

While there are some signs of national economic recovery, unemployment remains high and job growth rates are meager. National unemployment is currently at 7.1 percent and has exceeded 7 percent for the last 14 consecutive months. Clearly, unemployment continues to be a serious issue.

Mr. Speaker, some areas, such as my home State of California, have not seen economic improvement. In fact, California has the second highest unemployment rate in the Nation, 9.8 percent. I enthusiastically support President Clinton's bold proposals to jump start the economy and believe that Congress must focus its energy on creating new jobs and retraining our work force. This bill is the first portion of President Clinton's economic proposal to come before the full House, and will certainly be a positive first step. We must assist jobless Americans who risk losing their sole source of income.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 920.

□ 1310

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 103 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 103

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in

the House the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the emergency unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes. The amendment recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill and the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. All points of order against the bill, as amended, and against its consideration are waived. Debate on the bill shall not exceed two hours equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a point of order against the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against House Resolution 103 on the ground that two amendments self-executed by the resolution are in violation of two different House rules, and I ask to be heard on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania wishes to be heard, and the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, first, House Resolution 103 is in violation of clause 5(a) of rule XXI because it proposes to adopt the Ways and Means Committee amendment printed as section 4 in H.R. 920 as reported. That section deals with financing provisions and in effect reappropriates advance account funds to make payments to the States to provide these additional benefits. Clause 5(a) of rule XXI prohibits appropriations provisions in a bill not reported by the appropriations committee.

Second, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 103 attempts to adopt an amendment contained in the report to accompany the resolution extending coverage of the bill to railroad employees. That amendment is in violation of clause 7 of rule XVI which prohibits the consideration of germane amendments. The amendment contained in the Rules Committee report is under the jurisdiction of the Energy and Commerce Committee and is therefore not germane to this bill from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, since both of those amendments will be considered to be adopted when this rule is adopted, they are currently before us and must be subject to points of order. It is clear from the rule that once the rule is adopted, the bill as amended by them is not subject to points of order. But, prior to the adoption of this resolution, those two amendments are obviously a part of this resolution and subject to the two points of order I have raised.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The fact that amendments which if offered separately would be violative of the Rules does not prevent the Rules Committee from self-executing the adoption of those amendments together in the rule itself, by providing for their adoption upon the adoption of the rule. The amendments are thus not separately before the House at this time.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I make another point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order that the gentleman raises is overruled.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania have another point of order?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I make another point of order against House Resolution 103 on the ground that it is in violation of section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and I ask to be heard on my point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act provides that, and I quote, "Whenever a committee of either House reports to its House a bill or resolution, or committee amendment thereto, providing new budget authority * * * new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2), or new credit authority * * * the report accompanying that bill or resolution shall contain a statement, the report accompanying that bill or resolution shall contain a statement, or the committee shall make available such a statement * * * prepared after consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office" detailing the costs of that provision.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment contained in the Rules Committee report, which would be adopted upon the adoption of this resolution, extends coverage of this bill to railroad workers. It is my understanding that this may entail a cost of \$20 million, but the Rules Committee has not provided a cost estimate from CBO in its report on this amendment as required by section 308 of the Budget Act. This is an amendment reported by the Rules Committee and therefore is subject to the CBO cost estimate requirements. I therefore urge that my point of order be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises an objection based on section 308(a) of the Budget Act on the basis that the report accompanying this resolution coming from the Rules Committee would have to have a CBO estimate of the potential cost involved by virtue of adoption of the amendment. However, the Chair, after consulting precedents and the rules of the House, rules that the cost estimate does not

have to be made a part of the report accompanying the rule being brought from the Rules Committee, but rather the point of order might lie against the underlying bill. The resolution itself does not enact budget authority and, therefore, the resolution coming from the Rules Committee does not itself have to have the cost estimate in the accompanying report.

Therefore, the Chair now would overrule the gentleman's point of order.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Is this not a self-enacting amendment proposed by the Rules Committee and contained within the rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman state that again, please?

Mr. WALKER. Is this not a self-enacting amendment contained within the rule and proposed by the Rules Committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Upon adoption of the resolution, the amendments to which the gentleman is—

Mr. WALKER. So it is before the House at the present time as an amendment proposed by the Rules Committee, a self-enacting amendment, and the Chair has ruled, as I understand it, that the Rules Committee is not subject to the Congressional Budget Act under its authority to propose amendments?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not suggest that the Rules Committee is not subject here, but the Chair suggested that the report on the resolution itself does not have to set forth the budget estimates which the gentleman has requested.

Mr. WALKER. But that is the—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The budget authority is the underlying amendments which the Chair is advised occur and are considered adopted only upon adoption of the resolution.

Mr. WALKER. I have a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Is the Rules Committee not enacting and including in its resolution a provision which will in fact increase spending and, therefore, is subject to the Congressional Budget Act?

□ 1320

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would state that the Budget Act, section 308(a) of the Budget Act, does not require budget estimates to be included in the report since the amendments are not adopted until such time as the rule is adopted. At that time, then, the amendments which are contained and which would be self-actuated under the rule would then be subject to section 308(a) of the Budget Act.

Prior to the adoption by the House of Representatives of this resolution, that underlying budget estimate is not required to be a part of the report on the resolution itself.

Mr. WALKER. So the Chair is now ruling, or as a further parliamentary inquiry, the Chair has ruled that once we adopt this resolution with the amendment in it, that the Committee on the Budget will be required to file a new report before we can take up the underlying legislation that includes this particular budget estimate? Is that what the Chair is saying?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not make that ruling that there would be a need for the Committee on the Budget to file a budget estimate. The Chair is advised that there is data developing the potential cost in the section to which the gentleman refers in the material which, once the rule is adopted, will then be before the House.

Mr. WALKER. Could the Chair tell me what precedents the Chair referred to for this particular ruling that the Committee on Rules is not subject to the provisions of the Budget Act, does not have to include these items in its report, and now does not even have to report on the items before the House takes up the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair inadvertently may have used the term "precedent." The Chair was misspeaking itself when it referred to the "precedents." There are no precedents for this particular ruling of the Chair.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: so we are setting a new precedent here right now that the Committee on Rules is not subject to the Congressional Budget Act, that they do not have to, in their amendments, prepare the budget material, that they can, in fact, add spending without a requirement under the Budget Act, and that they never have to justify the spending that they are doing to the House before the underlying bill is taken up? Is that the precedent that the Chair has now provided to this House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that it is not the Chair's understanding that the extent ascribed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the extent of the Chair's ruling. The Chair's ruling is more narrow than that, suggesting only that until and unless this resolution is agreed to and adopted, there is no need within that rule, within the report on the resolution offered, to have in it the various cost estimates from the Congressional Budget Office and from the Committee on the Budget which the gentleman wishes. That material would be available at some point later in the discussion once the rule is adopted.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker; since the

Chair has taken us into unprecedented grounds here, when is the House going to be provided with this information?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Until such time as the resolution is agreed to and adopted, the Chair is really in no position to make that declaration or to give that advice.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, some people say that we do not need to help those who are out of work today in America. They say that the economy is in the process of a recovery, and "robust" is the word that Don Regan said the other day. They are the same people who, for 2 years, told us that we really did not have a recession. Time and again we heard, "No recession"; then, "Well, maybe, maybe a mild recession." And finally, that even though we had a recession, "it was no big deal."

Well, it was a big deal, all right. These are the same folks, though, that just never figured it out, Mr. Speaker.

Let me remind them of something: This recovery they talk about has produced virtually no jobs, zip, virtually no net jobs for this country.

Unemployment still stands at 7.1 percent, 9 million people unable to find work, another 6 million people only to find part-time work, another million, perhaps a million and a half, so discouraged that they have stopped looking for work.

All of us know somebody in our family, or in our neighborhood, or in our church, who falls into that category of 16 million Americans. About 2 million workers have been out of work longer than 6 months. That is a lot of folks, and they are not just numbers on some chart. They need help. There is really pain out there still for many Americans.

We have to face the facts about this so-called recovery, Mr. Speaker. The average recovery since World War II has been 10 times as strong, 10 times. In the fourth quarter of last year, nearly 1 out of every 10 families had at least 1 unemployed member, higher than the year before, and last year the real median income earnings of families fell again. The average hourly wage was \$11.37 in 1973. Do you know what it is now? It is \$10.34. Does that sound like a recovery to you? Does it sound like a recovery to the people of Northwest Airlines, last month, when they announced that they were laying off another 1,000 people, or at McDonnell Douglas when they cut 8,700 jobs, or at Sears where they cut 50,000 jobs, or at Boeing where 20,000 Americans lost their jobs, or at United Technologies, Pratt & Whitney Division,

10,000 jobs, or all those people at IBM, Xerox, Eastman Kodak, or Armco who heard their companies make similar announcements?

Mr. Speaker, well, some recovery. Do I think we will recover? Definitely, now that we have seen an economic plan by a President who leads us in the direction for a true recovery.

Because we are going to cut Government, we are going to create jobs, we are going to help the small business community where the jobs are, and finally, we are going to get the rich to pay their fair share. We are going to get this deficit down, we are going to get interest rates down, but if we do all that, let us face it, it is still going to be difficult.

Even if the economy rebounds like Shaquille O'Neal, there will still be a bunch of people left on the bench.

I want to get them back into the game. I want them to be productive, and we have got to move quickly with the plan that the President has suggested for us in order to get that done.

Those without jobs have their benefits run out in less than 2 weeks. So let us pass this rule. Let us pass this bill today. Let us build a bridge for people trapped by the policies of the past, a bridge for people trapped by the policies of the past, a bridge built on hope, of concern, of compassion, a bridge that brings them across to the better days that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 103 provides for the consideration in the House of H.R. 920, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993. The rule which we are now discussing provides 2 hours of general debate. The rule provides that the Committee on Ways and Means amendment printed in the bill, and the amendment printed in the report accompanying the rule concerning the railroad workers' emergency benefits, will be considered as adopted. The rule also waives all points of order against the bill as amended, and finally the rule provides one motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the previous question, and the rule, so that we can move to the debate on this terribly important issue that affects literally millions of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished majority whip, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this closed rule.

Addressing the job losses associated with our sluggish economy is clearly one of our most pressing problems.

□ 1330

Unemployment is at 9.7 percent in my State of California. Nearly 10.5 per-

cent, 10.4 percent, in Los Angeles County alone. Clearly, way above the national average.

It is a very serious problem, and that is why encouraging real job creation must be our top priority, and that is why it is important enough, Mr. Speaker, to have an open rule so that we can offer very thoughtful amendments which will be designed to create job opportunities for Americans.

Every significant piece of legislation that has been considered on the House floor this year has had a closed rule. Therefore, in the name of fairness this year has had a closed rule. Therefore, in the name of fairness, we will again attempt to defeat the previous question and offer an open rule that will empower every Member of this House.

In the Rules Committee just yesterday my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], made a statement in support for more-open rules. He called these constant closed rules bad legislative process and noted that they often contribute to making bad laws. Mr. Speaker, Mr. BEILENSON is absolutely correct.

This closed rule shuts out Democrat Members as well as Republicans. For example, this rule will not allow our freshman Congresswoman MEEK, who represents Homestead and Florida City, an area devastated by Hurricane Andrew, she will be prevented from offering an amendment which would extend unemployment benefits to 1,700 victims of that disaster.

Another Floridian, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, a new Member from this side of the aisle, requested the right to offer a very similar amendment to that offered by Mrs. MEEK and Mrs. MNK, and was denied on a party-line vote of our committee from having that right.

This closed rule, Mr. Speaker, also prohibits amendments to make the bill more fiscally responsible. At a time when no other business is waiting to come to the House floor, why can we not vote on saving the taxpayer a couple of billion dollars?

Mr. Speaker, this extension of the benefits is \$5.7 billion of President Clinton's \$160 billion in new domestic spending. Call it stimulus, call it investment, call it whatever you like, it is new Federal spending. Therefore, we add another \$5 billion to the deficit or, as was said by Mr. ARCHER in the Committee on Rules yesterday, we will be seeing an increase in the payroll taxes to pay for this.

Now, the President wants around \$300 billion in higher taxes to pay for this kind of new spending. He calls for tax increases on middle-income wage earners, social security recipients, and small businesses. I submit that if we ask the Government to contribute more to deficit reduction, these new tax increases will not be necessary.

The American people are concerned that the President's plan is top-heavy

with taxes. When people have said cut spending, President Clinton has said, and I have agreed with him, "No more hot air, tell me where."

I agree, Mr. Speaker, so let us start right here. Reduce spending by \$5.7 billion, and the lower deficit and lower taxes will help create jobs, which is our real goal here.

When you consider that unemployment has been falling since June, that it is lower than it was when we stopped extended benefits in 1985, and that almost all of the States with high unemployment have the authority and money to trigger extended benefits, this is a good place to reduce new taxes with spending cuts.

Just to provide a little perspective on this, Mr. Speaker, if we do not spend this \$5.7 billion, we do not need to impose the energy tax for 1994 and we could cut it in half in 1995. Remember, that tax targets the middle-class wage earner and will lead to the loss of 300,000 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, one very thoughtful amendment that was offered by our colleague from Connecticut, Mrs. JOHNSON, specifies that States with unemployment below 6.5 percent should not get new benefits, because they do not need them. This common-sense amendment would save a mere \$1.2 billion and still extend benefits to every other State, like my State of California, with unemployment that is even nearer the national average.

Mr. Speaker, all three of the amendments offered by Mrs. JOHNSON make very good sense and at least deserve to be heard in this House. The Gunderson retraining amendment prepares people for new employment, something the President says he supports. Let us have a vote on it here in the House, Mr. Speaker. The American people deserve to know of the reform proposals that are blocked by these closed rules.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a summary of the amendments that were blocked by this closed rule, based on the votes taken in the Committee on Rules, also the text of the open-rule substitute that we will offer if we defeat the previous question, and two tables detailing the number of closed and waived rules brought to the House floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

(There was no objection.)

(The text of the documents referred to is as follows:)

AMENDMENTS TO THE RULE ON H.R. 920, EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 1993

1. Open Rule—An amendment in the nature of a substitute for a two-hour, open rule.

Vote (Defeated 2-6); Yeas—Dreier, Goss, Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon.

2. Shaw amendment—Provide an additional 13 weeks to those unemployed in a federally declared disaster area.

Vote (Defeated 2-6); Yeas—Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon.

3. Gunderson amendment—Require that states accepting funds for additional benefits require recipients to undergo job-training.

Vote (Defeated 2-6); Yeas—Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon.

4. En bloc Johnson (C'T) amendments

A. Johnson/Grandy—Exclude states with unemployment rates below 6.5 percent from benefits under the bill.

B. Johnson (C'T) amendment 2—Require states with positive balances in their unemployment compensation trust fund to pay half the cost of extended benefits until trust fund is depleted.

C. Johnson (C'T) amendment 3—Pays for bill through reduction of meal and entertainment expense deduction.

Vote (Defeated 3-5); Yeas—Beilenson, Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Frost, Bonior, Gordon.

5. Trafficant amendment—Sense of the Congress language that Congress should act on job creating legislation.

Vote (Defeated 2-6); Yeas—Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon.

6. Meek/Mink amendment—Provide an additional 26 weeks to those unemployed in a federally declared disaster area.

Vote (Defeated 2-6); Yeas—Dreier, Goss; Nays—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon.

7. Final passage of the closed rule.

Vote (Passed 6-2); Yeas—Moakley, Derrick, Beilenson, Frost, Bonior, Gordon; Nays—Dreier, Goss.

H. RES. 103

An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. Dreier Providing a Two-Hour, Open Rule.

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the emergency unemployment benefits compensation program, and for other purposes, and the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. After general debate which shall be confined to the bill and which shall not exceed two hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit."

Explanation: This substitute rule provides for two-hours of general debate followed by an open amendment process under the five-minute rule.

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH—103D CONGRESS

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Num-ber	Per-cent ²	Num-ber	Per-cent ³
95th (1977-78)	211	179	85	32	15

OPEN VERSUS RESTRICTIVE RULES 95TH—103D CONGRESS—Continued

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	Open rules		Restrictive rules	
		Num-ber	Per-cent ²	Num-ber	Per-cent ³
96th (1979-80)	214	161	75	53	25
97th (1981-82)	120	90	75	30	25
98th (1983-84)	155	105	68	50	32
99th (1985-86)	115	65	57	50	43
100th (1987-88)	123	66	54	57	46
101st (1989-90)	104	47	45	57	55
102d (1991-92)	109	37	34	72	66
103d (1993-94)	4	0	0	4	100

¹Total rules counted are all order of business resolutions reported from the Rules Committee which provide for the initial consideration of legislation, except rules on appropriations bills which only waive points of order. Original jurisdiction measures reported as privileged are also not counted.

²Open rules are those which permit any Member to offer any germane amendment to a measure so long as it is otherwise in compliance with the rules of the House. The parenthetical percentages are open rules as a percent of total rules granted.

³Restrictive rules are those which limit the number of amendments which can be offered, and include so-called modified open and modified closed rules, as well as completely closed rule, and rules providing for consideration in the House as opposed to the Committee of the Whole. The parenthetical percentages are restrictive rules as a percent of total rules granted.

Sources: "Rules Committee Calendars & Surveys of Activities," 95th-102d Congs.; "Notices of Action Taken," Committee on Rules, 103d Cong., through Feb. 23, 1993.

WAIVERS OF 3-DAY LAYOVER REQUIREMENT FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS ON LEGISLATION

Congress (years)	Total rules granted ¹	3-day lay-over waivers ²	Waivers as percent of total
96th (1979-80)	244	19	8
97th (1981-82)	145	9	6
98th (1983-84)	184	10	3
99th (1985-86)	142	13	3
100th (1987-88)	147	16	11
101st (1989-90)	140	23	16
102d (1991-92)	127	18	14
103d (1993-94)	4	4	100

¹This figure includes all order of business resolutions providing for the original consideration of measures by the House. It does not include rules for conference reports.

²This figure covers all rules in which clause 2(l)(6) of House Rules XI is specially waived against a measure. It does not include blanket waivers which may also cover violations of the three-day layover requirement for committee reports.

Sources: "Survey of Activities of the House Committee on Rules," 96th-101st Congs.; "Notices of Action Taken," House Committee on Rules, 102d-103d Congs.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I urge Members on both sides of this aisle to vote to defeat the previous question and support this open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 920, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, and I thank the gentleman for bringing this rule to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, California, more than the rest of the Nation, has been hit hard by this lingering recession. Unemployment rates soaring to nearly 10 percent and the downsizing of the defense industry have thrust a skilled and bright segment of our work force almost into despair.

H.R. 920 provides an extension of unemployment benefits to those in need of getting back to work and gives them hope. I am confident that, coupled with the administration's new economic stimulus package, H.R. 920 will provide the recession's victims with the tem-

porary means required to survive economically until they can reenter the work force.

We are faced with a new and disturbing situation: An increase in jobs has not been commensurate with the recent improvement in the economy. Unemployment is higher today than it was at the time most economists thought we had hit rock bottom.

By every measure, millions of Americans are out of work, Mr. Speaker. Our new President has made addressing our economic ills the priority of his new administration. Until the President's proposals and actions can actually impact the economy, we owe it to our 9 million out-of-work constituents to provide this emergency extension. The Emergency Unemployment Benefits Extension Act is a necessary response to an emergency situation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 920 and responsibly respond to the unique circumstances of this recession and to the problems that are partial to crisis situations of our local economies.

I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3 minutes to the hard-working ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mount Lebanon, PA, Mr. SANTORUM.

Mr. SANTORUM. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Those of you up in the gallery who may be listening, Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what is going on here. We are not going to be allowed, on the floor of the House, as we are very often not allowed on the floor of this House, to offer an amendment. No one will be allowed to offer an amendment to the \$5.7 billion—that is with a "b," billion-dollar—proposal to extend unemployment benefits, and we will not pay for those benefits.

There will be no funding mechanism, there will be no tax increase or spending cut to pay for that. And no one on the floor of the House will be allowed an amendment to either not give the unemployment benefits to States, let's say, for example, like Nebraska, which has a 2.8-percent unemployment rate, yet they will get 20 weeks of extended benefits in those States. No, we are not allowed to offer that amendment to any State of the 10 States below 5 percent unemployment. Can we offer an amendment to eliminate those? No, we are not.

In fact, we asked to offer those amendments in the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from the Clinton administration who was representing the President there, who sat there when we asked why he did not support those amendments, he said, "We don't support any amendments." "Well, could we ask why you don't?" "We don't support any amendments. You do what we want you to do. No engagement, no discussion; you do what we want you to do."

□ 1340

Increase those benefits and make sure we increase the deficit in the meantime, \$5.7 billion.

You will hear throughout the next few hours the folks on this side of the aisle make the issue that we are not for extending unemployment benefits. That is not the issue.

I voted in the past for extending unemployment benefits. I would be happy and would support a responsible extension of unemployment benefits if it were funded. I am sick and tired, as are the American people, sick and tired of us coming to this House, passing bills to make hay with the folks back home, go back home and say, "We delivered some more to you, and have your children pay the bill." That is what they are sick of and that is what we are doing.

The first important piece of the Clinton revitalization plan is more deficits, more spending, more irresponsibility, more of the same.

Ross Perot said and said very articulately, "Folks, the devil is in the details."

Do not listen to these passionate pleas for extension of unemployment benefits, because we would all say the same things, or at least many of us would.

I believe we need to extend unemployment benefits, but we owe it to our children to do it responsibly. That is what the American public wants.

We have a right as Americans to demand that from our Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would take this opportunity to remind Members that the persons in the gallery are not to be mentioned.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my friend, the gentleman from Mount Lebanon, PA, who just spoke on the floor that his definition of responsible may differ from some of us on this side of the aisle.

When he took the well, he argued that he does not have a chance to cut the State of Nebraska from receiving extended unemployment benefits and quoted the figure of 2.8 percent of the folks in the State of Nebraska being unemployed.

I would tell my friend, the gentleman from Mount Lebanon, PA, that an unemployed family in Lincoln, NE, is no less deserving of the aid that is necessary to get that family through than someone is from the State of Pennsylvania.

I would also say to my friend, the gentleman from Claremont, CA, where the unemployment rate is 9.5 percent in the State, one of the highest in the country—

Mr. DREIER. It is 10.4 in that county.

Mr. BONIOR. I cannot understand why Members on this side of the aisle after creating a recession that has put 16 million people out of work now are trying to stall a bill that will help people make the bridge necessary for a decent life until we can get this economy back on track again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], who has worked very hard on this bill.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] for yielding me this time.

You know, we would not be here, I tell the Members on the other side of the aisle, were it not for the fact that next week on March 6, 1993, these benefits are going to expire. The reality of the situation is that even though the unemployment rate is 7.1 percent and it is decreasing marginally from 7.3 to 7.1 in the last 3 months, nevertheless the long-term chronic unemployed still exists. In fact, there are 1.5 million Americans on extended benefits at this time. They are increasing at the rate of 300,000 per month. What we are asking is just to extend these benefits for another 7 months.

Yes, it costs money, but the fact of the matter is that money is going to be thrown into the economy, just as we did in 1981 when we gave those massive tax cuts, and it will stimulate the economy. In fact, it is part of the President's economic stimulus program.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MATSUI. No; I only have 3 minutes of time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield the gentleman some more time if he would yield to me.

Mr. MATSUI. All right, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me just make the one point, and I thank my friend for yielding to me.

We are in a position where an amendment was offered in the Ways and Means Committee by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] which extended benefits for 3 months. Why is that not adequate?

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim my time. I plan to get into that, if the gentleman will allow me to continue.

Mr. DREIER. I just wanted to raise that because that was a point that was raised earlier.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] said there

are 9 million people who are unemployed in America today and there are another 6 million that are in a situation where they are working part-time and want to work full, and so the effective unemployment rate is much greater than 7.2 percent.

In addition, as the gentleman from California notes, because of the restructuring of our economy, those Americans who have been unemployed will probably not get jobs anytime soon. That is why it is so critical that we extend these benefits.

Now, let me respond to both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California in terms of this rule.

Bear in mind, and I sometimes wonder if the other side realizes this, but the fact of the matter is that the Secretary of Labor has been on his job no more than 30 days, or 32 days, I guess, if we count these 2 additional days, 32 days.

In addition to that, the Congress has just reformulated. We have now 16 new members on the Ways and Means Committee. I am the acting Chair of the Human Resources Subcommittee for just this session, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] is as well.

The Department of Labor, the members of this committee, have a lot of ideas, very fresh ideas, but the fact of the matter is we are not ready or in a position to make any radical drastic changes in the unemployment compensation law, even though we know changes have to be made. In fact, we have an advisory commission that we would hope will come back later this year or early next year to make recommendations on how to deal with long-term unemployment. As the gentleman realizes, last year we did make changes in the long-term unemployment program, but the fact of the matter is that it has not worked. No States have bought on to this new program, so revisions have to be made.

The fact of the matter is that we have not had any hearings or any debate or any discussion on any of these amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has expired.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the gentleman, the ranking member on the other side of the aisle on our subcommittee, that we will hold hearings and we will discuss these issues. We intend to make some changes in the Unemployment Compensation Act, but we need the recommendation from the Labor Secretary and others as well.

Let me conclude by making a couple of other observations, if I may. In terms of the payment mechanism, I

can tell the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle that there will not be any FUTA payroll tax out of this legislation.

This money, a good part of it, will be coming from the fiscal stimulus package of the President. As a result of that, we will stay under the October 1990, budget agreement, that we will not violate any of the budget rules of the House of Representatives or the U.S. Government.

So the bill does not require any additional taxes and we will not see any increase in the FUTA taxes in the future.

We need to move on this legislation immediately, because by March 6 of this year if we do not extend these benefits, the 110,000 who live in Pennsylvania and the 300,000 who live in California will not have their benefits extended, plus the 1.5 million nationally.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. MATSUI. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask again, would the gentleman care to explain the justification for not allowing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] which would have extended the benefits for 3 months, allowing for this transition period to which the gentleman referred with the new Secretary of Labor and the 16 new members of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. MATSUI. First of all, I would like to just comment, because the Assistant Secretary of Labor who testified during the markup session, incidentally, did not say they were against all amendments for whatever reason. They basically said they needed more time to evaluate the case.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] has again expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 additional seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MATSUI. That is not enough time. As the gentleman knows, we have the economic stimulus package in the House that the Ways and Means Committee will be debating over the next 90 days. We just need a little bit more time.

In addition, as I mentioned to the gentleman, we have an advisory commission that we intend to have results back from later this year. We would like to find out what their recommendation will be.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Mount Lebanon, PA, Mr. SANTORUM.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I think the point that is missing here is that the amendments that were offered up in the Rules Committee by and large, with maybe one exception, the amendments that were offered were to

the emergency unemployment extension, not to the permanent unemployment system or even the extended benefits system.

□ 1350

It was exactly germane to the topic here at hand, and to say that we need to wait to discuss it at some future time means that we enact a piece of legislation for the next 7 months under the old system, which is not, which is not, what the gentleman was saying. We have amendments like the amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] which would limit the number of States which would be available because there are States, in response to the point of the gentleman from Michigan—

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. Yes, I would say to the gentleman that people who have unemployment rates of 2.8 percent should not be eligible for extended benefits.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. And we can make the passionate, we can make the passionate plea, that somebody who is unemployed in Nebraska is the same as someone unemployed in Pennsylvania, but the fact is, if that were the case, there will always be extended benefits for everybody no matter what the unemployment rate is.

What we are talking about is the law here, and what the gentleman is doing is talking compassion, which has no point of fact when we are dealing with legal issues.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to my friend from California, and then I will be delighted to yield to my friend from Mount Lebanon and my friend from Claremont, but, before I do that, I just want to make a point.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my point goes to a comment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] made. He sort of, and forgive me; I do not mean to be mean, but the tone of his remarks with respect to the word "compassion" I took very negatively. I think there is room for compassion in this institution. I think there is no more important place for it than in this bill. The gentleman knows it. I know it. The American people know it.

If anybody in this Chamber has been in a family where the head of the household has been put out of work, they not only know the deprivation that family has to go through because of lack of certain commodities: food, clothing, housing, but the mental strain that that places on a family, and to come to the floor and to suggest that we should be doing this bill without compassion seems totally incompatible with the concept with which we are dealing today.

Mr. Speaker, compassion is a very important part of what we do in this Chamber.

Compassion without structure or discipline, I would agree, is unconscionable. But compassion with a sense of where we are going, bringing everybody aboard the boat so we can all get there at the same time, is something that we need, and we need to bring people into that boat from Claremont, and from Mount Lebanon, and from Mount Clemens, and from Lincoln, NE, as well. We do not need to be offering and accepting amendments that will eliminate virtually a third of the States in this country.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, that is what the gentleman is suggesting to me today. He is saying that we did not allow an amendment which would have excluded a third of America. Our party is not for excluding a third of America.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to whoever desires to respond.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Before the gentleman proceeds, the Chair would like to figure out who will have the time.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has the time, and has he yielded to the gentleman from California or the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I will start with the gentleman from Claremont, CA, and then move to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], for yielding to me, and let me just simply say from this side of the aisle that we want to have an opportunity to get on board that boat, but we want to have a chance, not to have their support necessarily for an amendment, but simply have a chance to offer some of these amendments which would greatly improve this bill and get many Members on this side of the aisle on board that boat. That is what we are trying to do, and obviously they do not want to allow us to participate, and I thank my friend from Mount Clemens for yielding.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I want them to participate so much that I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM].

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], and this is the kind of debate that we should be having on amendments, and I think that is what the gentleman from Claremont was saying, that we should have an opportunity to debate some very substantial issues, and the point that we are in discussion about here, as to whether to extend benefits to States which have 2.8 percent unemployment, is a very substantive issue and one that is a matter of structure, and that was the

point I was trying to make, and the re-characterization of that argument was very good—

Mr. BONIOR. I thank the gentleman. Mr. SANTORUM. But not accurate.

The point I was trying to make was that the structure is very important in this system and that in fact I think the gentleman would find the majority of the Americans, if we were to ask someone from California should they be paying higher taxes, should their children have bigger deficits to pay for States that have unemployment rates below the structural rate of unemployment; I think the gentleman would find that there is a vast majority of Americans out there who do not believe that is the way we should be acting here, that that is not responsible, and that is what we are trying to get debated and, hopefully, amended here on the floor of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I think everybody will have a chance to demonstrate their fiscal discipline and to try to make happen what the gentleman desires, and that is cutting the Federal deficit. They will get a chance to join us in probably 3 weeks in cutting \$142 billion out of the Federal deficit, the President's plan which we bring to the floor in 3 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to labor this point, but I just want to reiterate that the amendments that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] and others on his side of the aisle were talking about did go to the long-term extended benefit program, but the fact of the matter is the extended benefit program that was adopted last year is the one we have to review because none of the 50 States have triggered on to that program because of the fact that many of the States do not have the resources since they have been in recessions as well, and so we will look at these issues over the next 5 or 6 months, but we need time.

As I said, the new Labor Secretary has only been on the job for 30 days, and we are just getting formulated.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I stand in very strong support of the administration and the leadership of the House and the Committee on Ways and Means in bringing forth this emergency resolution which will extend unemployment compensation to the millions of people across the country, and it should be across the country. It should be universal. If we are going to extend anything, it ought to apply to every person who has been affected by this downturn in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, we have confidence that the President's economic package will

do something to correct this, but in the meantime these people are out there in great need for help.

I appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday because, while I understand that this extension went to the regular unemployment compensation program, I have about a thousand individuals in my congressional district who will not benefit by this program, and, just as strongly as I believe that this extension should be universal, I felt that they should also have the benefit of this extension. They come under, true, a different program, the disaster unemployment compensation program which is funded under FEMA. These benefits for these people will expire early also, on March 13; on February 28 in Florida; so together we went to appeal not to narrow, the program, not to limit it in any way, but to extend it and to include these other individuals whose suffering with unemployment is just the same, if not worse than, those who have been unemployed because of economic conditions. They stand today with their homes demolished, with their businesses destroyed and also have to look at March 13 as the end of the help from the Federal Government. So, Mr. Speaker, I was there at the Committee on Rules asking for the bill to be broadened to include these individuals who live next door to people who surely will benefit from the enactment of this legislation.

So, I merely want to make the point and to ask the support of the people on the Committee on Rules and on the Committee on Ways and Means and in other committees of the House of Representatives to take into account these few individuals who are going to be left out, who suffer under the same circumstances of unemployment and homelessness in my case, and ask this House to find some way in which early assistance can be brought to these victims. I have been told that we could add perhaps something to the supplemental emergency appropriations bill, and I hope that that can be done. In the meantime I am introducing a new bill today which I hope will be referred to the Committee on Public Works that has jurisdiction over FEMA, and together with the leadership of this House work to make sure that these few thousand individuals are added to this bill and given the same benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I testified yesterday in the Rules Committee asking for the opportunity to offer an amendment to H.R. 920 to extend unemployment compensation benefits to my Iniki Hurricane disaster victims whose initial period of coverage will expire on March 13, 1993.

Disaster unemployment compensation comes under the FEMA program and not under the regular unemployment compensation program. But if you are out of work, what does it matter that you lost it due to economic conditions or as a result of a hurricane that destroyed your place of work? In fact those who are out of work because of a hurricane

receive disaster unemployment compensation because of the President's declaration of a state of emergency. I say to you that this state of emergency still exists on the island of Kauai and parts of my district on Oahu. If any emergency is real, this is it. For us and for the people of Florida who were hit by Hurricane Andrew, we are in dire need of help.

Furthermore adding this group of a few thousand persons to this bill would not have added any cost. The money would have come from the balance of FEMA appropriations for Hurricane Iniki and Andrew passed last year which is unexpended and unobligated.

I thank the many Members who tried to help resolve this impasse yesterday and who have now suggested that we add this to the emergency supplemental appropriations bill which will be before us shortly. I am happy to take that route and will and hope that that far more complicated route will be cleared of other roadblocks.

I am introducing a bill today which will be referred to the Public Works Committee to authorize this extension of time to disaster victims of Iniki and Andrew to be paid out of existing funds. This is a far more tortuous route which I was attempting to avoid by having these victims included in H.R. 920.

People who are traumatized by the loss of their home, the loss of their business and of their jobs should have at the very least the same chance for recovery as jobless victims of our sustained recession.

□ 1400

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to respond to the remarks of my good friend, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK], by saying that those of us in the minority on the Committee on Rules joined in supporting an attempt made by my colleague from Florida, Mr. GOSS, to make in order the amendment that Mrs. MINK and the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. MEEK] joined and pleaded before our committee to have us consider. Tragically, every Member on your side of the aisle prevented you from having the opportunity to offer that amendment. We all worked to ensure that the gentlewoman would have the opportunity to offer that amendment.

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. Madam Speaker, I hope that having failed to persuade the majority to allow us to have this amendment to discuss today, that when it comes up next, that I may also enjoy the support of the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] in the Committee on Rules so this matter can be brought up expeditiously. I would hate to reply to the 1,000 people affected in my district that they are going to be treated differently.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, let me say to my friend from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK, that I

will do everything I possibly can to ensure that her rights are recognized. When the gentlewoman offers an amendment in the Committee on Rules, we will try our darnedest to see that the majority is joined on board at least in consideration of the amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois). The Chair would announce that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 18 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], the author of the amendment referred to.

Mr. GOSS. Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished surrogate leader from Claremont, CA.

Madam Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Rules, I would like to steer the debate back to the rule. That does not mean I am without compassion; it means that this is the time to discuss the rule, although I must say, it seems to me I might be able to put my comments about rules on autopilot pretty soon because we are getting into a rut, I think a very dangerous rut, of rushing important and extremely expensive legislation through, with a very minimum opportunity for our Members to debate it. In fact, we have 435 Members and Delegates here. And here we go again, another closed rule, another costly bill.

Another costly bill, off budget, \$5.7 billion. Another set of Members from both sides of the aisle shut off from offering what we thought were pretty good amendments, at least amendments that were reasonable enough to debate. Maybe not support, but reasonable enough to debate.

Let us be clear what a closed rule really is. A closed rule says only a powerful few, those that crafted this bill, and in this case, that probably comes from the White House and the top leadership of the majority, plus the nine Democrats on the Committee on Rules, may decide which topics and amendments we are going to talk about on the floor of the House.

There has got to be some in the majority party, as there are in our party, especially among the 63 majority freshmen, who find the practice of being shut out of the debate pretty discouraging.

Once again, there were pleas for an open rule, for amendments, from both sides of the aisle, to make this bill more fiscally responsible, and we think it can be done, to ensure that those who truly need help are the ones that will actually receive it, to ensure that States that have complied with the program's requirements are not providing for States that have not, and, most of all, to create jobs.

Madam Speaker, this legislation will increase the deficit by \$5.7 billion. It is

the first major bill we are going to consider, after the President urged us, in this very place, to sacrifice for the good of deficit reduction.

As the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means said, this bill is a payroll tax in waiting, because somehow, somewhere, sometime down the road, we are going to have to pay for it. We all know we are.

It is a costly program. Testimony from the bill's sponsors indicate this would actually be a \$5.7 billion advance on the President's stimulus program. Think of that: 30 percent of the stimulus program is now going to unemployment, leaving only 70 percent to create jobs and to grow the economy.

Is that going to be enough? I do not think so. For the life of me, I cannot see how \$5.7 billion in unemployment benefits creates a lot of jobs. But even if we accept the need to spend this money, and we know there are people in need, we are not given the chance to discuss the Hoke proposal to extend this for 3 months now, and correct the trigger problem which we know is out there. We are going to be right back here, in October, doing the same thing over again with new budget figures that say we are really in trouble.

So we have got a problem. I urge my colleagues to recognize that, and to vote down this closed rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished deputy minority whip, the gentleman from East Petersburg, PA [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if we listen to this discussion, we understand that there are no lengths to which the Democrats will not go in order to spend us into debt and deficit. The arrogance with which this rule is brought to the floor is unbelievable, because they are both shutting down debate and discussion. The arrogance with which the House leadership is abandoning all pretense of the House living under law is also unbelievable.

The Committee on Rules is in the process here of amending a bill. But then we had a ruling from the Chair just a few minutes ago that in so doing, they are not subject to the Budget Act.

There is absolutely nothing in the rules that suggests that the committee is not subject to the Budget Act, and yet we have had a ruling here today that they can go ahead and do whatever it is they are going to do.

Then the problem here is, that this also contains a waiver of points of order, so later on if someone wants to raise budget considerations with regard to this bill, guess what? You cannot do

it, because they have waived all points of order in the bill.

The only discipline in the Budget Act is the point of order that can be raised. When you waive the point of order, it means that there is no discipline. When there is no discipline on a \$5.7 billion bill, you are spending us into debt and deficit, and you are doing it knowingly.

I heard a lot of discussion here, a few minutes ago, about compassion. Then I heard the gentleman from California tell us what we were doing in this bill, was throwing money into the economy.

We are throwing money in it—but it is our kids' money, and our grandkids' money, and future generations' money. What kind of compassion is that? What kind of compassion is it to go throwing money around that is not even ours? And that is what we are talking about doing with this particular bill.

Then we were told, by the gentleman from Michigan, that the reason why we cannot have these amendments on the floor is because our party does not believe in that. So in other words, the Committee on Rules has now become a place, where, if the Democrats do not believe in something, it is not even subject to discussion. We cannot even have it debated. We cannot even talk about it.

Now, let me tell you something: That is kind of the ultimate in PC [political correctness] in the House of Representatives. In what is supposed to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, we are now in a situation where if the Democrats do not believe in something, such as curbing debt and deficit, it cannot even be discussed on the floor. We cannot have amendments and we cannot have any discussion.

That is wrong. It is just plain wrong, and it is characterizing what has happened in this House and what is happening to the detriment of this institution as a whole.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, are we not debating this right now?

Mr. WALKER. We are not debating this in a real sense. There are substantive amendments that Members want to bring to the floor.

Mr. BONIOR. Have we not been talking about them? Will we not have a vote on the previous question to determine, whether or not, your position is right or my position is right?

Mr. WALKER. Come on, at least let us have a discussion that is meaningful here.

Mr. BONIOR. It is meaningful. Mr. WALKER. No. As you know, your party makes the point of informing your members on procedural votes that they are to stick together.

Mr. BONIOR. And your party does not?

Mr. WALKER. Your leadership.

Mr. BONIOR. Yours are free to vote the way they want? Your party does not?

Mr. WALKER. Of course.

Mr. BONIOR. What is this charge that our party does not?

Mr. WALKER. On both sides of the aisle there is an attempt to hold Members together on procedural votes. So when you say to me, that there is a previous question vote that every Member gets a chance to vote their conscience on, you know that that is not right. You have 259 Members on your side who are going to vote—

Mr. BONIOR. Who elected those 259 Members? The American people?

Mr. WALKER. Sure, the American people.

Mr. BONIOR. Or did they just sort of appear here and decide to put their card in there and vote?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, do I control the time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has been yielded the time. It is his time to control. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] wishes to reclaim his time, he may do so.

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman does not have to yield to me. I control the time.

Mr. BONIOR. I gave the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would now like to use a little of it. The point being that, sure, the American people send us here as representatives. They send us here to vote directly on issues, and not have them colored by procedural votes.

□ 1410

We are not going to have a chance to discuss a number of very important amendments that go to the question of cutting debt and deficit, because the gentleman's party, on a purely procedural action, is going to keep us from doing so. The only way we can stop that, in all honesty, is to begin to defeat these rules, because it is now clear that the gentleman's party, is even now, within the rules, trying to spend within the rule and then having the chair rule that that does not exceed the Budget Act.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would like to ask my friend, who is managing this rule, is it true that those Members on his side of the aisle who might consider this more than procedural vote, may be an opportunity to actually consider these amendments, will, in fact, be let off the hook, so to speak, so that they can vote to defeat the previous question, so

that we will, at least, be allowed to consider these amendments, now that my friend has acknowledged that this is going to be a substantive vote?

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the only hook, I would tell my friend from California, is the hook that the American people, who sent my colleagues here, have on making sure that they come here and vote for legislation that will get the debt down, that will provide a bridge on unemployment comp for those who are out of work. But that is the only hook.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the American people are waking up to the fact that there is something deathly wrong in an institution that will not let us vote on real issues. When the American people hear about the fact that that debt and deficit has been going up substantially, they wonder why Congress does not act. Congress does not act because they are not allowed to act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. MAZZOLI]. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has expired.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I wonder if the gentleman understands how many times we have voted on real issues over the last 2 years, 100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, 700, 1,000 times maybe.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONIOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, not that many times. As long as Members want to have ideas brought up here, they should be allowed, if there are 10,000 of them.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, there is a time to discuss and there is a time to act. When we have got 16 million people out of work, it is time to act.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very important point that needs to be underscored here. The gentleman from Michigan has acknowledged that we are going to be faced with a substantive vote here on the previous question. That is why Members should vote down the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], a very hardworking member of the Committee on Ways and Means who in fact authored three of those amendments that tragically were not allowed to be considered under this rule.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule but as a strong supporter of extending the unemployment compensation benefits for those who have exhausted their eligibility, certainly, people desperately deserving in my State of Connecticut.

I oppose gagging the very process on which democracy relies to develop good policy. My three amendments do not represent a danger to action. They would only have targeted these benefits and funded these benefits.

We funded the extension of benefits last year. We have funded the extension of benefits the year before. And if we are serious about deficit reduction, we can fund the extension of benefits this year. And so my amendments would do three very simple things, and they would honor the reform that we adopted last year. During the adoption of that reform, we said, after this reform, no State will ever be held back from meeting the needs of their long-term unemployed by the failure of this body to act.

I respect that thoughtful reform, and I honor it here today. It is simply and plainly irresponsible to borrow 100 percent of the dollars to fund this bill when we are going to provide benefits to some States where their unemployment is 3.2 percent.

When unemployment was 4 percent in my district, I had businesses closing because they could not find people to hire. It is irresponsible to borrow those dollars to fund extended benefits in States below the trigger.

It is also irresponsible, and this is my second amendment, not to require those States with surpluses in their funds to use their dollars, matched with our dollars, to fund these benefits until they need our help.

It is irresponsible, once we have taxed our people to fund needed benefits, to then go out and borrow 100 percent to pay for them all over again.

Those are my two amendments. What is dangerous about those?

We cut out the States where there really is not an extended benefit problem; and, we use those resources, that we have already generated by taxing the people, to help fund the benefits in those States where they are needed.

And then my third amendment, my colleagues, startling as it may be, is to fund the remaining cost. We did it before because we were faced with a Presidential veto if the bill was unfunded. We ought to be able to do it now as a matter of common sense and congressional discipline, because we have committed ourselves, each one of us in this last campaign, to deficit reduction, to reform, to turning the Congress around, the economy around, and the Nation around.

I urge opposition to this rule.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] is recognized for 2 minutes and 30 seconds.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, here we go again, unfortunately, in terms of partisanship on this issue, when it should not be.

Look, we are 10 days away from a deadline.

Ten days from now, if there is not an extension, hundreds of thousands go off the unemployment comp rolls so they cannot find jobs. Second, what we are extending is a proposal that was eventually accepted by President Bush.

I do not think that makes it a radical proposal.

Third, this is a different kind of a recession than the past. A small minority of those who are laid off are going to return to the jobs from which they were laid off, and that is what everybody faces in every State, whatever their unemployment rate is.

And fourth, I want to say this to my colleagues from the Committee on Ways and Means, every year that I have been on the Committee on Ways and Means, we have been talking about reforming the trigger mechanism.

Every year the minority has opposed efforts by myself and the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Pease, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], and others to reform the trigger mechanism.

Now what they are saying is, do it in 2 months. They know it cannot be done in 2 months. They know it cannot. We have got 50 States involved with varying situations.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, did we not last Congress change the trigger mechanism?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, we did in a way that no State has utilized it. The gentleman from California rises with his pious statements, when he comes from a State where his Governor, a Republican, vetoed a bill to trigger on.

As I told the gentleman, he comes from a State which has not lifted a finger to trigger on. And that is because a lot of States do not have the wherewithal to do it at this point. I am in favor of reform.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, do those States have a surplus in their trust fund?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, some of them do and some of them do not. I rise in support of the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 4 minutes remaining, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], who offered a very thoughtful amendment but which tragically this rule does not consider.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. There are people in my State and in my district who H.R. 920 will help in difficult times. There are many thousands of other Americans who will be helped as well. I want to help these people, and I believe that we should. But I believe that we can, and we should, provide much more substantial and meaningful help than what is now available in H.R. 920. As the bill now stands, Mr. Speaker, it represents a lost opportunity.

First, H.R. 920 is a lost opportunity to demonstrate to the American people that the new administration and this Congress are serious about addressing the deficit and restoring some integrity to the Federal budget process.

The President is asking the American people to swallow the largest tax increase in history. In return, they are asking him, and us, to make the tough budget choices which will ensure that those new taxes provide, at least, a substantial down payment on a balanced Federal budget. Instead, we have resorted to the same kind of budget gimmickry and sleight of hand that the American people have come to both resent and reject. We'll write a check today for almost \$6 billion and conveniently forget to make an entry in the Federal checkbook.

There were alternatives to business as usual. Our colleague from Connecticut, NANCY JOHNSON, offered an amendment to the Rules Committee yesterday which would have paid for these extended benefits by reducing the business deduction on meals and travel. This is similar to what the President is already asking for in his tax package, and it would have made sense for the House to consider it now as a means of financing this bill. If we were serious about making tough choices, Mr. Speaker, we could also have asked the States to pay a fair share of the cost of this legislation, and an amendment was also offered which would have accomplished this end. Twenty-one of the States that will receive Federal moneys as a result of this legislation are currently running a \$16 billion surplus in the UI trust fund accounts. They can afford to help and we should require that they do so.

This legislation also represents a lost opportunity to begin the process of restructuring our unemployment insurance system to better accommodate the real needs of today's unemployed Americans.

Since its inception, Mr. Speaker, the primary purpose of the unemployment insurance program has been to provide temporary income support to unemployed workers to sustain them until they can return to work. The system was designed, in other words, to deal with a situation in which long-term, structural unemployment was far less of a problem than it is today.

Unfortunately, a greater and greater portion of today's unemployment is the

result of a fundamental change that is taking place in our economy. It is not the result, as it has usually been in the past, of short-term fluctuations linked to variations in a business cycle. Jobs that are lost are in many cases being lost forever. The percentage of unemployed workers not expecting to be recalled to their previous job has risen to its highest level on record—48 percent.

Moreover, the new jobs that are being created frequently require skills and competencies which the unemployed simply do not possess. This accounts, in large measure, for the fact that the percentage of unemployed workers who are exhausting their regular unemployment benefits is also at an all time high—40 percent. Today, in fact, 30 percent of all Americans who are collecting unemployment benefits—1.3 million men and women—are collecting the emergency benefits which H.R. 920 will provide.

Getting these individuals back into the work force under present circumstances requires that they learn new skills and identify new career paths. Our current unemployment insurance system is not designed to do this. For more and more unemployed workers temporary income support—even the 52 weeks that is now available—is clearly an inadequate response to the problem they confront. We are not contributing to the solution of their longer term and more fundamental problem. For these workers, reemployment assistance is critical if they are to reenter the work force.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee which would have required that States, in order to receive Federal payment of emergency unemployment compensation, establish and implement a screening procedure for all individuals who apply for emergency unemployment compensation after March 6, 1993. Under this program, applicants who the State determined to be eligible for and in need of retraining or job search services would be required to participate in such programs, provided that the resources are available for such participation. Like the other amendments that I've mentioned, this one was rejected by the Rules Committee.

Demonstration projects carried out by the Department of Labor in recent years have proven that early exposure to reemployment assistance programs improves a worker's chances of making a successful and satisfying job transition and can actually save the Government money. I regret that the Rules Committee rejected my amendment.

H.R. 920 includes a provision which encourages, but does not require, States to profile all applicants for unemployment benefits to determine whether retraining might be necessary to get them back into the work force. This approach is insufficient in the sense that compliance is voluntary, are

poorly targeted in the sense that the pool of initial unemployment claimants is not where we should be investing in limited resources that are available to us.

In closing Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate that we can and we should do better by the American taxpayer and by the long-term unemployed in America than we are doing in this legislation. Unfortunately, this rule denies us the opportunity to do better, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

□ 1420

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule for H.R. 920, the emergency unemployment compensation bill.

This bill will give thousands of out-of-work Americans an additional 20 weeks of benefits so they can pay for housing and feed their kids while they continue to search for new jobs.

In New York City, this legislation is especially welcome. Last year, the city lost a job every 5 minutes. That's more than 114,000 jobs overall in 1992. And in January, the situation got even worse with the unemployment rate soaring to 13.4 percent—the highest jobless rate in New York City in 25 years.

Right now, there are more people out of work and looking for jobs in New York City than the entire population of Atlanta, GA or Cincinnati, OH.

So, I support this extension of unemployment benefits, but I also recognize that this is only the first step in addressing the critical issues of our economy.

In the weeks and months ahead, it is up to all of us in Congress to work with President Clinton on his economic plan so that America once again can be known as the land of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], a hardworking member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, when Speaker FOLEY addressed the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to which the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has just referred, he made very many poignant points:

I believe this committee is off to a good start. We are seriously considering procedural and organizational problems that confront the Congress of the United States, and I believe the body that has been appointed to study and make recommendations on this subject is doing a good job.

One of the things Speaker FOLEY told us in his opening comments was that as we approach the issues that are ours

to consider and on which to recommend, maybe it would be well if the minority thought as though it were the majority and the majority thought as though it were the minority. I think that is a good recommendation.

I think one of the problems here in this House today is that the majority has become so arrogant from having been in power so long that they do not know what fairness is.

There is no problem in letting the minority in this body offer substantive points of view which could be debated and voted upon. Yes, the Democrats have the votes to vote us down, but for heaven's sake, at least let us present them and let this whole body, and yes, we have been elected by the people of this country, let this whole body decide what is right and what is wrong, rather than just the Democratic steering committee or the Committee on Rules, which is dominated by the Democrats in this House.

We understand that, that they are the majority. We know we are likely to get beat, but for goodness gracious, at least let us present our ideas.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct the gentleman. There is a reason why this is a closed rule and they will not let us debate these amendments. The Members will find it in an abnormal psychology book under "terminal insecurity."

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am offended, Mr. Speaker, by this process, as one who listens to the debate and tries objectively to make up his mind. I urge opposition to this rule, and I stand in support of the substantive approach taken by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair would advise the Members that the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has 4 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, there is really a reason why the House has chosen, or I hope will choose, to move very quickly on this bill, and it is found in the streets of America in the faces of 1,500,000 workers who are on these unemployment benefits, 250,000 to 300,000 a month who are about to come off in just a few days, and each month thereafter an additional 250,000 to 300,000 will find themselves without benefits.

That is why the House of Representatives has decided to set sail and do it quickly to protect these people. One of the mechanisms we are using is a self-

executed rule. There was some controversy earlier about railroad workers being included in the self-executed rule. This rule that would self-execute the coverage of those railroad workers, that is my amendment. I want to tell my colleagues on this side who are concerned about the cost of that, the cost of the railroad worker coverage, which I have secured in this rule, is not \$20 million as was expressed on the other side; it is, rather, \$2,500,000.

The coverage would include 1,200 railroad workers who, without this rule, will not be covered with extended unemployment comp benefits.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, like every Member of this House I am greatly concerned about the problem of unemployment. As I said in my opening remarks, I represent Los Angeles County, CA. Defense and aerospace cuts and a wide range of other problems in southern California have created a 10.4-percent unemployment rate in my area, and it is very devastating.

The key to dealing with this problem, Mr. Speaker, is to work on job creation and economic growth. After all, that was the resounding message that we all heard in last year's campaign on both sides, or all three sides. People were talking about job creation and economic growth.

We desperately want to do that. What we are debating here at this time is the rule under which this bill to extend benefits for 6 months is being considered. Tragically, Mr. Speaker, this rule has denied many thoughtful Democrats and Republicans from having the opportunity to even consider and debate the ideas that they brought before our Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, as we listened to this very interesting debate over this rule, I believe that one of the most interesting statements came from my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the distinguished majority whip, when he referred to the fact that this vote on the previous question will not simply be a procedural vote, because we have all found in the past that, especially on the majority side, and yes, occasionally on the minority side, but especially on the majority side, there is intense discipline on my Democrat colleagues.

A vote on the previous question, which simply means we should defeat the previous question and allow for the consideration of amendments that the Committee on Rules, with a 2 to 1 plus 1 majority number against us did not allow to be considered, usually that vote on the previous question shows that those guys on their side of the aisle are not allowed to even bring up a vote for the consideration of those amendments.

I am glad that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], has indicated that we are going to have a chance here in this House to consider some very thoughtful amendments and that vote is going to be on the previous question.

□ 1430

If a Member votes to proceed with the previous question, does not allow us to offer amendments, they will be saying that they do not want the amendment that was offered by our new friend from Florida, Mrs. MEEK, and our friend from Hawaii, Mrs. MINK, which would provide an additional 26 weeks in benefits to those who were affected by declared Federal disasters. By voting to pass the previous question you are saying that amendment cannot even be considered.

By voting to move ahead with the previous question you are tragically saying that the proposal supported by President Clinton which was offered here as an amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], which would require that States accepting these funds for additional benefits have to undergo job training, those Members who vote for the previous question are saying we cannot even consider that amendment.

And, very unfortunately, the thoughtful amendments that were outlined here by our friend from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON], the first one of which would exclude States with unemployment rates below a 6.5-percent level, we are saying by voting for the previous question that we are not even going to allow consideration of those measures.

Mr. Speaker, what we must do here is defeat the previous question so that Democrats and Republicans alike will have a chance to improve this unemployment benefits bill, so that virtually everyone can get on board in support of an effort to deal with those who were struggling to emerge from this recession and become gainfully employed.

I urge a vote against the previous question.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself my remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, for 3 years we have heard people say in the former administration, some on this side of the aisle, not everyone, that we did not need to help the unemployed. We have heard it over and over again, that there was not a recession, it was a mild recession. The Secretary of the Treasury from the last administration said the recession was "no big deal," it was almost over, we were about to turn the corner, the economy is robust.

The tune is a little different today, the tune is a little different today. People know that people are hurting, 16 million folks cannot find full-time employment.

To those people who questioned this program then, I only say to them I have only one question: Where are the jobs, where is the so-called recovery? And if they think there is a recovery they ought to tell that to the people who have been laid off at General Motors, and Sears, and IBM, and United Technologies, and I could go on and on and on.

And those layoffs did not just happen in Michigan, in New York, in California. They happened in 50 States across this country. Now they are crying foul because we did not make in order an amendment that would have cut out 30 of those States from receiving any extended benefits.

We need to get on with this legislation as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] have so correctly pointed out. We have 2 weeks to take care of these people who have families to feed, who have mortgages to pay.

When we get done with that, we will get to the economic package that the President has offered, and then we will include, I hope, some of the good suggestions that were made on the floor today. I happen to be supportive of the idea of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON]. I think his idea with respect to training and unemployment has merit, and I hope to join with him at the proper time to do it. But today is the day that we need to take care of those millions of folks who need that bridge until we can get to that point and that time.

So I ask my colleagues to vote "yes" on the previous question and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 172, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—243

Andrews (ME)	Bevill	Brown (FL)
Andrews (TX)	Bilbray	Brown (OH)
Applegate	Bishop	Bryant
Bacchus (FL)	Blackwell	Byrne
Baesler	Bonior	Cantwell
Barcia	Borski	Cardin
Barlow	Boucher	Carr
Barrett (WI)	Brewster	Chapman
Becerra	Brooks	Clay
Beilenson	Browder	Clement
Berman	Brown (CA)	Clyburn

Coleman	Kaptur	Pomeroy
Collins (IL)	Kennedy	Poshard
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Price (NC)
Condit	Kildee	Rahall
Conyers	Kiecicka	Rangel
Coppersmith	Klein	Reed
Costello	Klink	Reynolds
Coyne	Kopetski	Richardson
Cramer	Kreidler	Roemer
Danner	LaFalce	Rose
Darden	Lambert	Rostenkowski
de la Garza	Lancaster	Rowland
Deal	Lantos	Royal-Ballard
DeFazio	LaRocco	Rush
DeLauro	Laughlin	Sabo
Delums	Lehman	Sanders
Derrick	Levin	Sargmeister
Deutsch	Lewis (GA)	Sarpalius
Dicks	Lipinski	Sawyer
Dixon	Lloyd	Schenk
Dooley	Long	Schroeder
Durbin	Lowey	Schumer
Edwards (CA)	Maloney	Scott
Edwards (TX)	Mann	Serrano
Engel	Manton	Sharp
English (AZ)	Margolies-	Shepherd
English (OK)	Mezvinsky	Siskiy
Eshoo	Markey	Skaggs
Fazio	Martinez	Skellton
Fields (LA)	Mazzoli	Slattery
Filner	McCloskey	Slaughter
Fingerhut	McCurdy	Smith (IA)
Flake	McDermott	Spratt
Foglietta	McHale	Stark
Ford (MI)	McKinney	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McNulty	Stokes
Frost	Meehan	Strickland
Furse	Meek	Studds
Cejdenson	Menendez	Stupak
Gephardt	Mfume	Sweet
Geren	Mineta	Swift
Gibbons	Minge	Synar
Glickman	Mink	Tanner
Gonzalez	Moakley	Tauzin
Gordon	Mollohan	Tejeda
Green	Montgomery	Thorton
Gutierrez	Moran	Thurman
Hall (OH)	Murphy	Torres
Hall (TX)	Murtha	Torricelli
Hamburg	Nadler	Towns
Hamilton	Natcher	Traficant
Harman	Neal (MA)	Tucker
Hastings	Neal (NC)	Unsold
Hayes	Oberstar	Valentine
Hefner	Obey	Velazquez
Hilliard	Oliver	Vento
Hinchey	Ortiz	Visclosky
Hoglund	Orton	Volker
Hoeftbeckner	Owens	Washington
Holden	Pallone	Watt
Hoyer	Parker	Waxman
Hughes	Pastor	Wheat
Hutto	Payne (NJ)	Whitten
Insee	Payne (VA)	Williams
Jacobs	Pelosi	Wise
Jefferson	Penny	Woolsey
Johnson (GA)	Peterson (FL)	Wyden
Johnson (SD)	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Johnston	Pickett	
Kanjorski	Pickle	

NAYS—172

Allard	Callahan	Everett
Archer	Calvert	Ewing
Armey	Camp	Fawell
Bacchus (AL)	Canady	Fields (TX)
Baker (GA)	Castle	Fish
Baker (LA)	Clinger	Fowler
Ballenger	Coble	Franks (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Collins (GA)	Franks (NJ)
Bartlett	Combest	Galleghy
Barton	Cox	Gallo
Bateman	Crane	Gekas
Bentley	Crapo	Gilchrist
Bereuter	Cunningham	Gillmor
Bilirakis	DeLay	Gilman
Bliley	Diaz-Balart	Gingrich
Blute	Dickey	Goodlatte
Boehert	Doolittle	Goodling
Boehner	Dornan	Goss
Bonilla	Dreier	Grams
Bunning	Duncan	Grandy
Burton	Dunn	Greenwood
Buyer	Emerson	Gunderson

Hancock	Manzullo	Royce
Hansen	McCandless	Santorum
Hastert	McCollum	Saxton
Hefley	McCrery	Schaefer
Henger	McHugh	Schiff
Hobson	McInnis	Sensenbrenner
Hoekstra	McKeon	Shaw
Hoke	McMillan	Shays
Horn	Meyers	Shuster
Houghton	Mica	Skeen
Huffington	Michel	Smith (MI)
Hunter	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hutchinson	Molinari	Smith (OR)
Hyde	Moorhead	Smith (TX)
Inglis	Morella	Snowe
Inhofe	Myers	Spence
Istook	Nussle	Stearns
Johnson (CT)	Oxley	Stump
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Sundquist
Kasich	Paxon	Talent
Kim	Petri	Taylor (NC)
King	Pombo	Thomas (CA)
Kingston	Porter	Thomas (WY)
Klug	Pryce (OH)	Torkildsen
Knollenberg	Quillen	Upton
Kolbe	Quinn	Vucanovich
Kyl	Ramstad	Walker
Lazio	Ravenel	Walsh
Leach	Regula	Weldon
Levy	Ridge	Wolf
Lewis (CA)	Roberts	Young (AK)
Lewis (FL)	Rogers	Young (FL)
Lightfoot	Rohrabacher	Zeliff
Linder	Ros-Lehtinen	Zimmer
Livingston	Roth	
Machtley	Roukema	

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie	Dingell	Miller (CA)
Ackerman	Evans	Solomon
Andrews (NJ)	Ford (TN)	Waters
Clayton	Henry	Wilson
Cooper	McDade	Yates

□ 1455

Mr. SLATTERY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report, which I understand is now before us, based upon the Chair's previous ruling.

I make my point of order on the ground that the report in this resolution violates section 308(a) of the Budget Act requiring a cost estimate.

Section 308(a) of the Budget Act, which requires the CBO cost estimate in the report on any committee bill, resolution or amendment, contains no exemption for the report of the Committee on Rules.

I quote from the section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act:

Whenever a committee of either house reports to its house a bill or resolution or committee amendment thereto providing new budget authority, new spending authority described in section 402(c)(2) or new credit authority, the report accompanying that bill or resolution shall contain a statement or the committee shall make available such a statement prepared after consultation with the director of the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the debate on this particular resolution, the gentleman who purports to be the author of the railroad worker amendment admitted costs are involved in his amendment. The quote that I have just read

means that the committee then has an obligation to provide to the House a congressional budget statement.

Section 308(a) clearly applies to the committee amendment, and the amendment contained in the Rules Committee or report is a Rules Committee amendment. It was not reported by the Ways and Means Committee, it was not reported by the Energy and Commerce Committee and so therefore is exclusively in the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee.

□ 1500

The amendment contained in the Rules Committee report on this resolution will be considered to have been adopted when this resolution is adopted. So there is no question who should provide the CBO cost estimate. It is the Rules Committee. They are not above the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my point of order be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BONIOR. I do, Mr. Speaker.

We had this argument a little over an hour ago and it is again timely, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has indicated.

He refers to section 308. Section 308 applies to measures providing new budget authority. The resolution before us does not provide for new budget authority.

The rule makes in order a bill as amended. The bill as amended provides for the new spending.

House Resolution 103 waives all points of order against the bill as amended and against its consideration. It waives all points of order against the bill and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to rule that the point of order is not in order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania seek to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard further on the point of order.

It is true the Rules Committee has waived all points of order against the bill that would be considered pursuant to this rule. That is the reason why this point of order is timely now.

When it comes to a question in the bill itself, the point of order with regard to the Budget Act will not be in order because that point of order has been waived. The only time we can get at this particular item is in the self-enacting amendment which is a part of the rule.

The gentleman has not referred to the self-enacting amendment. That is the question to which this particular point of order pertains and it is up to the Chair, I think, to sustain the point of order based upon the fact that the self-enacting amendment within this

rule does in fact add costs. It is new budget authority and is therefore in violation of the Congressional Budget Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Do any Members wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that my colleagues are correct in wanting to be informed with regard to the cost effect of that provision which is executed by this rule. That provision has been handled this way three times by previous Congresses. The provision includes, this is what we are executing here, it includes coverage, extended unemployment coverage for America's railroad workers who have their own unemployment fund and therefore would not be covered unless there was a separate amendment or unless we do it this way. Previous Congresses have chosen to do it this way.

The cost, Mr. Speaker, is estimated by both the Congressional Budget Office as well as the Railroad Retirement Trust Fund System, to be \$2½ million for the coming year, and the coverage would be extended to 1,200 railroad workers.

I do think my colleagues are correct in asking for that information, and they now have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard further on the point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana has just made the case. While he has informed the House of his estimate of what this costs, the fact is that the rules of the House require that the statement be a Congressional Budget Office statement contained within the report. That is what the House does not have. That is what the House requires.

The gentleman from Montana has also made the point that his amendment is included in this rule, that it is new budget authority, that it does extend to new people and it does cost at least \$2½ million. That is information that should be contained in the committee report. It is not. It is therefore a violation of the rules of the House. It is a violation of the Budget Act, and my point of order should be sustained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment printed in the bill and the amendment printed in House Report 103-18 will be considered as adopted by the operation of House Resolution 103, which is the special order now pending before the House.

After adoption of this special order, House Resolution 103, the bill is called up for consideration as so amended.

A point of order under section 308 of the Budget Act against consideration of the bill in that form could properly come at that point when the bill is called up for consideration.

As the Chair indicated previously, the new budget authority at issue would be provided not by the resolution reported by the Committee on Rules, but rather by the bill as amended.

At this point, the point of order does not lie. That all points of order against the bill as amended will be waived by House Resolution 103, if adopted, does not cause such points of order to lie at some earlier stage.

The rules of the House authorize the Committee on Rules to report a resolution providing a special order of business, and a point of order under Section 308 of the Budget Act does not lie against such a resolution on the ground that its adoption would have the effect of abrogating clause 2(1)(3) of rule XI, which incorporates the requirement of section 308 in the standing rules.

Accordingly, the point of order is overruled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. It was difficult to hear, Mr. Speaker, but I believe I heard the Chair rule that a point of order would lie against the amendment after the amendment had been adopted. Now, that will be a brand new precedent for the House and I am a little confused by it.

Is that what the Chair has ruled in this case, that the point of order would lie on the amendment after the amendment was adopted?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order could lie against consideration of the bill once the amendment has been adopted.

Mr. WALKER. Well, a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: Is it not true that after the rule has been adopted, a point of order would lie against the bill, but because the bill waives all points of order, the fact is that no point of order lies against this additional spending, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. Once the bill is called up, the point of order could lie against an amendment under section 308 of the Budget Act, but because the rule which has by that time been adopted has in its waivers of points of order, that point of order is not to be sustained.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: Just so I understand, the Chair has now ruled that a point of order lies against the amendment after the amendment has been adopted as a part of the rule, but it

cannot really be, there cannot be a point of order because all points of order were waived in the rules, so the Rules Committee has protected its violation of the rules with another provision in the rule; is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that the point of order would not necessarily lie against the amendment at the point when the resolution is agreed to, but that would be the time to raise a point of order; however, because the waiver has been included in the resolution which by that time is adopted, the gentleman's point of order would not be successfully lodged.

Mr. WALKER. Well, a further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker: So I am correct in stating that the Chair says that the point of order lies against the amendment, however, the Rules Committee has protected itself in a way that allows it to violate the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would just state that there are oftentimes when points of order are waived for various reasons on various resolutions and on various pieces of legislation. That is nothing unique and novel and it is not today.

But again, the Chair has ruled.

□ 1510

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 178, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 39]

YEAS—237

Andrews (ME)	Collins (MI)	Furse
Andrews (NJ)	Condit	Gedjenson
Andrews (TX)	Conyers	Gephardt
Applegate	Coppersmith	Geren
Bacchus (FL)	Costello	Gibbons
Baehler	Coyne	Glickman
Barcia	Cramer	Gonzalez
Barlow	Danner	Gordon
Barrett (WI)	Darden	Green
Becerra	de la Garza	Gutiérrez
Berman	Deal	Hall (OH)
Beverly	DeFazio	Hall (TX)
Bilbray	DeLauro	Hamburg
Bishop	Dellums	Hamilton
Blackwell	Derrick	Harman
Bonior	Deutsch	Hastings
Borski	Dicks	Hayes
Boucher	Dingell	Hefner
Brewster	Dixon	Hilliard
Brooks	Dooley	Hinchey
Browder	Durbin	Hoagland
Brown (CA)	Edwards (CA)	Hochbrueckner
Brown (FL)	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Brown (OH)	Engel	Hoyer
Bryant	English (AZ)	Hughes
Byrne	Eshoo	Hutto
Cantwell	Fazio	Insee
Cardin	Fields (LA)	Jacobs
Carr	Filner	Jefferson
Clay	Fingerhut	Johnson (GA)
Clayton	Flake	Johnson (SD)
Clement	Foglietta	Johnson, E. B.
Clyburn	Ford (MI)	Johnston
Coleman	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski
Collins (IL)	Frost	Kennelly

Kildee	Murtha
Klecaska	Nadler
Klein	Natcher
Klink	Neal (MA)
Kopetski	Neal (NC)
Kreidler	Oberstar
LaFalce	Obey
Lambert	Olver
Lancaster	Ortiz
Lantos	Orton
LaRocco	Owens
Laughlin	Pallone
Lehman	Pastor
Levin	Payne (NJ)
Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)
Lipinski	Pelosi
Lloyd	Penny
Long	Peterson (FL)
Lowey	Peterson (MN)
Maloney	Pickett
Mann	Pickle
Manton	Pomeroy
Margolies-	Poschard
Mezvinsky	Price (NC)
Markey	Rahall
Martinez	Rangel
Matsui	Reed
Mazzoli	Reynolds
McCloskey	Richardson
McDermott	Roemer
McHale	Rose
McKinney	Rostenkowski
McNulty	Rowland
Meehan	Roybal-Allard
Meek	Rush
Menendez	Sabo
Mfume	Sanders
Miller (CA)	Saagmeister
Mineta	Sarpalius
Mink	Sawyer
Moakley	Schenk
Mollohan	Schroeder
Montgomery	Schumer
Moran	Scott
Murphy	Serrano

NAYS—178

Allard	Fields (TX)	Levy
Archer	Fish	Lewis (CA)
Armey	Fowler	Lewis (FL)
Bacchus (AL)	Franks (CT)	Lightfoot
Baker (CA)	Franks (NJ)	Linder
Baker (LA)	Gallely	Livingston
Balleger	Gallo	Machley
Barrett (NE)	Gekas	Manzullo
Bartlett	Gilchrist	McCandless
Barton	Gillmor	McCollum
Bateman	Gilman	McCreery
Bentley	Gingrich	McCurdy
Bereuter	Goodlatte	Mohtague
Billakis	Goodling	McInnis
Bliley	Goss	McKeon
Blute	Grams	McMillan
Boehert	Grandy	Meyers
Boehner	Greenwood	Mica
Bonilla	Gunderson	Michel
Bunning	Hancock	Miller (FL)
Burton	Hansen	Minge
Buyer	Hastert	Mollinari
Callahan	Heffey	Moorhead
Calvert	Hergert	Morella
Camp	Hobson	Myers
Canady	Hockstra	Oxley
Castle	Hoke	Packard
Clinger	Horn	Parker
Coble	Houghton	Paxon
Collins (GA)	Huffington	Petri
Combest	Hunter	Pombo
Cox	Hutchinson	Porter
Crane	Hyde	Pryce (OH)
Crapo	Inglis	Quillen
Cunningham	Inhofe	Quinn
DeLay	Istook	Ramstad
Diaz-Balart	Johnson (CT)	Ravenel
Dickey	Johnson, Sam	Regula
Doolittle	Kasich	Ridge
Dornan	Kim	Roberts
Dreier	King	Rogers
Duncan	Kingston	Rohrabacher
Dunn	Klug	Ros-Lehtinen
Emerson	Knollenberg	Roth
English (OK)	Kolbe	Roukema
Ewing	Kyl	Royce
Fawell	Lazio	Santorum
	Leach	Saxton

Schaefer	Snowe	Upton
Schiff	Spence	Vucanovich
Sensenbrenner	Stearns	Walker
Shaw	Stenholm	Walsh
Shays	Stump	Weldon
Shuster	Sundquist	Wolf
Siskisky	Talent	Young (AK)
Skeen	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Zelliff
Smith (NJ)	Thomas (CA)	Zimmer
Smith (OR)	Thomas (WY)	
Smith (TX)	Torkildsen	

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie	Evans	McDade
Ackerman	Ford (TN)	Nussle
Bellenson	Henry	Solomon
Chapman	Kaptur	Whitten
Cooper	Kennedy	Yates

□ 1527

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1530

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 103, I call up the bill (H.R. 920) to extend the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaRocco). Pursuant to House Resolution 103, the amendment printed in the bill and the amendment printed in House Report 103-18 are considered as adopted.

The text of H.R. 920, as amended by the amendment printed in the bill and by the amendment printed in House Report 103-18, is as follows:

H.R. 920

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Sections 102(f)(1) and 106(a)(2) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993".

(b) MODIFICATION TO FINAL PHASE-OUT.—Paragraph (2) of section 102(f) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993", and

(2) by striking "June 19, 1993" and inserting "January 15, 1994".

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 101(e) of such Act is amended by striking "March 6, 1993" each place it appears and inserting "October 2, 1993".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks beginning after March 6, 1993.

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF RAILROAD WORKERS.

(a) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 501(b) of the Emergency Unemploy-

ment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993".

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 501(a) of such Act is amended by striking "March 1993" and inserting "October 1993".

(b) TERMINATION OF BENEFITS.—Section 501(e) of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking "March 6, 1993" and inserting "October 2, 1993", and

(2) by striking "June 19, 1993" and inserting "January 15, 1994".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks beginning after March 6, 1993.

SEC. 4. PROFILING OF NEW CLAIMANTS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—The Secretary of Labor shall establish a program for encouraging the adoption and implementation by all States of a system of profiling all new claimants for regular unemployment compensation (including new claimants under each State unemployment compensation law which is approved under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act (26 U.S.C. 3301-3311) and new claimants under Federal unemployment benefit and allowance programs administered by the State under agreements with the Secretary of Labor), to determine which claimants may be likely to exhaust regular unemployment compensation and may need reemployment assistance services to make a successful transition to new employment.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES.—The Secretary of Labor shall provide technical assistance and advice to the States in the development of model profiling systems and the procedures for such systems. Such technical assistance and advice shall be provided by the utilization of such resources as the secretary deems appropriate, and the procedures for such profiling systems shall include the effective utilization of automated data processing.

(c) FUNDING OF ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of encouraging the development and establishment of model profiling systems in the States, the Secretary of Labor shall provide to each State, from funds available for this purpose, such funds as may be determined by the Secretary to be necessary.

(d) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Within 30 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall report to the Congress on the operation and effectiveness of the profiling systems adopted by the States, and the Secretary's recommendation for continuation of the systems and any appropriate legislation.

(e) STATE.—For purposes of this section, the term "State" has the meaning given such term by section 3306(j)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. FINANCING PROVISIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for nonrepayable advances to the account for "Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds" in the Department of Labor appropriations Acts (for transfer to the "extended unemployment compensation account" established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the amendments made by section 2 of this Act.

(b) USE OF ADVANCE ACCOUNT FUNDS.—The funds appropriated to the account for "Advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund and Other Funds" in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act for Fiscal Year 1993

(Public Law 102-394) are authorized to be used to make payments to the States to carry out the purposes of the amendments made by section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 6. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.

Pursuant to sections 251(b)(2)(D)(i) and 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Congress hereby designates all direct spending amounts provided by this Act (for all fiscal years) and all appropriations authorized by this Act (for all fiscal years) as emergency requirements within the meaning of part C of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 103, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently being considered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 920, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

H.R. 920 extends emergency unemployment compensation benefits from March 6 through October 2, 1993. Continued claims would be honored during the phaseout period after October 2, 1993, through January 15, 1994.

In addition, this bill authorizes the design of automated systems to identify dislocated workers and refer them to reemployment services.

Unemployment benefits and related administrative activities of the bill are estimated to cost about \$5.7 billion in fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

All direct spending and authorized appropriations under the bill would be designated as emergency requirements within the meaning of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Since an emergency is declared, no pay-as-you-go financing is required, and discretionary spending caps do not apply.

Prior fiscal year 1993 appropriations will cover the cost of benefits through about the end of April. Additional appropriations will be made in the supplemental appropriations bill which will include other elements of the President's economic stimulus package.

Mr. Speaker, the economy is improving, but job growth has been disappointing. The unemployment rate declined to 7.1 percent in January, but it is still higher than the 6.9 percent it

had reached when the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program was enacted in November 1991. It has been 22 months since the bottom of the recession, but the economy has regained only about a half million of the 1.7 million jobs lost. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, if this had been an average recovery, we would have regained all of the jobs lost, plus an additional 2.2 million jobs.

There are about 1.9 million workers who have been unemployed longer than half a year. About 1.6 million of these workers are receiving emergency benefits now. If the Federal Government extends this program through the end of the fiscal year, another 2 million workers will receive this assistance and be able to sustain themselves until they find jobs.

Mr. Speaker, let me take a few minutes to address some of the arguments I have heard against this bill in the past few days.

First, some say this bill increases the deficit. They are right, but let me tell you why. The President has designated this spending as part of his economic stimulus package. Although this package is modest, most economists will tell you that it will stimulate the economy. This will be true in particular if the Federal Reserve Board of Governors accommodates the President's plan in its monetary policy, and Chairman Greenspan has given every indication that it will.

For those who still are concerned, I want to remind you that this is a temporary program that does not add to the structural deficit. I assure you that we will address the President's structural deficit reduction proposal as the stimulus package begins to work this year. The time to consider permanent changes in revenue and outlays is when the economy is moving on a sustainable growth path.

Second, some say that the bill grants emergency benefits to claimants in States with low unemployment rates. This is true. All States will be able to provide at least 20 weeks of benefits to workers who exhaust their 26 weeks of regular State benefits. To these opponents I say, look back to what happened in the House and Senate when Congress first passed the emergency program. Many Members were angry that the bill authorized their States to pay only 6 weeks of benefits because their State unemployment rates were low. Although the bill passed the House, States with only 6 weeks of benefits were given 13 weeks by the Senate when the anger spilled over to the Senate floor. Does anyone think this will not happen again if we deny benefits for half of the States as some opponents of this bill have proposed?

The long-term unemployment problem, the plight of these workers, and displacement of workers as our economy changes is a nationwide concern.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard these arguments before. Let's not allow opponents of this bill to detour us back into legislative gridlock. The President has a plan to stimulate the economy, followed by a bold, credible, and permanent deficit reduction package.

Today we can take the first step toward implementing his plan. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill, which will not only assist 2 million long-term unemployed workers, but will supplement other economic stimulus proposals, and help move our economy along the right track.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has repeatedly emphasized the importance of reducing the Federal deficit. Yet in this, his first major piece of economic legislation, he chooses to finance the bill by borrowing an additional \$5.7 billion. I cannot support a bill that increases the already terrible debt burden on our children and our grandchildren.

We hear the argument from the majority that this bill is part of the President's stimulus package.

Secretary Reich, in his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, said that this, and other deficit-financed measures to be proposed later, were specifically designed that way in order to, as he put it, "jump start the economy."

Someone should tell the Keynesians in the administration that the Nation already has an admitted \$326 billion deficit stimulus. In the face of such a huge stimulus already in place, what good can an extra \$5.7 billion be expected to do?

In this morning's newspapers, we read that President Clinton, once again, has changed direction by delaying spending increases until after spending cuts occur.

□ 1540

That means this \$5.7 billion unemployment extension is the only part of his new spending program that's moving ahead quickly. The rest of his new spending programs will apparently come as part of his tax increase package later this spring.

The fact that this extension of emergency unemployment benefits isn't paid for in any way is reason enough for Members to reject it. But, in fact there are other reasons as well.

Less than a year ago Congress changed the law to make it easier for States to extend unemployment benefits in partnership with the Federal Government.

Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee were pleased, as they put it last July, and that they were able to permanently fix the extended benefits problem while passing an increase in temporary benefits.

One member said the new extended benefits trigger would be "far more equitable and reasonable . . . for unemployed people." Another said that lowering the trigger was "better than forcing States to adhere to rigid and completely different Federal standards".

Yet another said that fixing the trigger would "bring stability back to unemployment compensation so that long-term unemployed workers will not have to wait for Congress and the Administration.

Now, just months later, the majority wants to turn its back on the program its members praise so highly when they enacted it into law. This is especially surprising given the now obvious fact that the new trigger works exactly as the majority said it would.

When the current Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program runs out on March 6, 12 States and Territories will be qualified to receive extended benefits. All their State legislatures have to do is enact the program. The Federal Government will even pay 50 percent of the costs.

In a few minutes, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM], the ranking member of the Human Resources Subcommittee, will show clearly that the 21 States that could trigger extended benefits have unemployment trust fund accounts and overall budget surpluses that render them fully capable of paying their share of these benefits. By contrast, the Federal Government is long since broke, and can ill afford any new benefits.

Another reason we oppose this bill is that some of the benefits it provides are not justified. The logic of the Extended Benefit Program under the Federal unemployment compensation system has always been that additional benefits are necessary in States where unemployment is exceptionally and chronically high. The reasoning was that high unemployment levels make it relatively difficult to find a job. Hence, workers need additional time.

Yet this bill provides emergency benefits to workers in every State, including those that have little unemployment. In addition to benefits for 23 States that suffer from unemployment over 7 percent, benefits would flow to 12 States with unemployment between 6 and 7 percent and 17 States with unemployment under 6 percent—including one with unemployment under 3 percent. These benefits violate the rationale of the unemployment system itself.

During the debate this afternoon, we will develop all these arguments in more detail. We oppose this bill because:

First, States do not need new legislation; they can provide extended benefits themselves, and the Federal Government will pay 50 percent of the cost;

Second, States are in better financial condition to provide the benefits than the Federal Government;

Third, unfunded benefit increases now will inexorably lead to tax increases later;

Fourth, some of the benefits in this bill are wasteful; and

Fifth, we are increasing the deficit by \$5.7 billion which will be built into the baseline and never recovered.

I close by quoting a former Texas colleague from the other body when he said last year, and I quote,

I do not want to see us add to the deficit, I want to see us pay for what we do in the way of unemployment compensation. * * * It is impossible, almost, to get the Administration to show leadership and say where we pick up the money to extend benefits. And it is that kind of a philosophy that has us in the kind of a straightjacket that we are in now. It is that kind of philosophy that has tripled this national debt. It is that kind of philosophy that gives us a \$400 billion deficit. And we have got to start turning that around.

Those were the words of then-Senator Lloyd Bentsen, who, of course is now Secretary of the Treasury.

They were made at a time when the economy was suffering to a much greater degree than it is now, and when unemployment was much, much higher than it is now.

I pose this question to my colleagues before they vote on this deficit raising bill: Are Secretary Bentsen's words any less correct now that he works for the Clinton administration than they were when Senator Bentsen admonished the Bush administration?

Mr. Speaker, I will let the Members dwell on that, and I hope they will vote for the motion to recommit and against this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for moving this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am just going to make two quick points in my 1 minute. The reason that we are moving ahead quickly, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] mentioned, he said, "This is the only part of the package that is moving ahead quickly." The reason for it is because in 10 days, on March 6, 1993, extended benefits, the EUB program, will expire. As the gentleman knows, there are 300,000 Americans each month that are going on the EUB program, the extended benefits program. Right now there are 145 million Americans on this program, so we have to move quickly. There is just no question that this has to be done.

The second part of it is the notion of the permanent fix. Yes, last year we did attempt a permanent fix under the extended benefit program. The irony,

however, is that even though we have been in one of the deepest recessions in our country, not one of the 50 States have bought into the program. That means we really have to fix this up.

In the meantime, before we have the opportunity to fix it up, we have to extend these benefits for the 300,000 per month that are going onto the rolls on extended benefits. I urge an aye vote on this legislation.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in order to engage the gentleman in a colloquy and to say that in response to why the States have not exercised their ability to trigger, it is because they know they are going to rush to the rescue and spend 100 percent of it out of a Federal Treasury that has no money.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI].

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that there are only 14 of the 50 States under the EB law we passed last year that could actually trigger onto the new program. The irony is that four do not have any money, or sufficient money, in their unemployment trust funds in order to actually trigger.

Then we have a number like Illinois, Pennsylvania, Texas, that are eligible but do not have sufficient funds, either, although I guess they could appropriate additional moneys if their general fund will allow it. So that is the problem with this EB program. It is not because they know we are going to extend the program, it is because they do not have the resources with which to continue on their long-term program. That is what the problem is.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING].

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 920, the Unemployment Benefits Extension.

This bill adds \$5.7 billion directly to the deficit. It does not pass go. It starts out with a get out of jail free pass from the Rules Committee that limits debate on it. And right out of the gate, \$5.7 billion goes straight to the bottom line.

This is not the way we should do business when we are facing a \$300 billion deficit. That is not the way we should do business when we are trying to convince the American people that we are serious about cutting the deficit.

This bill says "nothing has changed. That business as usual is still the order of the day in Washington, DC; just declare an emergency, do what you want. Spend what you want. And it's OK."

Well it is not OK.

This bill violates the spirit, the intent and the terms of the last major

deficit reduction promise we made to the American people—the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

In that agreement, Congress promised to pay as we go. If we ignore that promise—how can the American taxpayer believe any promises we make this year?

And this bill does, indeed, break that promise. Today, we are not even making a token stab at trying to pay as we go. We just say, "It looks like an emergency to me. Let's spend \$5.7 billion and we will pay for it later."

In the committee, Republicans offered an alternative which would have extended benefits until June 7 and which provided a mechanism for paying for the increased costs. But that alternative was rejected out of hand. We were told that the costs of the unemployment bill had been factored in to the President's economic package and would be paid for later on.

Paying for it later is not working any more. That's what the phone calls from back home are telling me.

The American people are not buying it. It is not right. It is not honest. And in this case, it is not even needed.

Last year, we passed reform legislation which allows States to provide extended benefits themselves. The Federal Government would even pay half the freight.

Naturally, the States where extended benefits could be triggered would rather have the Federal Government pay for the whole ball of wax—even though the States involved have more money than we do.

But that is not an emergency. It is a windfall for the States involved but it is not an emergency. And it is particularly not an emergency which justifies adding \$5.7 billion to the Federal deficit.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 24, 1993]

BEWARE THE "TRUST" DEFICIT

(By David S. Broder)

President Clinton's economic plan is addressed, he says, not to one deficit but to three: the budget deficit, the investment deficit and the social deficit.

Americans, he says, must shut down the drain of red-ink budgets that have virtually quadrupled the national debt in the past dozen years. At the same time, we must increase the investments that promise productivity growth and future prosperity. And there are, he says, unmet needs for AIDS research, public housing rehabilitation, preschool education and a score of other things that cannot wait.

Clinton is right; to say all three deficits must be faced, but he is wrong—dangerously wrong—to do so in a way that worsens a fourth deficit: people's trust in their leaders.

The new president is being rightly praised for putting all these issues on the table in a comprehensive and coherent fashion. But if his diagnosis of the nation's needs is accurate, his prescription falls far short of a remedy. His plan just doesn't achieve its advertised goals. And it will avail Clinton little to push his economic program to passage if voters decide afterward that they have been misled about what it will do.

Doubts about his reliability plagued Clinton all through the campaign year and caused him to wind up with the lowest share of the popular vote of any winner since Richard Nixon, in a similar three-way race, 24 years earlier.

Now people are discovering that Clinton really played fast and loose with the facts in last year's campaign. When reporters challenged the assumptions and the internal mathematics of Clinton's campaign-season economic plan, "Putting People First," the Democratic nominee brushed off the questions. When Republicans said he was being deceptive, he issued indignant denials that ring hollow today.

Last Oct. 1, for example, when the Bush campaign ran ads based on the calculation that Clinton could finance his campaign promises only by raising taxes on every family earning more than \$36,600 a year, this is what the Democratic nominee said:

"It is blatantly false. . . . It is a disgrace to the American people that the president of the United States would make a claim that is so baseless, that is so without foundation, so shameless in its attempt to get votes under false pretenses."

Last week Clinton, unembarrassed, put forward a revised program requiring tax increases the administration says will affect most families making over \$30,000, one-sixth below the threshold George Bush had forecast. Clinton claims he has been forced to these steps by the unexpected \$346 billion size of the deficit he inherited. But last July, he told *Business Week* the deficits would approach \$400 billion.

The more serious problem is that the new economic plan, "A Vision of Change for America," looks almost as jerry-built as the campaign document it replaced. The administration's \$30,000 threshold, for example, is not what most people understand as income, or even the Form 1040's familiar adjusted gross income line. It is a figure concocted to include all kinds of "non-cash income," including fringe benefits and even the imputed rental value of the family home. As administration officials have conceded, the higher tax bites actually begin at a figure closer to \$20,000 than to \$30,000.

These artifices were carefully concealed in Clinton's State of the Union address, helping him to gain a favorable first public reaction. Assiduous salesmanship on his part has so far sustained that image of evenhandedness.

But the more that is learned about the plan, the less solid it looks. As much as \$54 billion of claimed spending reductions are actually increases in taxes or fees. More important, major cost-cutting moves are of dubious value.

The plan calls for more than \$38 billion in Medicare savings over the next four years, not through any reforms but simply by cutting government payments to hospitals and doctors. In the past, when Republican administrations have proposed such "savings," Democrats have objected, properly, that hospitals and doctors will be forced to shift those costs to private patients and to raise their rates to make up for the loss. The argument is still valid. In effect, Clinton is proposing an additional "tax" on anyone unlucky enough to enter a hospital as a non-Medicare patient in the next four years.

Leon Panetta, the conscientious former House Budget Committee chairman recruited by Clinton as director of the Office of Management and Budget, knows these games for what they are. That may explain why he looks so uncomfortable defending such artifices, as he was forced to do repeatedly after

Clinton's speech. But the accounts of the plan's formulation suggest that Panetta lost some crucial inside battles when Clinton sided with political aides who wanted to sugarcoat the message, as Clinton did during the campaign.

That is bad politics as well as bad economics. Clinton is likely to get a budget-economic package passed this year. Passing one that just pretends to fix the deficit is no fix at all. It simply moves the day of reckoning closing to the next presidential election. George Bush is the living evidence of the danger of following that course.

□ 1550

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REYNOLDS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this extension. There are Americans out here expecting us to act. We are beyond the gridlock that we faced for so long in this body, and these Americans are expecting us to act. If we do not act, in 2 months they have got a big problem, and in 2 months that is not enough time for the States who are prepared to act to go ahead and act in that period of time.

I would hope that we would get beyond the back and forth that we have had in this body for so long and realize that there are people out there counting on us to act to help them. There are States that cannot trigger, they do not have the money to trigger. It is clear that we have to act from this end, from the Federal Government end.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GRANDY].

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I read with interest this morning in two newspapers accounts that freshman Democrats in this body have succeeded in getting the President to change course and emphasize spending cuts ahead of stimulus packages, which indeed increased spending and will require tax increases. And I think we should applaud those Members of Congress who in a very short time have made a very significant contribution.

The first vote to achieve that end is today on this package by voting no, because this bill, regardless of the rhetoric that has gone before, is not about unemployment compensation, it is not about investment, it is not about stimulus. It is about spending, and it is about priorities. It is the one example of deficit spending that cannot be justified because the money is there from other sources to pay for these benefits.

I have served on the Human Resources Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over unemployment compensation for a couple of years now, and I was in the last debate that created the extended benefits program so that we would avoid the confrontation

we are having today. Let me read to Members some of the discussion that took place at that time.

We also changed the mechanism for extension of benefits. We will not have to in future recessions continue to amend and change the laws in order to provide benefits for people who richly need and deserve them.

That is the former chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY]. What he achieved was a new threshold for unemployment not based on insured unemployment, which was an arbitrary and unnecessarily high threshold which many States could not trigger. We changed that to total unemployment, which means that the student getting out of college, the displaced homemaker or the housewife returning to the work force is not part of the threshold that States calculate to receive benefits. And in so doing we lowered the trigger so they could trigger on and cash in that money. The Federal Government pays 50 percent; they pay 50 percent.

The States that we affect today currently are sitting on \$16 billion worth of money in their unemployment trust funds. By the end of the year the Federal trust fund will be \$340 million in deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the money is there. We do not have it. They do.

If you believe that the President's initiatives should move toward spending cuts, surely you have to believe that States that have the money under a bargain that Congress agreed to in the last session of Congress should pay that money. Why do we break this bargain today? They are flush; we are broke. That makes no sense at all.

But to go even further, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON] and I in the Rules Committee offered an amendment that would say surely we should not extend benefits to States whose unemployment threshold is 6.5 percent or lower. If you cut them out of the mix, you can almost pay for this program. You achieve \$1.2 billion in savings. If you do lower the amount of extension to 3 months that pays for the program.

And every time, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has considered unemployment compensation, even when unemployment was at 7.3 percent the last time we considered this legislation, we paid for it. Yes, we screwed around with the Tax Code, we did some things that none of us are very proud of. But we applied the pay-as-you-go provisions, and we honored them. We do not do that today. We spend money we do not have, and we tell the States do not bother spending the money you do have. And we repudiate a mechanism to allow States with cyclical unemployment to use the money so that they would not have to borrow from the States that have no unemployment.

That is equity. That is fairness. That is good public policy. Yet today we de-

cide that we do not need to follow those precedents.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to follow the lead of the freshman Democrats, and I urge them to follow up with their deeds what they said with their words this morning and vote no on an expansion, an unnecessary expansion of Federal spending.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 920, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension.

Less than 2 weeks from today, nearly 1.8 million jobless Americans risk losing their shield against financial disaster, unless we act quickly on the legislation before us. We are all familiar, by now, with the statistics that clearly tell us that, unlike past recoveries, this one is not accompanied by growth in jobs.

There are counties in my own district that have unemployment rates in excess of 10 percent.

The statistic that concerns me more than any other is that, unlike past economic downturns, so many of those who lost their jobs in this recession will never be rehired by their former employer.

In the past four recessions, 44 percent of unemployed workers were on temporary layoffs. In this recession only 14 percent of unemployed workers were expected to be recalled by their previous employer.

Our present unemployment compensation system is based on the assumption that short-term income maintenance is necessary in recessions for laid-off workers. This recession has taught us that, the workers we are serving with the program are increasingly likely to be permanently-displaced workers.

It is important that our future unemployment compensation system be based on serving workers by helping them retool their skills, remarket their abilities, and reenter the workplace at a new point.

The President says that he is ready to go to work, with our committee, on comprehensive reform of our entire complex of worker training, worker readjustment, and worker income maintenance programs.

Obviously, there is not time to design a single comprehensive, flexible program to incorporate the income benefits that are critically needed right now.

I do not agree with those who would wait for the States to do our work for us. Comprehensive reform, that will work, requires leadership and acceptance of responsibility from the President and the Congress.

I believe President Clinton is on the right track with this legislation. He has said that H.R. 920 is part of the

short-term stimulus package. It should not be thought of as the regular way for us to do business. The President has stated, that the benefits for the next fiscal year will be paid for in his package, which we will vote on later this year.

I applaud the President's vision and his challenge. We can, and must, do much better. I support both the President's long- and short-term goals and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1600

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, my district is literally crippled with unemployment, the highest rate in the State of Ohio for about 20 years.

I tried to get on the committee. I wanted to have a say for our people on the tax policy of the country. I am not very liked around here. We tried to extend unemployment four times last year. We debate unemployment, debate unemployment.

I am going to vote for this. It is the only money workers in my district have a shot at, but I want to tell you something, we continue to put a crutch under the arm pits of the American workers, and this crutch is constantly being kicked out, forcing the American worker to limp back, dependent, frustrated, and mad as hell.

The staff over there can laugh. This is a Democrat upset with the Democrat Party, having tax policy by very few Democrats.

The very first bill we have on the floor is an unemployment bill. Where is the jobs bill? Where are the jobs?

In fact, this committee is going to be bringing out the free-trade agreement with Mexico, and you are going to be shipping more jobs overseas. I am going to have more unemployment in my district, and I do not want to hear it anymore.

The Democrat Party has to open up to everybody, Republicans and Democrats, for ideas that create jobs, not to come before this body and debate unemployment.

I am going to vote for it every time, but it is not the game I want to be involved with here.

Show me your jobs bill. And I want a chance to participate and offer some suggestions.

And if anybody from the Ways and Means staff laughs at me again, you are going to have problems with a Member of Congress.

Take my measures and every measure in this House serious, because we are losing the damn war, and my people are hurting.

I do not want to hear compassion. I want to hear jobs.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that the American people do not trust Congress, and they do not trust government. This is a perfect example of why they do not trust us.

Mr. Clinton, President Clinton, has been telling everybody we are going to have deficit reduction, we are going to get control of runaway Government spending, we are going to pay for our programs. And here is \$5.74 billion right off the top that we are not going to pay for. It is going to be added to the deficit.

Our kids and our grandkids are going to have to deal with it. Not only that, it is going to hurt the economy and economic growth, because what you are doing to solve this problem is not cut spending, not attack the deficit in this country, but to raise taxes.

We just had a tax increase 2 years ago of \$184 billion, the largest in history, and here we come back with a \$328 billion tax increase 2 years later. We are going to take it out of the hide of the American people, and yet the President says we are going to get control of spending; we are going to cut that deficit.

Here is \$5.74 billion you are not going to pay for. You are misleading the American people, and they do not like it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mrs. KENNELLY].

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, today we vote on an issue that is critical to far too many American families—the extension of emergency unemployment compensation benefits. Those of us in Connecticut know far too well that these benefits can mean the difference between keeping a home or losing a home; between making a car payment and defaulting; between economic survival and economic devastation.

Today, we face an economic paradox. Experts and economists agree the recession is over, ended months ago in fact. Yet unemployment continues to rise, and now stands higher than it did in the depth of the recession.

My own State of Connecticut lost about 200,000 jobs in this last recession. Now, in the so called recovery, planned layoffs have been accelerated, and new layoffs have been announced. My State is struggling to regain its economic footing—but the firm ground of stable employment continues to erode. In defense, in manufacturing, in insurance and banking: Every sector of the economy and employers large and small are all affected.

I commend the President for his efforts to move quickly to address the problem of continued high unemployment. Now is exactly the time that expanded benefits are needed. These unemployed individuals cannot afford to wait. Quite literally, when the benefits run out, time runs out.

Mr. Speaker, the clock is ticking. I urge my colleagues to act now.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have a fundamental misunderstanding here. I said this earlier today, and I want to repeat this for everyone listening. The debate today is not on whether we should extend unemployment benefits.

Now, this may seem what this debate is all about, and certainly the arguments on that side would make you think that many of us on this side do not want to extend unemployment benefits. Let me assure you that is not the case.

I do not know about the majority, but certainly a great number of people on the Republican side of the aisle want to extend unemployment benefits.

But there are three ways we can do this. I repeat this, there are three choices on the floor today, not just one, to extend unemployment benefits, three.

First, you can do what has been brought to the floor as the way to solve the extension of unemployment benefits, and that is raise the deficit by \$5.7 billion, again, billion dollars, with a "b," billion dollars, pass the bill on to your children and grandchildren, and pay out benefits for the next 7 months. That is one way of solving the extension of unemployment benefits. But that is not the only way.

We will have a motion to recommit. The motion to recommit will be with instructions to send the bill back to the committee, and for the committee to come back very quickly, tomorrow, next week, before the extension, before the deadline runs out, come back with a way to fund the \$5.7 billion in expenditures. So that is option 2. You will have a motion to recommit to do that.

Option 3, and this is what has been talked about before on the floor, we can allow the States, not just any old States, but the States with the largest amount of unemployment, with the highest rate of unemployment, to trigger extended benefits. That is option 3.

Let us talk about those States. We passed this, by the way, and this is not a law that has been laying around for a long time. This is a law that we just passed, I think, 6 months ago, to change the mechanism for States to make it easier for them to extend unemployment benefits.

Now, 21 States, at least 21 States, would be able to do that. The Federal Government, in its beneficence, will pay for 50 percent of the extension. Regular benefits are 100-percent State; we will pay for 50 percent as an incentive for them to extend. They have to pick up the other 50 percent.

The argument is made, well, these States will not do this; these States just do not have the money to do this.

Well, let us look at these States, these 21 States. Looking at the chart

right next to me here, those are the funds, the cumulative funds, in the red column in the 21 States who could, if they wanted to, trigger extended benefits, roughly \$16 billion. Compare that with the trust fund of the Federal Government on unemployment compensation, \$1.2 billion.

It seems to me that they are in a very good position to extend unemployment benefits and should take advantage of that.

If we can have the next chart, the next chart shows the State budgets and the budget deficits, cumulative. We see that, on the right, \$2 billion, and that is the net operating deficits of the 21 States who could trigger extended benefits; budget surplus for this year. So they have \$16 billion in their fund, they have \$2 billion in budget surplus cumulatively, versus \$327 billion deficit for this U.S. Government and a \$1.2 billion surplus in the fund.

Now, ask the American people, if those were your choices, that you could do an extension of benefits that was not paid for except for your children in the future, \$5.7 billion, No. 2, go back and pay for the extension, again federally funded, but at least come up with the revenues to pay for it, or, No. 3, have the States, the ones that are in the worst shape, and on the next chart we will show you that 67 percent of the unemployed people in this country reside in those 21 States.

□ 1610

So you would cover 60 percent of the unemployed people and those with the worst labor markets to get back into.

Your third choice is to allow the States to take some responsibility for the unemployed in their respective States. Remember, they have the funds in the trust funds, No. 1, No. 2, they have budget surpluses, in most cases.

Now, that to me, I might be wrong and maybe I am from a very strange area of this country, but I would suspect that if you put those choices before any group of Americans, any focus group, the last thing they would choose is option 1, because they would say clearly that is irresponsible, clearly irresponsible, and clearly what this side of the aisle is going to do and pass today.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, there are 23 States that could trigger at this particular time under the EB Program, which no State at this time has triggered. But the irony of it, as the gentleman mentioned, is there is \$16 billion in the different trust funds. The unfortunate part of it is that 5 States, 5 of the 23 States, have about \$11 billion. Many of the States that need the money do not have sufficient revenues in which to use the trigger, because they do not have the money.

So that is the problem. You cannot look at these things in the aggregate;

you have to look at it in the State-by-State situation.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is suggesting these States are near zero or have small deficits in their trust funds, is that what the gentleman is saying? And that is the reason they are not doing it?

Mr. MATSUI. I am sorry?

Mr. SANTORUM. The gentleman is suggesting that the reason that they do not do it is because they have small deficits within their trust funds?

Mr. MATSUI. Does the gentleman mean the 23 or the 5 or which?

Mr. SANTORUM. The five.

Mr. MATSUI. The five have sufficient money, but the five probably are not the ones that are in trouble. For example, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] has \$960 million. Pennsylvania obviously does not have enough in terms of the 110,000 people that are unemployed.

Mr. SANTORUM. Reclaiming my time, let me explain and then maybe we can have a discussion here. From the list that I was given—this is again the Labor Department statistics under the Clinton administration—estimated that by March 1993 there would be 21 States eligible. From the numbers that we have been given in the third quarter of 1992 balances, there are three States that have deficits, three States. Now, what the gentleman is suggesting is that those three States would not be able to extend, would not be able to trigger extension, because they are in deficit. Is that correct?

Mr. MATSUI. The gentleman is misunderstanding what I said, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman.

For example, New York has \$482 million in their fund, but it would only give them benefits up to 2.1 months. You see, that is just the problem; they have money, but not enough money to go 5 months or 7 months. You have to look at this, not in the aggregate, but individually by State.

Mr. SANTORUM. But will they not continue to be paying taxes into those funds?

Mr. MATSUI. Yes, but it still would not—

Mr. SANTORUM. If the answer is "Yes," their taxes are going to be accumulating in that fund.

Mr. MATSUI. Taxes are coming in, but there is unemployment and people are drawing on EB at a greater rate than the money coming in. So you cannot catch up.

Mr. SANTORUM. Reclaiming my time, is it then their ability as a State to either borrow money or to go out and shift money around, to be able to pay for that extension, if they want to?

Mr. MATSUI. Will the gentleman state that again?

Mr. SANTORUM. Could they not come up with some mechanism to pay for that within their own State?

Mr. MATSUI. Well, I guess they could raise taxes, that is one way to do it, or from the general revenues; the States can do that.

Mr. SANTORUM. Reclaiming my time, the point I am trying to make is that the gentleman is saying they are being fiscally responsible so that we should be irresponsible. They are being fiscally responsible, at least according to the gentleman's comments, in not going out and raising taxes or decreasing spending somewhere else, so we should be irresponsible and add \$5.7 billion to the deficit? That is the kind of mentality that has the people across this country scratching their heads as to what we are doing here.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAMBURG].

Mr. HAMBURG. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 920 to extend benefits an additional 26 weeks to jobless workers for whom the pain of the recession is still very real. Nearly 2 million of our fellow citizens will be affected by our vote today.

Two million. We hear a lot of talk about economic recovery and renewed consumer confidence. But for the working and jobless people of my district in northern California, these statistics are an abstraction totally unrelated to their experience.

In my district, unemployment ranges between a low of 8.7 percent in Solano County to a high of 16.2 percent in Del Norte County.

Every month more and more families are faced with the difficult task of putting food on the table for their children, of paying the monthly rent.

We cannot afford not to extend benefits.

The extension of benefits is a Band-Aid, no less and no more. Extension of benefits is critical first aid, but more is necessary.

Following today's vote, let us move to the task of creating jobs that provide a decent standard of living. It is my sincere hope that the next jobs-related legislation we consider will be pro-active legislation to create jobs for families.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, the conventional wisdom in some quarters is that we have turned the corner on the recession and should leave things be, and the recovery will take care of itself. Taking care of itself is exactly what this recovery has been doing. Unfortunately, for working people, allowing the recovery to take care of itself has not taken care of 9 million workers.

In March 1991, the low point of the recession, national unemployment stood at 6.8 percent. As of January 1993, the number had grown to 7.1 percent, a half-million more unemployed than at the 1991 low point.

This recovery has produced only 29,000 jobs instead of an average of 228,000 by this stage in past recoveries. Instead of the usual 6-percent increase by this date, we have an increase in job creation of only one half of 1 percent since the March 1991 depth of the recession.

Look at my District here in the Nation's capital: The D.C. construction and retail trade industry has suffered devastating losses—4,400 jobs since the low point of the recession. The D.C. service sector, traditionally the fastest-growing sector in the District, has suffered an 800 job loss since the low point of the recession.

The District's finance, insurance, and real estate sectors have lost 2,000 jobs. Most troubling, 83,131 workers in the District alone have had to file claims for unemployment insurance since the recession's low point, March 1991.

For many companies, even the Fortune 500, recovery is being achieved by actually shedding workers: Sears, 50,000 jobs; Boeing, 20,000; IBM, 25,000; United Technologies, 10,500; McDonnell Douglas, 8,700; General Dynamics, 27,000. If these numbers signal recovery, the word has lost its commonsense meaning.

Companies cannot recover if workers do not. President Clinton got it right in this Chamber last week when he said, "There's no recovery worth its salt that does not put the American people back to work."

Until American workers experience recovery, my friends, it isn't happening. Until workers experience recovery, our obligation is clear. H.R. 920, the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Extension grants recipients of unemployment benefits an additional 20 weeks of aid, and 26 for those in high unemployment areas. Help workers until recovery reaches them. Vote for H.R. 920.

□ 1620

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] for yielding me this time and commend him on a job very well done in bringing this bill out today. It is very important.

I think he and I would both prefer that we did not have this kind of a bill on the floor. I would prefer that we have on the floor something more substantive in the area of job creation, but we have to deal with the short-term reality of unemployment even as we are working on the long-term job creation in this economy.

It is rather ironic to note that at the depth of the recession, in March 1991, there was only, if we want to call it that, a 6.8-percent rate of unemployment. We have the beginnings of the recovery in February 1993, and yet we have a higher rate of unemployment, 7.1 percent. That translates into what is called the jobless recovery. It is an ironic and peculiarly upside-down situation where we have recovery and we have actually more people who are jobless.

That, of course, results from a restructuring of the American workplace. It results from the application of technologies which have replaced people. It comes from competition and a lot of problems that we have to deal with in the long term.

But, the short-term reality is a lot of good people in the Nation, in Louisville, in Jefferson County, KY, which I am privileged to represent, are without employment, have exhausted their 26 weeks of unemployment benefits and are now, unless this bill passes by next week, consigned to nothing; no job and no unemployment compensation.

So what this does is simply extends the program so that these people who have exhausted their 26 weeks can have 20 more weeks.

This is what we call the response to an existing human condition. So I certainly commend the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman from California for bringing H.R. 920 to us. I certainly support it and hope it has a rousing vote of approval in the House.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Corning, NY [Mr. HOUGHTON].

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, you know it really is sort of too bad to have an argument like this. I am an accountant. I am tempted to use figures and arithmetic, but I do not think it is right now. We are so close. We both want unemployment extension. We both want the goal of helping people.

The question is, how do we go about it? I know the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] earlier said something about Senator Bentsen, now Secretary of the Treasury. I really think we have to adhere to what President Clinton wants. I applaud his candor. I applaud his vision for America and I think we ought to do what he really wants us to do, and now his Secretary of the Treasury and from the Secretary of the Treasury we get the word that he said it was impossible to get the administration, and this is the Bush administration, to say where we pick up the money for a particular program. That was the last program, the last unemployment extension program.

It is this philosophy that has tripled our debt, put our deficit into soaring figures. We cannot do this anymore.

I agree with that. I do not know, frankly, and this is not a political

speech to the people out in the United States. This is really to try to persuade some people, recognizing the fact this is Ash Wednesday and most folks are converted in the House Chapel rather than the House floor, maybe that is where we should all go, but seriously, you know, why can we not pay for it? We both agree on the basic concept. Why can we not pay for it?

I happen to have a program. My friend here, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, has a program. There are numerous programs to pay for it.

I do not see what the obstacle is. Let us do it. Let us get it out of the way. Let us help the people and pay for it with money that is there to pay for it.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT].

Mr. SWIFT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I want to express my very strong support for this legislation to provide necessary extension of benefits to the unemployed in America.

I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes language providing railroad workers with the additional extended unemployment benefits. On three separate occasions in the last Congress when we enacted legislation providing emergency extended unemployment benefits, we rightfully provided that similar emergency benefits should be available to unemployed railroad workers under the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

Once again we must ensure that that same extension of emergency unemployment benefits is provided for railroad workers as is provided for other workers.

Now, I would like to give you some information that deals with an issue that was raised earlier in the debate on the rule. I would like to note that the costs of the benefits for railroad workers and the associated administrative expense will be paid entirely from the railroad unemployment insurance account. This account is financed by contributions paid exclusively by railroad employers. Thus, no general funds will be used to pay for the benefits provided for Federal railroad workers through this legislation.

We have been advised by the CBO the costs of the extension for railroad workers from the railroad trust fund will be \$2½ million in fiscal year 1993, by their word an insignificant sum for fiscal year 1994. No appropriation is required to extend Federal funds from the trust fund. The railroad trust fund has consistently run a surplus and will continue to do so with the benefit of the extension we have here.

Let me quote from the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board:

The Railroad Unemployment and Sickness Benefit programs are financed solely by payroll taxes on railroad employers.

Since the unemployed railroad workers experience the same hardships as other unemployed workers and since the cost of the additional benefits would come from their own fund which can easily afford the additional benefits, I am pleased that this legislation recognizes the fundamental fairness of including railroad workers in the extension of unemployment benefits, and I urge its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWIFT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman who is the chairman of the subcommittee for his generosity in joining in an effort to ask the Rules Committee to put this provision in the rule. We wanted it, as the gentleman knows, either that way or as an amendment, but the 1,200 or so railroad workers who need and in our judgment deserve to be included in the benefits that other unemployed people have are greatly desirous that this be done on their behalf, as it has been done in each of the last two Congresses, I believe.

I very much appreciate the gentleman as well as Chairman MATSUI cooperating with us so that we could include the 1,200 unemployed railroad workers in this extended coverage.

Mr. SWIFT. Well, the gentleman from Montana has been a champion of this all along. It is only what my subcommittee is delighted to be able to do what is after all the right thing, and I appreciate it.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if I could comment on that colloquy, it was very touching and I agree with the gentleman. That should have been included and I would have been supportive of that. In fact, if that amendment had come to the floor, I would have voted for it, as long as it was funded. I think the words used by the gentleman from Washington that there is money in the trust fund is true, but it does indeed add to the deficit and is another increase in the deficit as a result of this bill. We should go back and not only pay for this amendment, but for the rest of the bill.

I wish we could have had the same kind of moments here on the floor with respect to other amendments which I think would have passed and could have passed on this floor had we had a rule which would have allowed a much more responsible and as the gentleman from Washington said the right thing to do to have happen here on the floor, to have a more responsible bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, providing help to people who are unemployed is important but so is addressing the problem of the budget deficit. The majority will try to portray those of us who oppose this bill today as being uncompassionate and uncaring. But Americans have told us they want a Congress that is willing to make tough choices, one that is willing to say "no" to more deficit Government spending, when it can seem too easy to say "yes."

The unemployment bill we are going to vote on increases the budget deficit by \$5.7 billion. If we are going to help people, let us not rob from their children by increasing the budget deficit. Let us find a way to pay for it or if we cannot offer an alternative that may not be as generous as some want it to be, but still helps. We did that when this bill was considered in the committee, but were voted down. Unfortunately, we are not going to have a chance for everyone to vote on a more responsible bill today.

President Clinton said in this speech last week, and I quote, "We must say that there can be no more something for nothing, and we are all in this together." Well, this bill is something for nothing. If President Clinton is sincere about what he said, then no one in this Chamber should be voting for this bill.

This bill is part of a plan to increase the budget deficit by \$16 billion in the first year. Cutting the budget deficit is the best stimulus to help people get jobs. By increasing spending and the deficit we are promising more unemployment, not less. Vote no on H.R. 920 to stop robbing future generations.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman. He has made an important statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA].

□ 1630

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I rise and speak in opposition to this legislation. While I am in favor of extending unemployment compensation to those who are without work and those who have lost their jobs and are struggling to survive, I have two serious problems with the legislation before us today.

First, the American people should know that the U.S. House of Representatives is no longer permitting representation. This bill is being ramrodded through this body in a kangaroo court fashion, without opportunity for the minority to be heard and without opportunity to improve the cost and impact of this measure.

The second reason I oppose this measure is that it is a glaring example of what is wrong with Congress. Congress has refused to address the real problems of the creation of new jobs,

investment in business, and assisting industry to create employment. Further, we have failed to bring forth legislation to keep American jobs at home and allow the United States to compete in a global market. Instead we offer no hope, no alternative, no creative solution to those who want to work or those who find no dignity in standing in an unemployment line. So, it is with sadness that I speak and vote against this measure that unfortunately typifies business as usual in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] for yielding this time to me, and I do want to make a point of some agreement with my Republican colleagues, that under almost any circumstance we ought to not put spending first this year. We also ought to find a way to pay either in advance for these programs or pay for them at the time they are moving through the House.

As all observers in the United States know now, the leadership of both the House and Senate came to agreement with President Clinton just today, that in each ensuing instance that is the way the Congress will conduct its future business.

We have here, however, a very unusual circumstance that I think both sides appreciate, and that is that in just a very few hours unemployment benefits are going to expire, extended unemployment benefits, that is, are going to expire, for an unknown number of America's laid-off workers, but a number that reaches into the hundreds of thousands.

So, Mr. Speaker, this House, it seems to me, has a choice. We could delay, and many of us believe that delay might be very significant as we try to reach agreement on how to pay for this, and the delay stretched into weeks the last time we tried to reach it. Or we could pursue another option, which is the one that we have decided to pursue here today, and that is to move dramatically and with speed in finding a way now to pay for only part of these very needed unemployment benefits. The others, in my judgment, will be paid for. We will find ways to do it. But in the meantime we cannot allow unemployment benefits to expire for the many hundreds of thousands of Americans who need them.

We have today, as we are debating this issue, more than a million Americans on extended unemployment benefits, and so what the House is deciding today is, as a Supreme Court Justice once said, whether we sail with the wind or against the wind, we must, above all, set sail. The House is deciding today to set sail on behalf of these unemployed workers.

But let me conclude by saying that my Republican colleagues, and my Democrat colleagues and the President of the United States who want to find ways to pay for these things in the future before we do them are correct, and that is what we intend to do. We are not doing it in this instance because we are faced with an unusual, but very difficult, crisis.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I wish to engage the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I will say in reference to his comments that he says we are hours away. We are roughly 240 hours away from the expiration of the benefits under the last emergency extension, which is plenty of time for the members of the Committee on Ways and Means to go back and work in committee to hammer out a funding mechanism to pay for this, and the gentleman says it took weeks last time. The reason it took weeks last time is because we had weeks last time before the expiration of the benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish the same debate had taken place in previous Congresses when we were trying to find billions by the hundreds for the Pentagon, and for star wars, and for space station, and for the superconducting super collider, but, when we try to find a few dollars for unemployed, laid-off workers, the other side rails about how in the world are we ever going to pay for this. When we try to find a few dollars for Head Start, the other side rails about how are we going to pay for it. I wish they would rail when we are really spending money around here.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, if I could reclaim my time, I do rail on many of those programs which the gentleman mentioned, and I do agree with him, that we need to do some substantive things about appropriations around here, but this is not an appropriation. This is an extension of an entitlement program, and I do not hear railing on either side of the aisle when it comes to paying for these things. We just seem to put them on the deficit, and that is the kind of irresponsibility that I believe the American public would like to see stopped and stopped not next week, not next month, but today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS].

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I spent a good part of last month responding to reporters' questions about what I thought about

Zoe Baird, or Kimba Woods, and whether I ever hire illegal aliens, and questions about gays in the military. They wanted to know if I had a chauffeur and other perks of office. And then the press asked me why I was spending all my time on these issues and not the important issues like the Federal budget deficits and the economy. I told them, "The only time I spend on these issues is when you call and ask me about them."

We had a momentous moment last week when the President walked down this aisle, and spoke at the dias, behind me and alerted the Nation to the fact that we have budget deficits that simply have to be addressed. He said in essence that they are a dagger in our heart, a noose around our neck, an anchor that drags on the ocean floor preventing our Nation from moving forward. To his credit he changed the debate of this Nation to the Federal budget deficits and our economy.

I serve on the Committee on the Budget, and we have had so many experts come before us and say, a stimulus package we do not need. Getting these deficits down we do. That will increase our productivity, create more jobs and move our economy forward.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak forcefully enough to the fact that, we must not vote out bills that are not paid for.

The President's budget only reduces the deficits \$325 billion, over the next 4 years; 207 billion because of increases in net taxes; \$93 billion because of net spending cuts; and \$25 billion because of savings in debt costs. And our first action as Congress is to vote out an unemployment compensation bill which I agree with, which I think we need, which I voted for in every instance when they were funded in the past; but which is not funded today.

□ 1640

It would be a clear mistake as our first action to vote out this important bill and not pay to fund it. It is the wrong way to go, and seems to me to fly in the face of everything the President has spoken to us about.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to defer voting on this bill until it can be properly funded.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 920 to provide extended unemployment compensation to people who have lost their jobs and are suffering due to the recession. In some quarters they tell us the recession is over, but try telling that to someone who has lost their job and is trying desperately to find a new one, and because of the economy cannot.

Quite frankly, after years of fighting with the Bush administration over extending unemployment compensation, it is a pleasure to finally have a Presi-

dent who recognizes the pain with which many Americans are suffering and who is willing to address it. I commend the Clinton administration and the Committee on Ways and Means for moving so quickly to extend the unemployment benefits for the long-term jobless.

While many of the economic indicators in this country have been on the rise, the unemployment rate has stayed above 7 percent and shows few signs of decreasing. In fact, there are currently more people without work than in March 1991, the supposed height of the recession. In New York City, part of which I represent, the unemployment rate in January of this year was an astonishing 13 percent, a 2-percent increase over December.

H.R. 920 would help alleviate the pain being felt by the unemployed by providing additional benefits to those people who are about to exhaust their original 26 weeks of unemployment benefits. Depending on the unemployment rate in individual States, people would be eligible for between 20 and 26 additional weeks of jobless benefits.

Quite frankly, I would have taken this even one step further. There are many people who have exhausted 52 weeks of unemployment compensation who are not covered under this bill. But this bill does go a long way in alleviating the suffering being felt all over this country.

Unemployment compensation, we realize, is only a temporary solution, but I am pleased that we are addressing the long-term structural problems in our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Clinton administration is addressing the long-term structural problems in the economy by proposing additional spending on infrastructure, job retraining, and investment in high-technology industries. It really boggles my mind that there are so many people on the other side who are arguing against this, and then when the President is proposing an economic stimulus package to actually create new jobs so that people who are on unemployment now will have real jobs, they oppose that as well. That does not make any sense to me.

With an administration committed to addressing the problems in our economy, hopefully this will be the last time we have to extend unemployment compensation. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 920.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] that to the best of my knowledge, and I have been here through the entire debate, there is not one Member on this side of the aisle who has gotten up and argued against extending unemployment benefits. What we have argued with, have been very consistent and

pointed about arguing with, is the way this bill does it.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the gentleman right now, I will vote for an extension of unemployment benefits if you come back with a funded bill. If you come back with a way to pay for it, I will vote for it, and suggest if you do not get all Members, you will get most of them here on this side of the aisle.

So that is not the argument here today. The argument is not to extend benefits; the argument is how do we do it. I would suggest that the American public, once we get past the first issue, the American public wants us to do it responsibly.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say I have been around here now for almost 5 years and have listened to a great many debates and participated in many of them, and found when people want to really kill a bill, it is very easy to come up with all kinds of reasons to do it.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I could respond to that, let me repeat, I do not want to kill this bill. I would be very happy to vote for this bill if it had a funding mechanism. Most Members on this side, a great number of them, would vote to extend benefits if it were funded. We do not want to kill this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we in fact have a motion to recommit which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the ranking member, will be offering, which will instruct the committee to immediately report back as soon as possible a measure that is paid for. That is all we are asking. That is the debate. I understand maybe the gentleman was not here for all of it, but I can tell him, the debate on the floor of this House has not been about whether we should extend unemployment benefits; it is whether we are going to be responsible in paying for it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would hope that when the President's package is sent before Congress containing the economic stimulus, along with the budget cuts in order to get the deficit down, that my friends on the other side of the aisle will support that as well, because that truly is something that pays for itself and moves in the right directions and helps create the jobs.

Mr. Speaker, all I am saying is there are many people who are suffering now, and I do not believe, quite frankly, these people can wait another 2 weeks or 4 weeks or a month or 2 months. We need to pass this package now and need to get it signed into law.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to pass this

package before March 6. We have 240 hours, 2 weeks, to pass this measure. All I am suggesting is we have plenty of time for very smart people on the Committee on Ways and Means, and now that I am one of them I can say that, to go ahead and come up with a mechanism to pay for this. That is what the American people want, in addition to an extension of benefits.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COYNE].

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge House passage of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1993.

Unemployed Americans are depending on help from their elected officials.

Some may argue that the House should delay action on this issue, but any delay puts at risk the ability of unemployed Americans to provide for their families. The House must act expeditiously to ensure that unemployment benefits are available after the March 6 expiration date which is only 10 days away.

The Labor Department reports that long-term unemployment remains a significant problem. The facts are that recently reported economic growth has not been matched by an adequate level of job growth. Americans experiencing long-term unemployment continue to exhaust their basic unemployment benefits at a rate of over 300,000 workers per month.

State governments have not been able to respond to the need of the long-term unemployed. The recent recession has depleted State unemployment trust funds to the point that not one State has implemented the optional benefit trigger provisions enacted by Congress last year. Only the Federal Government can respond to this national economic emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this emergency unemployment compensation legislation. Unemployed Americans need your help today.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the issue that has been raised about the amounts that are in the trust funds in various States and why we are not saying to them to use these trust funds. I want all Members on both sides of the aisle to look at the facts here and not listen to emotional pleas.

Mr. Speaker, some of these States at first blush might seem to have considerable amounts in their trust funds, but lots of them do not. In terms of the months that they have in their trust funds, you take a State like Illinois, they have less than 9 months in their trust fund, and this is to cover the regular flow of unemployment benefits.

□ 1650

The same is true, for example, of Ohio, of New York. New York has only

a couple of months. Ohio has less than 8 months. Pennsylvania has 6½ months. This is to cover the regular flow of unemployment benefits.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is using a static number. He is saying that there is x number of dollars at this point in time to cover that. But there are always taxes going into the fund.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will have to listen and understand this.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I am trying.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made this plea and he is confusing, if I might say so, in my judgment, some of the Members on his side of the aisle.

Sure, money is coming in, but the unemployment persists that has a call on those funds. So there is more money coming in, but there is more to be paid out. And there is no indication that the unemployment rate in the gentleman's State is going to plunge dramatically.

So if we say to a State like Pennsylvania, that has 6½ months in their fund, take an extended benefit in addition to your regular benefits, we are going to deplete that fund in much less than 6½ months. Nobody knows exactly, I think, how soon. It could be in 1 or 2 months.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it could be more than that.

Mr. LEVIN. There is no indication that unemployment is going to be lowered dramatically. No one assumes that.

It may drop one-tenth or two-tenths of 1 percent.

I want to zero in on this. Everybody has to understand it.

There are some States that have a larger number of months of benefits in their fund. But we cannot craft, on the spur of the moment, a new system because we would say to those States that have taxed their employers and put their funds in a very, very strong position, you pay extended benefits while other States, which have fewer months in their trust fund, they would not have to draw on them.

That is why we have said, and responsibly so, you can't do it overnight and you can't do it risking the security, the income security of hundreds of thousands of people in Pennsylvania.

So I say to the gentleman and I say to my colleague from Michigan, who spoke earlier, if you want to, under the banner of fiscal responsibility, vote against tens of thousands of people in your State, go ahead and do that. But it is a false banner. It is a false banner. It is rhetoric.

What we need to do, and we will do it on the subcommittee and in the com-

mittee, we will finally reform this system.

But while we are doing it, we should not victimize individual people and families, and the gentleman should not victimize them under the banner of fiscal responsibility because he is not being that.

And the gentleman, who comes from Pennsylvania, and other States like that especially, he is playing with the lives of tens of thousands of people, raising some kind of rhetoric. It is false rhetoric.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, what I think I hear the gentleman saying, but again, I am not too sure I pick all this stuff up, but I am trying, is that the unemployment extension you passed last year out of your subcommittee with your approval that you and members of that subcommittee passionately argued for, the permanent change that you passed last year does not work. It is a bad idea, should not have been passed, because it obviously does not work, because you are suggesting that those of us who think that we should try to have it work are wrong.

But let me suggest that we passed the permanent changes to the unemployment compensation program to take care of this very circumstance, that when we would come into another period, and it happened to be the same period, another period of bad unemployment, which we all agree is the case, that we would have a mechanism to assist States with Federal dollars to help them trigger earlier on for extended benefits. That is what we passed last year. That is what you argued for last year and now you are repudiating today.

All I am suggesting is that if it was a good idea last year, and one certainly worthy of passing with, I believe, unanimous support from the Democratic side of the aisle, then it should be worthy enough to at least be tried once.

And what I am suggesting is that there are surpluses in these funds. And, yes, there may not be enough surplus to pay for all of the extended benefits. And if that is the case, then States have the responsibility of either, and I say either, finding some other benefit cuts or increasing FUTA taxes, which is the prerogative of the State, instead of the alternative that you find so, just so distasteful, is to come up with a measure to pay for these extended benefits, 100 percent Federal, with some other mechanism.

That, to me, is, I think, what we passed last year, what every Member wanted, was a shared responsibility between those States who have high unemployment and the Federal Government. And now you are telling me this is a bad idea and we should not have passed it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, no, not at all.

We on our side tried a permanent change in the trigger. It was opposed.

Mr. SANTORUM. You succeeded.

Mr. LEVIN. No, we did not. We passed a permanent change, and it was changed to a voluntary system in part because of the resistance of the Bush administration. They would not agree to any permanent change in the trigger mechanism. We have been trying for years. So put the blame on the doorstep where it belongs.

Second, I want to just say one word to you, have you gone back to the State of Pennsylvania or have my colleagues from Michigan, Michigan has in its fund 1½ months of benefit, that is all we have left, have my colleagues from Michigan or have you gone back to your State and said, "Look, you just have a couple of months left. What I want you to do is to use those few months on extended benefits and when you run out, raise taxes of the employers or take money out of the general fund of the State?"

Have you said that to your State? Mr. SANTORUM. As you know, because you asked this question of me in the committee, yes, I did go back and talk to members of my State Legislature about this. And do you know what they told me? They told me that on balance, remember they represent the same people I represent and the same people in the State legislature level in Michigan that you represent. And what they said is:

We have to balance, we have to be responsible. We have to balance between what are the needs of the people in my community and the fiscal situation in our State.

And do you know what? They are making decisions based on a whole different premise than we are here, because when we do things here, we do not worry about fiscal responsibility. We do not worry about the fiscal responsibility. We just worry about the cases out there, and I understand they are compelling. And I am willing to pay for them, which is more than members of the my State are doing. I am willing to pay for them.

But what you are arguing is, since members of the State Legislatures in these 21 States have chosen one of two things, you have to make this argument, either that we are going to come in and bail them out, which we will, and they know we will, or that they have fiscal restraints that are keeping them from extending benefits to people. The same people now, these are not people from Mars representing Pennsylvania, these are people elected in Pennsylvania, representing Pennsylvanians, making these decisions.

What you are saying is that this, that somehow or another these people

are being irresponsible and that we need to be responsible, come in and extend benefits and put the taxes on our children. That to me is not responsible.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I am not saying that people in Pennsylvania are irresponsible.

What they have said to you, and every Member should listen, what your State legislators have said to you is, no, they will not raise FUTA taxes and they will not take money out of the general treasury. So now you are coming back here, after the State has said no, and what you are going to do, by putting the burden back on them, when they will not do it, you are going to penalize, victimize tens of thousands of people in Pennsylvania. You are the one who is being irresponsible.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is recognize, if they are going to say no, and I really believe the reason they are saying no has less to do with their fiscal problems and more to do with knowing that we are going to come in and bail them out anyway. They know this is on the greased skids. So they know this is happening. So they are not going to put up any money, if we are going to pay for the whole thing. These folks are not dumb. These are elected officials, and we like to think we are pretty smart.

So they know what we are doing here, and they know we are going to pass this and they are not going to pass anything that is going to cost them money when we are willing to pay for the whole ball of wax.

What I am saying is that we need to be responsible here, if we are going to take that approach to pay for it.

□ 1700

That is all I am suggesting. Let us go back to the committee. Let us pay for the measure. Let us come up with the revenue increases or the spending cuts to pay for this and let us move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAZIO].

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, never have I agonized over a matter as I have agonized over this. I want to vote for this bill more than anything else that I have done so far in this Congress, but unfortunately, I cannot. This measure is a prime example of how a great idea can enter this institution, get run through the political process, and end up doing more harm than good.

I was first elected to Congress last November with the support of voters who demanded change. In my district, many of those voters were—and remain today—unemployed.

It was my hope to be able to come to the House floor today and vote to extend unemployment benefits that millions of out-of-work Americans need

and deserve. I had only one request. Before Congress extended these important benefits, I wanted us to include a way to pay for them.

For too long, Congress has been providing benefits without showing the courage to pay for these benefits. While many of us had hoped that this practice would end in the face of President Clinton's pledge to attack our Federal budget deficit, this bill marks a return to business as usual.

I just want to make one other comment. There are 110 new Members of the House of Representatives. Each was elected on a mandate to change the way business is conducted around here and to reduce our Federal budget deficit.

President Clinton has pointed out the fact that the most jobs can be created by actually attacking this budget deficit, increasing savings and investment. That is how we turn around unemployment, not by running up the budget deficit.

That, obviously, is not what my colleagues on the other side want to hear. That is the long-term answer to unemployment, to create more jobs and stimulate this economy over the long run to get this deficit down, not to increase this deficit.

I reluctantly vote against this measure today, but hope that the leadership will bring another unemployment insurance extension benefit bill to this floor, one that will be paid for, one that I will vote for. If a responsible financing mechanism is included in that bill, I will be its strongest advocate.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LEVIN].

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that people on the minority side are looking for excuses to vote no. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] shifts his ground. First he says "Let them do it there." Then he acknowledges they cannot do it there because of budget constraints. Then he says "They are looking to us to bail them out."

Then he says, "No, the problem is that we ought to pay for it; you know, say how we are going to pay for it."

The proposal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON] in the committee was to borrow from next year; totally irresponsible. This is a responsible way to proceed. I urge we adopt this bill.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 920, and urge my colleagues to join me by voting for passage of this much-needed measure, to extend emergency unemployment compensation [EUC] an additional 6 months.

Economic indicators show that we seem to be finally recovering from the

devastating recession of 1991. But job growth rates paint a different picture. In fact, job growth today is more sluggish than in past recoveries. No recovery is worth its salt without meaningful reemployment of displaced workers. With reemployment limping behind other indicators, we are not out of the woods yet.

H.R. 920 responds to this situation in a compassionate and sensible way by extending emergency unemployment benefits through October 2, and making funds available to help States to more quickly identify and direct displaced workers to job placement and retaining services. The spending for this effort will be offset by savings from eventual job growth accounted for in the President's long-term deficit reduction package.

Without our intervention, an estimated 1.5 million displaced workers, and their families, will be barred from filing for emergency unemployment benefits after March 6. These folks, who lost their jobs through no fault of their own, will be forced into poverty or onto welfare. Thousands of these people were just recently laid off by corporate giants such as IBM, Sears, GM, and Boeing who probably will not be rehiring them. Providing an extra 6 months of emergency compensation is in our economic best interest as well, because such action will help in part to stabilize the economy while hundreds of thousands of Americans look for a new job.

The overall unemployment rate is relatively low in Wisconsin, compared to that in the home States of some of my colleagues. This should not become an excuse to avoid helping out States that are troubled today by higher unemployment rates. Parochial interests are inappropriate in this situation.

Genuine economic recovery depends upon helping the unemployed to continue purchasing basic needs, such as food and housing, while looking for a new job. It is our moral obligation to provide help during this difficult time, and for this reason, I support this important legislation.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, who is handling the bill, for this opportunity to respond to some of the remarks as I was just watching them on TV from the committee room.

Mr. Speaker, it seems as though the ones who are most vociferously opposed to granting unemployment extension benefits for the unemployed of this country, who have extended their unemployment for a period of a year to a year and a half, who are searching for work, who are crying for job retraining, those same opponents will be here, and were here last year, voting to fund a space station which costs billions of dollars, were voting to fund a super-

conductor super collider down in the Southwest that costs billions of dollars, who were voting for foreign aid and who, yes, were voting consistently for American warplanes to fly off into the horizon and drop half-a-million-dollar bombs and cheer every time they did it.

They did not think then it was on borrowed money, but now they remind us, "Oh, we have to borrow the money to take care of America's unemployed workers."

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Members, this is an investment in unemployed American workers who have been gainfully employed, supporting their families, and through no fault of their own, now find themselves in the line waiting to sign up for unemployment. They do not want to be there, but the economic conditions and policies of this country, for the past 12 years, placed them in those lines. Let us take care of them in my State for another 20 weeks.

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes. We are getting to the close of this debate at this time, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] will speak, and then the leader will speak after I complete my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, we would not be in this dilemma, now, were it not for the fact that we have a March 6 deadline. I think most of us, on both sides of the aisle, would prefer this matter to come up with the economic stimulus package, but the fact of the matter is, in 10 days we have to take action. Otherwise 300,000 additional Americans a month will lose extended benefits, and 1.5 million who are currently on that program will lose benefits as well. We have no choice but to act.

If we delay this, I think what will happen is, that the American public will say "There they go again; even though you have a new President who is there for change, we have gridlock," so we have a responsibility to pass this legislation.

The other body, hopefully, will pass it soon and we can send it to the President, so we can assure these millions of Americans that their benefits will continue, their mortgage payments will be paid, and they will be able to support their children going to colleges or wherever else those children may be.

Bear in mind we are not talking about full benefits. These people are only getting about 37 percent of what the average wage is, so this is no windfall to these Americans. This is just to get by on a temporary basis while we try to move out of this recession, and into some level of employment that gets these people back to work.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. MATSUI] remark

that the President campaigned on change. We now see today the first change with this new administration. The change is, in the last three times we extended unemployment benefits, we paid for them, all three times. The last three times we extended unemployment benefits, we paid for them.

Guess what, we have change in America. We are not going to pay for this, we are going to do it differently. We are going to put this one on the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Members that that is not the change, that is not the change, that America thought it was voting for. Today, and I will repeat again, despite all the rhetoric on the other side about whether we want to extend unemployment benefits or not, let me assure the Members as the ranking member on the subcommittee, and as someone who voted for all three extensions last year, I would like to vote for an extension this year. I would be willing to go back to subcommittee and committee and work on this.

I think a number of Members, as the Members have heard on this side of the aisle, feel very strongly about that. We have before us, not a question of whether we should extend unemployment benefits. This is a question of choices, three choices.

□ 1710

One choice, the choice that will happen because what I found out, and it took me a little while, but I found out that when you have 82 more votes on the other side you win most of the time. They are going to win this one. They are going to pass this bill, and it is going to pass with a \$5.7 billion additional deficit over the next 5 years, \$5.7 billion. We would not have to pass the energy tax for a year and a half if we just came up with some other measure to pay for this \$5.7 billion added onto the deficit, and have your children, your grandchildren, pay for it for the rest of their lives.

Talk about compassion, how about children, how about compassion for their future? How about compassion for their ability to get a job? How about compassion for their economy? How about compassion for their elected officials who will have to come here and deal with the mess that we are going to leave them if we continue this kind of compassion?

This is one option, pass it on.

Option 2. We can go back to the committee. In a motion to recommit we can send this bill back immediately to the committee, have a mechanism put in it to pay for this and bring it back to the floor. I will guarantee, and again I am new here, but I would bet Members, that if that motion to recommit passed we would have this bill back faster than any bill has ever come back here with a measure to pay for this. And I guarantee that it would be before

March 6. I would lay a lot on that probability, that it would come back with a mechanism to pay for this. That is option 2.

Option 3. Use the permanent trigger, that was put in place last year, which 21 States could now adopt, to extend benefits anywhere from 13 to 20 weeks in only those States that have high unemployment, not in States, like Nebraska, which has a 2.8 percent unemployment rate which will, let me remind Members, which will get an extension of unemployment benefits of 20 weeks for people in Nebraska which has an unemployment rate under the structural unemployment rate of 3 percent.

Those are the three choices. First, extend benefits for \$5.7 billion onto the deficit. Second, extend benefits but come up with a mechanism to pay for it. Third, allow States in the highest areas of unemployment to trigger benefits. Those are the three choices, all of which will extend benefits to those who need them.

Now I ask my colleagues, the public, whomever is listening, Mr. Speaker, what choice would you make if this was your vote, what choice would you make? Gee, I might be from, again, some other planet, and I might not have lived in America as long as other people in this body have lived in America, but I have lived here long enough to know that most Americans, the vast majority of Americans, would come up with a responsible way of doing, as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SWIFT] said, the right thing.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTORUM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and join him in opposition to H.R. 920.

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in opposition to H.R. 920 which provides for the extension of unemployment benefits by declaring the new spending an emergency under the 1990 Budget Enforcement Act—thereby exempting the bill's cost from the pay-as-you-go requirements and directly adding to the deficit. The American people want us to reduce our deficit, yet here the majority and the House goes again, resorting to the same old tricks, calling this an emergency and increasing the Federal deficit.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to deny extended benefits to Americans who are still without jobs, but if we are to strengthen our economy so that more jobs can be created we must stop adding to our deficit. The way to get the economy on the right track is to show some discipline and find budget offsets to pay for this extension. There has been much talk in recent days about Government acquiring that discipline. Now is the time to exercise it.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of such budget offsets, this Member urges his colleagues to oppose H.R. 920 as proof that they are serious about reducing the Federal deficit.

Mr. SANTORUM. I just plead, I just plead with Members on the other side