

some day and come again. These parting words are in behalf of an outraged, heart-broken, bruised and bleeding, but God-fearing people; faithful, industrious, loyal people, rising people, full of potential force." George White did not go quietly, and neither will I.

The attorney for the State of Georgia representing Democratic leadership in the State of Georgia said at the trial in Augusta, "Our position is that Section 2 does not mandate a second Congressional black district."

I think that just about says it all. The fears that we had in the middle of the special session, at the end of the special session; the confusion that we experienced at the beginning of the special session and all during the special session, was a joke. It was a hoax. Folks were laughing at us.

I had faith, hope, and trust in my Democratic leadership of the State of Georgia, because I am a Democrat too. And when I come up here and I vote, I do not see anything on my card that says "Black vote," or "Black Democrat." I do not see that. I vote yea or nay, just like everybody else.

Other folks see that. And then other folks bring what they see that is ugly to the political process. Now the whole Nation is wrapped up in this issue of race, when maybe really all it is is just a matter of greed. But greedy folks will use the issue of race. Greedy folks will divide people. Greedy folks will say "You all do not deserve to be together," so that they can continue to get and get and get, and take and take and take.

Claude McKay says the following in his poem, "If We Must die:"

If we must die, let it not be like hogs
Hunted and penned in an inglorious spot,
While round us bark the mad and hungry
dogs,
Making their mock at our accursed lot.
If we must die, O let us nobly die,
So that our precious blood may not be shed
In vain; then even the monsters we defy
Shall be constrained to honor us though
dead!
O kinsmen! we must meet the common foe!
Though far outnumbered let us show us
brave,
And for their thousand blows deal one
deathblow!
What though before us lies the open grave?
Like men we'll face the murderous, cowardly
pack,
PRESSED to the wall, dying, but fighting back!

That is about the way I am going to take this whole redistricting fight, pressed to the wall, dying, but fighting back.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-331) on the resolution (H. Res. 261) providing for the consider-

ation of Senate amendments to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 115) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 2586, TEMPORARY INCREASE IN THE STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-332) on the resolution (H. Res. 262) providing for the consideration of Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 2586) to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IMPORTANCE OF BALANCING THE FEDERAL BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. AL-LARD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues, particularly my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] and other colleagues who will be coming to the floor shortly in what promises to be, I think, a very special and informative 1-hour special order.

We are going to talk about a variety of subjects tonight, Mr. Speaker; but, most of all, we are going to focus on the importance to America, to our constituents of passing a balanced Federal budget.

So much really hangs in the balance or is at stake. I guess I should not say "balance" too often, for fear that the people might be misled a little bit, but so much is at stake here over the next several days or several weeks, depending on how long it actually takes us to ultimately get a balanced budget signed into law. But our constituents and our colleagues listening tonight and perhaps viewing on C-SPAN should realize that House Republicans, as the new majority in Congress for the last 10 months, have been absolutely dedicated to balancing the Federal budget for the first time in a quarter of a century.

We have already passed on this House floor the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995, which balances the Federal budget in 7 years by limiting the growth, the increase in Federal spending, to 3 percent per year.

Now, the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act also contains some very other important reforms, including genuine welfare reform that requires work for the able-bodied, emphasizes families, and provides people who are

dependent on welfare in the short-term real hope and opportunity for the future.

The Reconciliation Act also includes a significant tax cut for families and for economic growth and job creation in the private sector. This is the dividend, if you will, the economic dividend, for families resulting from getting our fiscal house in order at the Federal level. It is only right, since we all know that the beleaguered middle-class American family has been overburdened by the combination of high taxation and stagnant incomes for many, many years, it is only right that we keep our promises and provide them with much needed tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, before I yield to my California colleague, Mrs. SEASTRAND, I want to point out earlier today the House passed a temporary increase in the Federal Government's borrowing authority. That is known as the debt ceiling. Basically, we sent a bill to the other body, the Senate, that allows the Federal Government to continue borrowing money for the purposes of financing a deficit until on or about December 12.

The passage of that legislation today follows on the heels of the past and of a continuing resolution which allows the Federal Government to keep the doors open and to keep paying its bills, meeting its financial obligations. That is the continuing resolution which passed on this floor yesterday.

When it came time to vote on the temporary increase in the debt ceiling, the short-term extension until December 12, we heard some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, some of the so-called moderate Democrats, make statements about wanting to balance the Federal budget in a bipartisan fashion. In fact, they even went so far, as is the prerogative of the minority party in the House of Representatives, to offer a so-called motion to recommit. They claim that that motion to recommit would allow us to achieve a balanced budget working in a bipartisan fashion.

But here is the flaw in their thinking. We would be remiss on this side of the aisle if we did not point out that a couple of weeks ago, we did pass the 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, which again was the key vote on whether a Member of Congress on either side of the aisle supports the idea of balancing the Federal budget in 7 years or less, whether that Member is willing to go on record as making the difficult decisions and the tough choices necessary to balance the Federal budget in 7 years.

Now, when we had that legislation on the House floor a couple of weeks ago, only 4 Democrats, only 4, there are 199 Democrats currently serving in the House of Representatives and only 4 had the courage to cross this middle aisle, which you might refer to as the partisan aisle, to support the House

Republicans, the majority party, in approving and passing that balanced budget plan.

Just before that vote, they had the opportunity, as again is their prerogative, as the minority party in the House of Representatives, they had their opportunity to present their budget alternative known as the Democratic substitute.

When they offered that plan, the Democratic Party's substitute, which they claim would also balance the Federal budget in 7 years, only 72 Democrats out of 199 supported the Democrat substitute. In fact, the House minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], and the House minority whip, the No. 2 ranking Democrat in the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], both voted against the Democrat substitute. That is to say, they both voted against their own party's version of a balanced budget.

So my point is that only 76 Democrats, the 72 who voted for the Democrat substitute and the 4 Democrats who supported our balanced budget plan, only 76 out of 199 Democrats, far less than a majority, actually supported, when it came time for the talking to end and the voting to start, a balanced budget.

When the debate had finally ended and it was really time, if I can use sort of a crass term, to put up or shut up, only 76 out of 199 Democrats supported, with their vote, the concept of balancing the Federal budget and stopping the immoral practice of borrowing from our children's future to pay for today's spending binges.

Despite this 11th-hour rhetoric we heard on the House floor today, an overwhelming majority of Democrats clearly believe that we can continue our merry deficit-spending ways.

So I am a returnee to the Congress. I served one term, took an unintended vacation or sabbatical, depending on your point of view, and returned as a Member of our new majority. I learned in my first term in office, serving back here in Washington, a priceless saying that has been, I guess, bandied about this august institution for years and years, and it is simply paraphrased as, "Don't listen to what they say. Look at how they vote."

When it came time to vote for a balanced budget, only 76 Democrats stood up to be counted. The remainder, out of 199, so that would be 123 Democrats, voted against balancing the Federal budget, voted against the other reforms that were contained in that act.

So here we are trying to solve problems for a generation, and all they can offer is more rhetoric.

Before I yield, I want to also point out one other chart. Maybe we can understand their action, the action of our Democratic colleagues in the House, a little bit better if we understand that the President of the United States and the leader of their party has also failed to come to the table with a real, verifi-

able plan to balance the Federal budget. In fact, what I have put up here on this chart are the budget deficits that are projected by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office resulting from his so-called 10-year balanced budget plan.

You can see, because this is not my word, for that matter this is not the claim of any of my colleagues, this is the considered professional opinion of the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office as to how his budget, the President's budget plan remains unbalanced, generating \$200 billion deficits year in and year out over the next 10 years. Red ink as far as the eye can see.

□ 1945

So, in a way, I empathize with some of my Democratic colleagues because they really have not been able to look to the President of the United States and the leader of their political party for leadership on this particular issue, and that is what this issue is all about, real leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we are on the verge of working out the final details between the House and the Senate on the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act, and as soon as we have done that we will be sending that, along with a longer term extension of the national debt ceiling and larger term increase in the national debt ceiling, and we will be sending that legislation to the President of the United States. It will be time for him, at that point, to decide if he is going to make good on his earlier promises to the American people to balance the Federal budget.

And of course we know that the President is, unfortunately, inclined to say one thing and do another, but the reality is he is on the record very recently as telling Larry King, during the course of an interview on CNN, and I am actually now looking for his exact words here, he is on record as saying that he believes that the budget can be balanced. In fact, back on June 4 of 1992, the President told Larry King, "I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget". Well, Mr. President, we are still waiting to see your 5-year plan to balance the budget, because, obviously, what you sent to Capitol Hill not only does not balance the budget, it adds a trillion dollars, over a trillion dollars more to the national debt; the aggregate debt of \$5 trillion.

So, Mr. Speaker, we believe that after months of delay, after months, to be honest about this now, of the President and some of his liberal Democratic allies in the Congress using every trick, every excuse, every scare tactic that they could to halt our reforms to balance the Federal budget, to preserve and protect and strengthen Medicare, to reform the welfare system, to cut taxes for families and private businesses, after months of delay the time really for the President to act is now. He is running out of excuses.

The American people are clearly running out of patience. They expect us to

do the right thing, and that means balancing the budget. We are absolutely committed to doing that. We say let us get the job done, no more excuses, no more Washington gimmicks. It is time to do the right thing for America's future and adopt a Federal budget that reflects America's values.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND], my distinguished colleague.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. It is interesting when he says no more gimmicks, no more Washington excuses, let us just do it. I would note that his district is on the coast of California, way to the north. I am on the central coast of California. Many hundreds of miles divide our districts, but I know that when he goes home, as I do, and walk the parades and go to the town hall meetings, we hear our constituents, whether they be Democrat, Republican, independent or such, they give us that slogan, no more excuses, let us just do it.

I would like to say that balancing the budget is really a nonpartisan issue.

Mr. RIGGS. It should be.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. And, Mr. Speaker, we can do it in a bipartisan way. I would like to remind people that it has been over 25 years since we have balanced the Federal budget, and that goes back a long way.

As I have said to people, my son is 25 years old, and being involved in politics for so long, grassroots politics, I remember writing letters to my Congressman. In fact, Congressman Leon Panetta was my Congressman in the late 1970's, and we heard a lot of talk about we are going to balance the budget. I know the distinguished gentleman is now in the White House, with a very important job to do, and we are talking about balancing the budget and here it is 1995.

Mr. RIGGS. The gentlewoman should probably point out that he is at present the White House Chief of Staff, but as one of our former colleagues he was chairman of the House Committee on the Budget. He was chairman of the House Committee on the Budget when I served in the Congress 4 years ago, in the 102d Congress.

And, in fact, my most bitter memory from that whole time period was losing the fight for the balanced budget amendment out on this House floor by six votes, and then Congressman Panetta helped lead the opposition to the balanced budget amendment and helped ensure that the balanced budget amendment was defeated back then, or else I think we probably would already have a balanced budget as the law of the land and be well on our way toward, obviously, reducing and eliminating the deficits and actually then beginning to pay down on the national debt.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I guess the point is we do a lot of talking. It has been 25 years. I remember

talking to my Congressman in the late 1970's and in the early 1980's, and there was a lot of talk when previous Congresses went home. I am sure Members of this House went home and said to their constituents that they were going to balance the budget, but we never saw it accomplished. Coming here into the House as one of those reform-minded freshmen, it is a joy to be surrounded by other Members that think the way I do.

Mr. Speaker, being a mom and a wife, I had to realize that I had to have some kitchen table financial reality at least once a month, and so sat down with the checkbook and figured out what my priorities are with my husband for our family. And when we think about the families across America tonight that are probably going to be doing that very thing, the checkbook, the bank book, figuring out what are the priorities for the family, maybe they do want to take a trip or something but they just cannot afford it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we all know what it is to be maxed out on our credit card. I think families across America might have been in that situation. I think when they get their monthly statement from their credit card and they see the amount of interest they are paying, and if they are sensible persons, taking care of their finances and sitting at that kitchen table, they have to come to the conclusion that they cannot continue maxing out on their credit card. One, there is a price to pay. They are not going to be allowed to charge on it anymore, but the fact is that that interest is eating their dollars up.

So, Mr. Speaker, I like to use that comparison because I have a credit card here and it is one of 435. It is a very unusual credit card, and I would think that in previous Congresses it was one that was used and, well, they simply maxed out on their credit card. We have a new 104th Congress here, a Congress with a new attitude, realizing a simple fact of life; that we are maxed out and the interest is killing us. The experts tell me we are almost paying a billion dollars in interest alone on this credit card every day. We cannot continue along this line or we are facing really some terrible realities.

So I am pleased to be one of those 73 reform-minded freshmen with the idea that we are going to balance the budget. We know it is not going to be easy, but this Congress needs to sit down at the table here and have some kitchen table financial reality just like all families do. We are maxed out.

Each year American taxpayers pay almost \$300 billion just to service that debt that we have accumulated. I do not know about my colleagues, but sometimes when I think about it, a billion dollars does not mean much to me. I do not deal in my checkbook with those kinds of dollars.

Mr. RIGGS. Not that many zeros in anybody's checkbook.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. No. But I know we are in the red and I want to do something about it. What is so great is to know that we now have a plan, a 7-year plan. We have set priorities. Let me tell my colleagues that I have had to use this, if I can call this a credit card, now on many, many votes and made tough choices to pick out priorities of where we are going in this Nation as a family and how we are going to get out of the red. Very difficult choices and decisions that I have had to make; not pleasing to many people, pleasing to some.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it comes to setting priorities. Just like in our own families we are not going to make everyone excited about the fact when we say we have to face reality, we have to pay the bills and set priorities, and we are not going to take that trip to the Caribbean. We might hear moans, but it is just a fact of life.

I think we should realize that the debt, as of a couple of days ago, November 6, to be exact, was \$4,984,737,460,958.92. A lot of dollars, a lot of commas, as it just is a fact that we have to have that kitchen table financial reality today.

It is a pleasure and I am looking forward to the next several weeks. I hope we can get an agreement with the President and I hope in the end the President will see that he has a job to do. I think we are going to, hopefully, see decisions made for the best interests of all of our citizens across America, our families in America.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her observations and her comments because she is so right. Republicans in this Congress are different. We really are committed to doing business differently than the old way of doing things in Washington. We have proven that we are committed to keeping our promises, and that we are willing to meet the challenges of the Nation head on with no more excuses, no more Washington gimmicks, no more blame game, and that is a point I think the gentlewoman made particularly well.

Again, I know from having served in this body before that it was easy for Members to go home and tell their constituents that they were all for the idea of a balanced budget, but then come back here and vote in a very different fashion, basically vote to continue to spend more than we take in, to continue our old deficit spending ways, literally imposing by future borrowings a tax, a hidden tax, a tax without any representation on future generations. By future generations I do not just mean our kids or grandkids. I am talking about those children not yet born who will inherit the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, we have learned something in this Congress called generational accounting, and it really is stunning to realize that an American child born today can expect to pay, over the course of his or her lifetime as a wage earner and a taxpayer, \$187,000

in taxes that go to pay interest on the national debt. Nothing else. Interest on the national debt. That is money that is not going for a college education, a home purchase, health insurance, or any other item. It is just money going to pay interest on the national debt.

If we do not turn the situation around, if we were to adopt a budget like the President proposes, the percentage of taxes that an American child pays that goes to pay just interest on the national debt would continue to increase, to the point where the gentleman from Ohio, JOHN KASICH, of the Committee on the Budget is fond of mentioning that at the current rates, or on this present path, if we do not reverse direction here, that soon an American child can expect to pay something like 80 percent of their taxes just in interest on the national debt. Obviously, it is a situation that we have to turn around and that we will turn around in the interest of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to recognize, if the gentlewoman from California will stay, because we were going to talk a little about the spending increases in our 7-year balanced budget plan and the benefits for our colleagues back in California, but I want to recognize our good friend, our classmate, the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. TIAHRT]. I was just reading about him earlier today, because he participated, apparently, at a press conference held earlier today.

I am actually looking now at the news release put out by the Republican National Committee headlined "Congressional Republicans Celebrate Former Democrat Day," and it quotes our good friend, Mr. TIAHRT, who switched to the Republican Party in 1990 because he, "Saw that there was a trend towards the loss of credibility in the Democratic Party by the way they fought for the status quo on social programs and spending, and I think that this loss of credibility is continuing."

Mr. TIAHRT goes on to say, "I am proud to be part of a party that focuses on the positive, that focuses on hope for the future, a balanced budget, welfare reform and saving and preserving Medicare." And we are very proud that he is part of our party and that he is part of the new freshman class that has swept so much change into Washington, and I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS], and the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND], and I wanted to kind of carry on some of the discussion that my colleagues were having about the balanced budget.

If I can be retrospective a little bit, if we go back to November 8, many of us new Members of Congress came in not because we were good looking or attractive or we spoke particularly well. We were elected to Congress because the United States was extremely frustrated at the way business was being

done here in Washington, DC, and there was that loss of credibility, as I referred to in the press conference today.

I think that we are finding, after being here and seeing what the status quo was, we are starting to uncover more and more things that we are trying to bring forward in this 7-year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act that my friends have been talking about.

Today, I want to spend just a little time developing an argument as to why we should pick out portions of the Federal Government that are extremely ineffective and inefficient and eliminate those portions or consolidate them, and also there is something that happened today that I want to talk about that kind of really brings this to the surface.

□ 2000

Let me go back to the review of the Department of Energy, which is one portion of the Federal Government that has approximately a \$17.5 billion budget per year.

When we were looking at the overall Government, we found that this one agency was particularly a problem because of its ineffectiveness, because of its redundancy, because of poor contracting methods. It came out of the aerospace industry, out of contracting with about a dozen years of experience, and we could see that this was just one of the problems that they were facing. The GAO said that they had lack of focus, "A vision a minute."

The Department of Energy was really a 1970's tax guzzler, and it really has outlived its purpose. It was formed out of the energy crisis and the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. SEASTRAND] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] will remember the gas lines that were part of the problems that we had in the 1970's, especially in California. But those were in part formed by price controls and allocation controls.

When the 1980's came along, President Reagan eliminated those controls, and we found out that the crisis was gone. Even during Desert Storm when we had twice as large of a percentage interruption in the income of petroleum into the United States, we still had no gas lines. The crisis had been gone, but yet we were left with this bureaucracy.

So in our further research, we found out that even Vice President Gore, through his National Performance Review, found out that the Department of Energy, particularly the environmental management, was 40 percent inefficient. It missed 20 percent of its marks, that means that it was late on one out of every five projects, and that if we did not do something about it, that it would cost the taxpayers of this country \$30 billion over the next 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, if there is a legacy that we can leave behind it is that we remember that it is not the Government's money, it is the taxpayers

money, it is the people's money, and we must be very cognitive of how we spend it.

The GAO also finished a report in February 1995, and it fit in very nicely as far as timing with what we were trying to do in looking at the parts of the Government that were ineffective. I want to quote from one of their reports. It said, in effect, referring to the Department of Energy, "They are unsuccessful as a cabinet agency." They are unsuccessful as a cabinet agency.

Then it gave a couple of reasons. One is their inability to overcome management weaknesses. I think that is very important as we lay out this argument as to why we need to focus on this if we ever hope to balance the budget. Also, the second reason they cited is that they have the burden of mission overload, going back to that original quote where I said they have a vision a minute.

So I think the original purpose of this agency, like other parts of the Government, has run its course, and in an effort to reinvent themselves to stay active, they are constantly reaching out into other areas.

In 1977, the Department of Energy spent 80 percent of their budget dedicated to the energy function. Today, it is 20 percent, less than 20 percent.

So they have really reinvented themselves. We have a socialized oilfield now in the realms of the Government. It is called Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is in southern California.

Mr. TIAHRT. Yes, and even though we have this out there as part of this agency, and it is unnecessary, we should sell it off, we do not do a very good job of producing oil as a Federal Government.

We have a charter to produce oil in Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve, but we do not have a charter to produce natural gas. It is a byproduct of the whole operation there, and instead of selling it, it is pumped back into the ground to force more oil up to fulfill the charter. So we are again inefficient in the way we handle even the Naval Elk Hills Petroleum Reserve.

We also have three-fourths of the effort within the Department of Energy that is defense-related functions and what that has caused is a redundant bureaucracy where we have entities inside the Department of Energy which are very similar, provide similar functions as entities in the Department of Defense. So what we have uncovered is a 1970's tax guzzler and we have decided it is really time to turn the lights out on the Department of Energy.

Let me talk just a little bit about the budget, because it relates back to balancing the budget. As I said earlier, the Department of Energy's budget is about \$17.5 billion a year. In the President's request for a budget back in January, Secretary O'Leary was requesting an increase in the budget of \$337 million. Over the next 5 years,

that type of increase would equate to a \$1.5 billion increase.

Well, as we are going through the legislative process of looking at the details inside the Department of Energy, developing legislation which would correct that and in effect eliminate the Department of Energy as a cabinet-level agency, the Secretary of Energy came out with an alternative plan last May or so, last spring, which said basically that if you allow me to play a little shell game, sell off a few things, I can save taxpayers about \$14.1 billion over the next 5 years.

So now we are seeing a shift from what was an increase of \$1.5 billion to a decrease of \$14.1 billion, because people like us knew in Congress, or returning to Congress after a sabbatical, as is the gentleman from California, were putting pressure on the administration and on the system to change the way business is done, so that it is not done the same as it was prior to the 104th Congress. I think that is a significant swing for the taxpayers, and again, it is their money.

But this just kind of points out the fact that the Department of energy should be abolished. We have started even this year in the balanced budget amendment. We reduced their budget \$500 million over what it was in fiscal 1995. Now, instead of increasing it \$337 million, we are decreasing it about a half of a billion, which is a significant swing, almost a \$1 billion swing, but we are headed in the right direction.

We are going to privatize the Alaska Power Marketing Administration. This is something that is part of the legislation to eliminate the DOE, a very necessary action. Mr. Speaker, there are many power companies that do a good job of distribution power to the private sector, to our homes, to our companies, to where we work, where we go to school, where we shop, and for the Government to do this seems a little bit redundant. Often, it is done more efficiently by the private sector and we have started that process.

We are going to sell the Elk Hills Naval Petroleum Reserve; I think is very important. We are going to sell the strategic petroleum reserve because of some infrastructure problems that we need to correct, and even the Secretary of Energy, Secretary O'Leary, as admitted that the lab structure is too big, too complex, and needs to be consolidated and downsized.

So we see that the system with the new Congress is putting pressure on the administration to try to correct the problem. We have not gotten there all the way yet, but we have made a significant step.

Then, next, we started seeing some evidence of the management problem and it came in the form of travel. There was an article that came out in the Washington Times from information that was received through the Freedom of Information Act that looked at cabinet-level travel, and it

was found that the Secretary of Energy, Secretary O'Leary, has the highest average trip expenses of anyone in the President's Cabinet, even higher than the Secretary of State, who is forced to travel overseas.

Quite often her travel problems include upgrading herself to a resort or a four-star hotel, kind of living the life of luxury. She operates at first class, but more than that, she takes along a large contingency of staff, sometimes as many as 70 when going to foreign countries. We even found out that in the agency they made a T-shirt that had a globe on it, on the chest, and the different countries that Secretary O'Leary has visited this year, and it was titled, Secretary O'Leary's World Tour, kind of taking off from some of the concert tours that rock groups have gone on. But it is just a reflection of where there is an abuse here in the travel.

The Committee on Science is currently looking at some of these problems, because what has happened is the travel budget has been diverted from some of the very important research programs to the Secretary's bureaucracy, central bureaucracy, so that she can fund these lavish travels.

We also have a GAO audit going on requested by Congressman HOKE from Ohio and myself just to look at where this money is coming from, how it is being spent, is this the best use of taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, if I could just interject for a moment if I might. When we use the term GAO, we are talking about the General Accounting Office, really the accounting arm of the legislative branch of Government, the Congress.

I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. That brings us to today's story.

In the Wall Street Journal today there was a story about how Secretary O'Leary has taken \$43,500 from the taxpayers and hired a private investigative firm to go do research on reporters, on members of industry, and also on Members of Congress, and in this investigation there was some type of analysis as to who was giving the biggest negative impression of the Department of Energy and Secretary O'Leary down to the 25th, and through some of the inquiries, particularly in the Wall Street Journal story, it was found that Senate Majority Leader DOLE was No. 1 on the list.

I think this is a little peculiar since all they are trying to do is develop a good image for Secretary O'Leary by spending the taxpayers' dollars, but it just happens that it targets the No. 1 opponent to her boss, Secretary O'Leary's boss, President Clinton.

Mr. RIGGS. The leading candidate for the Republican nomination and Senate majority leader.

Mr. TIAHRT. That is right. It is very important that the President's image is up, so we are using taxpayer dollars

to look at his administration trying to improve their image. But this is part of this enemy's list, so-called enemy's list as it was entitled in the article.

We found out by contacting the Department of Energy themselves and talking to an assistant secretary that even I was named on the list, as were others, I believe; JOHN KASICH, who is chairman of the Committee on the Budget, was also labeled. But I was No. 13 on the list, which I think is going to be particularly unlucky for the Department of Energy and also Secretary O'Leary.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I always regarded 13 as my lucky number, but in this case I will defer to the gentleman.

Let me just for a moment hold up the Wall Street Journal article for our visitors in the gallery and for our colleagues and constituents who might be watching this special order, because it is a page 1 article, the Wall Street Journal today. The headline is, "Turning the Tables, Energy Department Reports on Reporters", and then there is a subheadline that goes on to say, just as the gentleman from Kansas mentioned, "It paid \$43,500 in tax dollars."

Mr. Speaker, these are American tax dollars to find, "Unfavorables, a Little Bit of Nixon," the subheadline concludes, and the article is written by Michael Moss, a staff reporter for the Wall Street Journal.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. If the gentleman from Kansas would yield, I think it is most interesting to know that we are talking about \$43,000. Now, there is a number I can understand. You were talking previously about billions and millions, and yet it is interesting to note that while we are talking about billions and millions, \$43,000 is a large amount of money for most people in America, and yet we are talking about other things that are costing millions and billions of dollars that we can save the taxpayer.

Mr. TIAHRT. Well, if you think that the average income in the Fourth District of Kansas, which is the district that I represent, is \$28,308, that is a significant amount of money. That is the average income; it means something, it is the average income for a family in the Fourth District of Kansas.

Again, I think this is just the tip of the iceberg. We have seen this mismanagement of taxpayer funds in travel, in the environmental management which has been 40 percent inefficient, and this goes way beyond just the gray areas. This is into the abuse of taxpayers' dollars. It is just another excess that we have.

The reaction has been very interesting. The reaction in Congress has been widespread shock and amazement. I think this is really a significant step back to the way business was done as usual, the old business was done as usual. It is what we have been trying to get away from in this new Congress.

I think this goes to show why I have joined with 69 others here in Congress, calling for the resignation of Secretary

O'Leary. If the President does not push for her resignation, I think that he validates this effort, he validates the hiring of a private investigation firm to look into other Members of Congress, other members of industry, other members of the press, and he also validates the misuse of travel dollars and what has been going on inside the Department of Energy and the inefficiency efficiency that we have been talking about and that has been uncovered by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a reflection of the problems that we have and it is why the Department of Energy should be eliminated as a Cabinet level agency. It should go beyond. We should consolidate the redundant areas of Government. We should privatize like we are doing in the power marketing administrations; we should eliminate the waste and it should all start with Secretary O'Leary's resignation.

I think that is why this logical process that I have just gone through calls for not only the resignation of Secretary O'Leary, but also the elimination of the Department of Energy as a Cabinet level agency.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I certainly commend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] for his leadership and his initiative in this area. I know he has worked very, very hard on this issue and has been really one of the driving forces behind the call for dismantling the Department of Energy, which would follow on the heels of the plan that actually passed the House of Representatives today as part of the short-term debt limit bill, and that is our plan, really the New Federalists or House Republican freshman plan to dismantle the Department of Commerce.

So I really commend the gentleman. It will be very interesting to see what comes of this investigation that he and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] have called for by the General Accounting Office of these lavishly expensive travel habits of Secretary O'Leary.

In just a moment I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] who I know has some particular insights to share with us on this issue. But I just want to point out how extraordinary it is to get so many Members of Congress to sign a letter in such a short period of time.

□ 2015

The gentleman from Kansas mentioned the number again. I know I cosigned the letter today, but how many Members have signed this letter?

Mr. TIAHRT. Sixty-nine as of this hour. When I left my office, we had another phone call that added the 69th name. As this information gets out, people are wanting to join in this effort because they see the abuse, that it is wrong and that it is time for a change.

Mr. RIGGS. This letter has only been circulated really on this House floor over the last few hours.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Yes, because I also joined in signing the letter. I

think as the article was distributed from information obtained about the Wall Street Journal article and such, I think people were outraged.

Mr. RIGGS. Let me just read the conclusion of this letter that so many of us have signed today:

Many serious questions have been raised about Secretary O'Leary's official travel. Now it has come to light that the Secretary has hired, and I will leave the name out right now, but apparently a private research or investigative firm to investigate reporters who cover the Department of Energy. The compilation of what is clearly an enemy's list is an extraordinarily dangerous precedent, one that we cannot countenance. Thus, we believe that Secretary O'Leary has forfeited her right to public office, and we urge you to ask for and accept her resignation immediately.

Again, this is a letter that 69 Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, have signed over the last few hours, late afternoon, early this evening today, and will, I am assuming, shortly be going to the President for his consideration. I thank the gentleman, and I hope he will stay for the remainder of the special order.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] leading up the effort to abolish the Department of Energy.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what perspective I bring to this issue. I am from the Third District of South Carolina, and the Savannah River site is in my district. I have been told it is the largest DOE industrial facility in the chain.

At one time, there were over 20,000 employees at the site. In the last 3 years we have had 8,900 people leave the site because we are trying to downsize the agency, trying to balance the budget. That means that every Congressperson up here will have some pain in their district, and that is what it is going to take to balance the budget, and we are trying to be fair about it. We are trying to shrink the Government, make it more efficient.

Instead of spending millions and billions and getting nothing for it, we want to get some results. We want to change cost plus contracts to performance contracts, and I will have to give Ms. O'Leary some credit. She has brought about some of those changes.

But in a time when people in my district are losing their jobs, when we are worried about the image of a Cabinet officer to the point that we are going to spend \$43,500, I do not know about where you come from, but that is still a lot of money. That is somebody's salary, probably two people's salary for an entire year, money spent to go out and survey the media, rate reporters to improve her image at a time when people are having to lose their jobs, having to

seek another way of making a living, having to retire early, to me that is very offensive. It is poor leadership.

The reason the articles have been bad concerning the Department of Energy, one, it is a Department that should not exist. It cannot find its niche. There is no justification for a huge Federal bureaucracy to manage these issues, and we have spent millions and billions over the years to remediate the environment, and we are no closer than we were 5 or 10 years ago.

The national defense needs are suffering. One issue that is very important to me is the production of tritium. Tritium is a gas that is essential to develop a thermonuclear weapon. We are quickly running out of our supply of tritium.

This Department of Energy does not have a plan to develop a tritium source. We have made tritium at South Carolina at the Savannah River site for the last 40 years. We now need to get back in the business, and I cannot get Hazel O'Leary or anybody at DOE to get serious about weapons production to maintain a nuclear deterrent force.

The commercial spent fuel is overflowing in this country. Go to any powerplant in this country. They are having a huge problem with commercial spent fuel, because we will not live up to our end of the bargain to open Yucca Mountain up, and the DOE is dragging their feet.

I am tired of it, and I want new leadership, want leadership that is not worried about their image but is worried about the country's problems, not worried about how they fly an airplane but worried about people, to deliver a quality product to the American people. I think any Member of Congress that took \$10 out of their account at taxpayers' expense to try to improve their image should lose their job, and she should lose her job.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I want to point out, we are joined now by the gentleman from Ohio, our theme team leader who has done a tremendous job on the House floor and certainly has spearheaded along with the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from South Carolina this investigation into Secretary O'Leary's travel practices.

I want to point out that this is just the latest in a series of scandals that have rocked the Clinton administration. I can recall then candidate Clinton promising the American people the most ethical administration in history. Remember that? The most ethical administration in history. Or as the kids would say, "The most ethical administration in history, not."

This follows on the heels of so many other broken promises from this particular President. We all recall candidate Clinton promising to end welfare as we know it, we all recall him promising to cut taxes for middle-class families. As I mentioned earlier, we all recall him saying that he will balance the Federal budget in 5 years.

This is just the latest in a series of reversals by this particular President and this particular administration going back really on his fundamental promises to the American people. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I just got in and I do not know, have we heard, has the Secretary resigned yet? Has that occurred? Because I do not want to go over things that are really irrelevant at this point.

Apparently not. In any event, this is the report. This is it right here. This is the Carma report. It is a wonderful name, the Carma report. \$43,500 happens to be about \$13,000 more than the average family household in my district earns. That is how much was spent on this report.

I happened to look through some of it. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] will be pleased to know he is cited in this a number of times, apparently because of his interest in the Department of Energy. I have a couple of notices. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is in here. The Speaker is in here. Mastercard is listed. Senator DOMENICI, the Galvin Report, Yucca Mountain, Senator JOHNSTON, USDC J. Edward Lodge, Senator THURMOND, Snake River Alliance, Representative HUNTER, Representative WALKER, House Appropriations Committee, Los Angeles Times, Representative ENSIGN, Phil Batt, President Clinton, Yucca Mountain. It is just stunning. I was thinking about this whole situation. I know we are pounding on the Department of Energy and particularly the Secretary, and I was reminded frankly of another thing that I had not thought of in some time and had not seen. But do you remember when the Secretary took a mission to India, it was supposed to be a trade mission? Well, one of the members of that mission was Carl Stoiber. He put together a little remembrance for everybody that included these cartoons, and he is a pretty good cartoonist. I believe he works for the Department of Energy. If not he was with one of the contractors that works for the Department. This is what he calls an alternative view. This was delivered or disseminated to all of the people that were on the trip.

This says "Prisoners of the Secretary of Energy." You can see they are taking off on their Air Force jet.

Here we have got one that says, "Yeah, the Air Force runs a really great flying cocktail lounge."

Mr. RIGGS. Does the gentleman know how many DOE employees went on that particular trip?

Mr. HOKE. I think it was in the neighborhood of 70. I think it was about 70. I am not absolutely certain.

Here is one, we see a fellow with a big red nose, apparently in a glass of suds, of beer, it says, "Let's Make Sure We Stop in Shannon on the Return Flight."

Here is the Secretary, thinking to herself, "Gee, maybe I should wear rose petals all the time."

This is Secretary O'Leary's visit to Donnewas Village, in a kind of a caricature. Apparently they stopped off in Egypt, in Cairo so that they could see the pyramids and ride on camels. "Whoa, Just Call Me Hazel of Forrestal," it says here, Forrestal being the name of the building that the Department of Energy is located in.

And finally something that is probably not so funny. I do not think if I were an Indian national I would think this is very funny. I think it is frankly in extremely poor taste. I know that there are a lot of people that would feel very sensitive about it. It is a can that says "Simmered Milk with Cow Dung Patties."

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman would yield for a second, to put this in context, a Department of Energy spokesperson when asked about the \$43,500 expenditure and the investigation said, according to the news article, a reporter's unfavorable rating meant we were not getting our message across, that we needed to work on this person a little.

What is the message?

Mr. TIAHRT. If the gentleman would yield, I want to point out that part of this message they were developing, I think, was to put them in a good light, so that when we looked in the details of the Department of Energy, that we would no longer uncover some of these inefficiencies, some of the ineffectiveness, some of the problems that they are having which add to the argument and make the case for Congress that we should eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet level agency. I think they were trying to overcome this.

Mr. HOKE. When you are doing things like this and you are putting a lot of energy from the Department of Energy into traveling all over the world, here is a mockup that was done on a Department of Energy computer, a color printer and computer, this was going to be on the back of a T-shirt until we exposed it in a special order one night. It says O'Leary's World Tour, 1993-94, Brussels, Islamabad, Lahore, St. Petersburg, et cetera, et cetera.

The fact is that sure you have got an image problem, you can be absolutely certain you have got an image problem when you are spending the taxpayers' money in these things. I said this earlier when we were talking. But the problem, this idea of muckraking about travel and getting into the details even of this \$43,000 that was spent, how anybody could have not realized that this is an inappropriate and utterly offensive use of taxpayer dollars to be hiring private eyes, private investigators to rate and investigate reporters. The fact is that is the tip of the iceberg. The real problem is the safeguarding of nuclear weapons, which is the No. 1 responsibility of the Department of Energy, and second of all, the safeguarding of the disposal of nuclear waste.

Mr. TIAHRT. If the gentleman would yield, in the Wall Street Journal article, it talked about they thought about gathering this information inside the Department of Energy; however, that would have cost over \$80,000. So instead, they hired a private sector, private investigation agency to do the job for \$43,500, which is approximately one-half the amount of money that it would have cost to have done the job inside the Department of Energy. Once again this reconfirms that we have large inefficiencies inside the Department of Energy and that we do need to consolidate, get rid of the redundancy and eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet level agency.

Mr. HOKE. So that even when it comes to dirty tricks, you could hire private eyes to do dirty tricks at half the price that the Department could do them themselves?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman would yield, the \$43,500, to put it into perspective, the average income in my district is \$13,000 per capita. A family is about \$25,000, \$26,000. Like I said, that is a lot of money and you should treat that money seriously.

The bottom line of the story is when she was presented with the data, she said, "Well, that's a little too confusing. I don't think that's going to help us."

What will help the DOE is to come up with a rational energy policy, to deregulate the cumbersome process of cleaning these sites up and getting on with the job. The message that she is not getting is that there is a limited pot of money to do the Nation's business with. You cannot always fly first class, you cannot always make the papers say what you want them to say. Part of a democracy is that when you engage in the public sector, in the public debate, you are going to be called on the carpet at times. She has been called on the carpet because she has no vision, she has no message. The administration has no vision or message. They assume that we can make enough money to make every problem go away.

Two papers that were rated in this survey and investigation are in my district, the Augusta Chronicle and Aiken Standard. Like I say, the largest employer in South Carolina is the Savannah River site Department of Energy facility. I admire those two papers for taking the Secretary to task. Sometimes that is risky because they do control our future to a great extent. They are asking to build a technology in our district that is experimental in nature, that is twice as expensive of known technology to make tritium, and I along with other Congressmen and Senators in South Carolina and Georgia are saying, "Don't buy us off. You're not going to build something in our district that's wasteful just because it is coming into our district." That is the message that needs to be said in the country.

Quite frankly, she just does not get it. The President does not get it. She needs to lose her job.

Mr. HOKE. Now, when you said the Secretary indicated that it was too confusing, the report, and that she really did not get anything out of it anyway, it really was not something helpful to her, I have to tell you I think she was saying exactly the truth. I spent 20-30 minutes this evening looking through it. Honest to goodness, I cannot understand it either. I can understand one thing that is very clear, this is U.S. media announcements, December, 1994, overview. This report prepared on behalf of the Department of Energy, coverage received by DOE from the national media for the month of December; ratings in the report relate to the rating system, blah, blah, blah. Here is the graph. Overall favorability was 49 percent favorable, 25 percent unfavorable, 26 percent neutral.

Where else have you ever heard of favorable and unfavorable ratings being done? Who does that? Do pollsters not do that? I think we are all familiar with favorable and unfavorable. The President gets one and all that. Who pays for that? Is that paid for by campaign moneys or by official moneys?

It is always paid for by campaign money, because it is clearly a campaign expense. You never may use official moneys for this sort of thing, and it is obviously, brilliantly an ethics violation.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the gentleman will yield, would you agree with me that it is part of an overall trend in this administration that we are going to make every hard decision by polls?

Mr. HOKE. It is; it is. I think that Mr. Clinton had hired Mr. Greenspan, Mr. Greenberg, in 1994 to do most of his polling to the tune of millions and millions of dollars, not a very good job apparently, according to the 1994 election. But in any event, to Mr. Clinton's credit, he did not pay for those polls from official funds of the White House. He paid for those polls from the Democratic National Committee, which is what should be done.

Well, that is not what has been done by the Department of Energy Secretary. This is wrong. This is an obvious and clear violation. It is the reason that now upwards of 70 Members of Congress have called for the resignation of the Secretary.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman's contributions. Again, I want to point out this comes from the administration, from the President who promised us the most ethical administration ever and, of course, it was kind of a running joke back in Washington, the only way the Clinton administration can have a Cabinet meeting is if there is room for all the attorneys and independent counsels.

We know, of course, of the ongoing investigation, the Secretary of Commerce. We know about the investigation of the former Secretary of Agriculture. We know about the travelgate controversy or scandal, depending on your point of view, within the White House. We know that the Whitewater problem has implicated high level officials within the administration.

So it is very clear again that this is one promise where the President has defaulted. It is another failure on his part to follow through on his commitments to the American people, following on the heels of his promise to end welfare as we know it, to cut taxes for the middle class and to balance the Federal budget.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], my fellow member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I believe, getting back to the focus of balancing the budget, one of the things we hear over and over again is the Republicans are balancing the budget on the backs of, fill in the blank, frankly, children, elderly, national parks, the Democrat Party, any victim of the day that the Democrats can conjure up.

But I had an interesting conversation. I called home and had an interesting conversation with my 7-year-old daughter, and I try to keep my children interested in the legislation process. I always heard people say stories like this. I say I am about to throw up. I find myself telling the story and feeling this.

She said, "Daddy, What were you voting on?" I said, "Raising the debt ceiling." I try to give an accurate answer. She said, "What does that mean?" She is 7 years old.

I was thinking to myself, how do I phrase it, how do I phrase my generation is going to stick it to your generation? That is what it means. It means we cannot control ourselves so my little 7-year-old Anne and all her little schoolmates and all the schoolmates that come after her are going to pay for it, because we as a Congress have found it is more important to stay elected than it is to say no.

I do not like telling these sappy, syrupy stories, but to talk to her immediately after the vote, knowing who is going to be saddled with that debt, and yet as I tried to explain to her what debt was, I also found a lot of, I guess, you know, felt better about it when I said, "However, we are stopping this deficit spending more money than we bring in."

I tried to explain to her, "It is like you have an allowance and spending more than you are getting." She could not believe that. I lost her on that one. How could I spend more than 25 cents if you only give me 25 cents?

But, you know, the fact is that I could end the conversation with my 7-year-old optimistic about the future rather than pessimistic, that if we can balance this budget and the interest

rates come down, as Greenspan had indicated they would, and the American family can look for lower interest rates on home mortgages, on car loans, on credit cards, if we do not spend \$200 billion each year on interest.

Of course, we are going to continue to do that for a long, long time, but if we can at the end of 7 years see the light at the end of the tunnel, then it is worth working through this weekend, it is worth working through Saturday, Sunday, Monday night, and even worth working through Thanksgiving and Christmas as well, if that is what we need to do so that little boys and girls like my 7-year-old and your children can look forward to having a balanced budget one day, and that is not how they are going to look at it. But they should not be saddled with our debt.

Mr. RIGGS. Those are inspiring words. I thank the gentleman very much. That really is what motivates us on.

I know we are about to conclude. Our 1 hour has gone by very quickly.

I yield to the gentlewoman from California so she can make some concluding remarks.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. I also understand what it is about little children. Sometimes they are very honest with us, and they have an understanding in very simple terms.

Earlier we talked about dealing with billions and millions and trillions of dollars. What does that mean to you, not your 7-year-old? What does it mean to me and the average American out there?

Well, we are talking about \$43,000. This is a number that means something to people. You talked about in some instances, I think it was the gentleman from South Carolina that mentioned some of his people are making \$13,000 a year. I know \$43,000 is a lot of money.

Yet tomorrow people will be reading additional stories about the situation with the Department of Energy, and they are going to look and say, "Why aren't we balancing the budget? Why don't they just do it, get rid of those, forget about the gimmicks, do it," and I am going to look forward to the next several days and weeks, and I will be very glad to put my vote up to balance the budget for all of our children, whether they be 7 years old or 25 years old.

Mr. RIGGS. I thank the gentlewoman. We are going to balance the budget with or without the help and cooperation of the President, for that matter, our Democratic colleagues in the House, because it is the right thing to do. We have to save the American dream for our children. We have to make America great again.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, November 9,

and Thursday, November 16, on account of official business in the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DURBIN, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. MCKINNEY, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GRAHAM, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. MOAKLEY, and to include extraneous material, during debate on House Resolution 245.

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

Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. PICKETT.
Ms. DELAURO.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. TOWNS in two instances.
Mr. SERRANO in two instances.
Mr. OWENS.
Mr. MENENDEZ in two instances.

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

Mr. GILMAN.
Mr. HOUGHTON.
Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.
Mr. COMBEST.
Mr. CHRYSLER.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.

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

Mr. POSHARD.
Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.
Mr. DELLUMS in two instances.
Mr. GEJDENSON.
Mr. TATE.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On November 7:
H.R. 1103. An act to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to modernize, streamline, and strengthen the operation of the act.