

international commitments and international standards of human rights that it has agreed to in the U.N. Charter.

We normally think of human rights violations as the violent denial of basic freedoms in many parts of the world. There is the denial of free expression and the incarceration of dissident voices. This is the violent abuse of human rights.

But there are other forms. In much the same way that the neglect of children is also a form of child abuse as is violent behavior, ignoring the political desires of a people for whom you have a responsibility qualifies as an abuse of human rights. The people of Guam have spoken through local referenda and they deserve serious and sustained attention to their political aspirations. To ignore these political aspirations is an abuse of human rights by neglect.

The Congress and the President as the representatives of the American people have consistently delivered the message throughout the world that good government can only begin when there is true consent of the governed. This is the core American creed. In the American territory of Guam, the vast majority of laws, the very political structure that the people live under are determined not by the people, but by a Congress in which they have no voting representation and by a President they have not elected.

Government through the consent of the governed is the most basic of all political rights and should remain the cornerstone of the structure of human rights. We should challenge ourselves to make sure that human rights are defended not just under the American flag when our troops are deployed in foreign lands, but that these human rights are also defended under the American flag when it flies over the non self-governing U.S. territories.

CELEBRATING COMMUNITY: THE OPENING OF THE NEW MARTIN LUTHER KING CENTER IN FREEPORT, IL

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, as we debate reaching the balanced budget by the year 2002 and what role the Federal Government should play in restoring hope to our children's future, one of the misguided arguments that some of my colleagues continue to banter in Congress and in the media is that the American people cannot trust anyone but the Federal Government to provide assistance and/or programs in the areas of need.

By what arrogance can this argument be made? To suggest that left to their own devices, the American people cannot provide for their families and neighbors? The notion that local communities and local governments cannot

be trusted? Please. This country was built through the goodness of people helping people. From the earliest days of the original colonies, the people of this Nation have thrived off the common goodness of its neighbors, its communities.

If we are to believe that there is nothing trustworthy outside of the Federal behemoth bureaucracy, whom are we accusing of being untrustworthy? Which Governor? Which State legislature? Which county? Which city or school district? Which community can we not trust?

I believe men and women, parents, elected officials, churches and other community leaders are best able to achieve the longest lasting and most effective changes we need in our society. Day by day, neighborhood by neighborhood, child by child, family by family, America gets stronger.

President Coolidge once said: "No person was ever honored for what he received. Honor has been the reward for what he gave."

Let me tell you about what one community has done. On November 18 of this year, the city of Freeport in the 16th District of Illinois celebrated the achievements of hard effort and leadership when it opened the new Martin Luther King Jr. Community Campus, and this is a picture of that beautiful campus. This beautiful \$3 million facility was built and paid for without any tax dollars or Federal grants. The facility was built with the commitment and dedication of the local community.

It started with a vision by the late Rev. Robert Huff to create a community center where area children and families could get whatever assistance they needed. Unfortunately, he passed away before he could witness the reality of his vision.

This beautiful new facility was made possible by the hard efforts and dedication of people like Jack Meyers, who led the fundraising campaign, and Ray Alvarez of Honeywell's Microswitch, who was instrumental in rallying community support for this construction.

The new MLK Campus in Freeport has not been erected only of mortar and bricks. It stands firmly on the convictions and hopes and dreams of the people dedicated to making Freeport a city committed to the future of their community, a future that is unified behind helping their neighbors locally.

The community campus has already provided many tangible results. It helped Wendy Mader realize her dream of becoming a licensed day care provider; Tameka Carter, who is reaching her dream of becoming a lawyer. And the Martin Luther King Campus helped Sharon Serna work through the single parent program to get off public aid, get an education, and become a registered nurse. Her dream was made possible by the local people who make the MLK Community Campus not only the envy but a model of what other communities in this country are accomplishing.

Again, the facility was built without one Federal dollar, built by the dedication and hard effort of the people of a small city in rural Illinois. Have any of their programs used Federal dollars? Yes, but the programs are designed and tailored by the local people for the local people.

Currently, Congress is working on major changes on how social services in this country are funded. The idea is that after 30 years of spending 40 cents out of every dollar on a huge Federal bureaucracy, we can be more efficient with our programs if we get the money back to the local people in the best manner possible.

If centers like the King Campus choose to apply for tax dollars, they should be able to get the most out of every tax dollar, not just 60 cents but 90 or 95 cents. That kind of efficiency cannot be accomplished through a huge Federal bureaucracy.

The campus is the perfect example of local control and local success.

I salute the efforts of everyone at the MLK Campus. I salute the people who have found a second chance or the special assistance they need through the center. And I want to salute the people of Freeport, who in their own way have proven that we do not need the Federal Government dictating policy to provide for their community.

What we need is the commitment and dedication of the people of the community who are willing to face a challenge and willing to meet the needs of the people they love so dearly and the people they serve so well.

KEEPING THE DISTRICT IN BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is day one of the countdown to shutdown. I have been on the floor virtually every day since the last shutdown. But I speak not of the shutdown of the Federal Government. There was an unintended consequence. The city I represent was also shut down.

A shutdown of a complicated big city is nothing short of a catastrophe. If there is a continuing resolution, it will be marginally better, but imagine putting handcuffs and a straitjacket on a city at the same time and then saying, "Run your city well on a weekend CR or a weeklong CR, and keep from over-obligating, and make sure you spend enough money."

I am here this afternoon to express my gratitude to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and to the DC Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, these two committees unanimously passed a bill to allow the District of Columbia to spend its own revenue instead of being shut down. I express my gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER], the

chairman of the committee, and to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], the chairman of the subcommittee. I will put an op-ed piece by Mr. DAVIS on this very subject into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The op-ed piece is headlined, "Why Shut Down the District?" The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] marshals all the arguments for not doing so.

Why was there such bipartisanship on this bill? In the first place, it was a matter of sheer principle. The Members knew and saw that shutting down the District was not their intent. They did not mean to catch a whole city in this fight. Then of course the Members saw up close what happens when you shut down a city and the trash is not collected, and the city cannot go about its daily business, and the citizens suffer. It is not a pretty picture.

It is our money and only our own money that H.R. 2661 speaks to. The Federal payment would be left here at the discretion of the Congress.

What is happening in the District of Columbia as I speak? The district is preparing to shut down. What a terrible diversion for a city on the brink of insolvency, when this Congress has told it to do otherwise, to prepare for reform of its financial and management operations.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] was just on the floor saying that there could be a weekend or a weeklong CR. There could be two such CRs. Nobody can expect the District to run well in that way, even if it were healthy, as of course we know it is not.

Speaker GINGRICH encouraged us to continue with the bills. He has been very helpful to the District in the past. I am asking him to bring the bill to the floor today, so that before midnight on Friday this body can guarantee that the city, where this body sits, will in fact be open for business.

□ 1515

Only a few hours stand between us and closedown of a city we do not mean to close down. At midnight on Friday, the District of Columbia goes dark and hundreds of thousands of innocent bystanders will see their city go dark, while the Congress remains in session uninjured by any shutdown. No Member of this body desires that. No Member of this body would want to defend that.

Please, help me to keep my city open. Help me to help my city recover. The city wants to do what the Congress has mandated it to do: get its house in order. This Congress has put a Control Board on the city, and now the Control Board has testified that the last thing the city needs is to be shut down and have to pay its employees for not coming to work—as would have to be the case since they would be forced onto administrative leave. That is not the way to run even a small town.

I am here to say to my colleagues, we cannot run the Capital of the United

States this way, and we cannot allow the word to go across the wires and around the world that some Federal agencies went back to work (and I congratulate you that some appropriations have now passed; it looks like ours will not, indeed, pass), but that the Congress of the United States allowed the Capital of the United States to close down catching 600,000 innocent people in the wake of our own special storm.

I appreciate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] have done. I appreciate that the Speaker has encouraged us to keep this bill going forward. Now, a little more than 24 hours stand between us and keeping the city of the District of Columbia, Washington, DC, open. Please, help us to do just that.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 14, 1995]

WHY SHUT DOWN THE DISTRICT?

(By Thomas M. Davis III)

Shutting down the federal government because Congress and the president fail to agree on a budget resolution is an act that has many unintended victims and numerous unintended consequences. The damper these failures put on recruiting and maintaining the best and the brightest for our federal work force will be with us for some time. On another level, the backsliding it inflicts on our efforts to change the District of Columbia government are profound.

The D.C. government is not just another federal agency. It is a front-line government providing vital health, safety and personal services to 570,000 residents and 300,000 metropolitan commuters. When federal agencies shut down, citizens in any city in the country can still get a driver's license and register their automobiles. When federal agencies shut down, the states can continue to process AFDC and Social Security applications. But when the District government shuts down, people needing services, whether medical care at a clinic or trash collection from their homes, are not served.

Congress should act immediately to ensure that the District of Columbia can spend its own locally generated tax dollars during such a shutdown. We can do this before this week's expiration of the current continuing resolution Del. Eleanor Holmes Norton has introduced legislation, H.R. 2661, to allow the District to spend its own revenues even if its budget has not been approved by Congress (the budget will still be subject to approval by the control board). I am a cosponsor of H.R. 2661, which yesterday was approved by the House subcommittee that oversees the District and is scheduled for full committee action today. It is imperative that Congress pass it for two important reasons.

First, without passage of H.R. 2661, the District government is subject to being shut down again, as it was Nov. 14-19. That's because the District's own appropriation has not been enacted, and there may be no continuing resolution to keep the government open.

The unique status of the District—the city cannot spend one penny of its budget, either local or federal revenues, without an appropriations bill being passed by Congress and signed by the president—has never before seemed important. In past federal shutdowns, the District appropriation had been enacted so that the city government could continue operations, or else the District has been put under a continuing resolution along with federal agencies that were without approved appropriations.

But this time there was no District appropriation and no continuing resolution. This places on the District of Columbia a unique burden. Every other city or state in the country can continue to operate its own programs, and may even take up the slack of missing federal funds from its own revenues when the federal government is shut down. But the District is stymied.

This situation is inexcusable even in normal times, but in the current financial crisis it has become extreme. The District lost more than \$7 million in productivity during the recent shutdown, according to the control board, and it failed to collect up to \$70 million in revenue that it was owed. Meanwhile, contractors around the metropolitan area are going bankrupt every day, and the IRS files liens for unpaid tax withholding because the District of Columbia doesn't have the cash to pay its bills. Allowing the District to fall even farther behind in its revenue collection is tantamount to negligence on the part of Congress.

In addition to lost productivity and lost or delayed revenues, the very officials who have so much work ahead to rebuild and reform the city were forced to spend their time deciding what services and employees were "essential" in a government that is already notoriously dysfunctional. Instead of working on privatizing city services, City Administrator Michael Rogers had to write furlough notices. Instead of reviewing contracts and improving cash management, Chief Financial Officer Anthony Williams had to figure out new ways not to pay bills. Instead of pushing ahead publicly with the council on urgently needed reforms, Mayor Barry could only wonder what new disaster he would have to deal with next. And the control board, which is trying to push the District forward, could only make certain that the District complied with the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act and shut down everything that was not an imminent threat to health or safety. This is no way to run a city in the grips of a financial crisis.

Congress and the president could keep the federal and District governments open either by reaching a budget agreement or by enacting another continuing resolution. I am hopeful that one of these two events will occur before there's another shutdown. No one can possibly expect to escape the public outcry that would come from sending hundreds of thousands of workers home 10 days before Christmas.

But there is an even more compelling reason to enact H.R. 2661 immediately. While operating under a temporary continuing resolution, the D.C. government has no legal authority to obligate funds beyond the expiration of that resolution. Since continuing resolutions are emergency, stopgap measures, this forces the District government to operate on an emergency basis, signing contracts and planning spending schedules from week to week. This ad hoc operational mode is not only bad for contractors and other service providers; it runs exactly counter to what is most needed in the District government: stability and the ability to make long-range decisions.

Unless H.R. 2661 is enacted and the District is allowed to obligate its own revenues, even without an appropriation bill, the District will continue to limp from crisis to crisis, lacking the ability to take concrete, long-term actions or to make the decisions that would be in everyone's best interest.

Congressional oversight and ultimate control would not be threatened, because the District's federal payment is not included in H.R. 2661. This legislation would not free the District from federal oversight and would not give the city budget autonomy. It would simply allow the District to escape from the

threat of shutdown and the gross inefficiencies of operating on a week-to-week basis, and to at least be able to crawl along on its own revenues during a budget impasse.

I am pleased that Speaker Gingrich, President Clinton and the control board support this legislation. Congress should act now to pass it, and thus prevent further paid furloughs and a shutdown of city operations.

CHANGING THE CULTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under the Speaker's announced positively of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank several of my colleagues for joining me in the House Chamber. As we discuss the pending events, we listen with great interest and, indeed, great agreement with our colleague, the delegate from the District of Columbia, and we realize also that the people have sent us here to Washington to change a culture, to change a pervasive practice which has permeated this Chamber and, indeed, our national governance for half a century.

In fairness, we should note that the Members of both parties have been involved in this, and it is this endless notion of tax-and-spend and tax-and-spend and tax yet higher and spend yet more. It is worth noting that one of our founders, Benjamin Franklin, said that there were only two certainties in this life: death and taxes. I dare say, if Mr. Franklin were with us in this Chamber as we prepare to confront this next century, he might amend his statement to say that higher taxes could lead to the death of the American Nation if we do not change what has gone on before.

The facts are these: In 1948, the average American family of four surrendered 3 percent of its income in taxes to the Federal Government. By 1994, that same average family of four surrendered almost one-quarter of its income, 24 percent, in taxes to the Federal Government.

It has been noted by Members of both parties that change is hard. Change is difficult. But as the newcomers to this Congress who join me this afternoon along with one of our distinguished Members of the sophomore class will bear out, change is necessary if we are to make a difference, if we are to prepare this last best hope of mankind to adequately confront the next century.

The people of the Sixth District of Arizona said it pretty simply in November of 1994. indeed, I think it was said across the country. The realization is this: The people of America work hard for the money they earn, and there is nothing selfish and there is nothing ignoble about Americans hanging on to more of their hard-earned money so that they may decide how best to save, spend, and invest for their families, so that they may make critical choices so vital to their children's future and so that they as seniors can hold on to more of their

money again to make choices that are best for them.

As I look around the Chamber, it is a formidable lineup. One of the gentlemen seated here, who we will hear from shortly, indeed, an NFL Hall of Famer, one of the gentlemen to my left, uncharacteristically, a resident of California, indeed, I call him an honorary Arizonan, for his mother was born in the Sixth District of Arizona, near the Inspiration Mine, I know he will have words of inspiration for us; our friend from Nebraska, one of three newcomers on the House Committee on Ways and Means. It is worth noting the last Republican freshman to hold one of those spots was in 1966, a gentleman who went on to become President of these United States, one George Bush; our good friend from Indiana is here, who has worked so hard on trying to get a handle on regulations; our good friend from Kentucky from the sophomore class, who speaks so eloquently and is really a redshirt freshman, if you will, for he came by way of a special election.

Mr. Speaker, now it is my honor to turn to the one-time Princeton line-backer, who is proud of his Tigers in their accomplishments this year on the gridiron, who went on to law school at Wake Forest, and he helped to tutor those teams and improve the record of those Demon Deacons, my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH].

Mr. EHRLICH. As usual, I am at a loss for words when the gentleman from Arizona introduces us. It is such a great opportunity to be with my colleagues from all over the country today to talk about, as the gentleman said, change, change that is long overdue in this society, change, and I believe the gentleman's words were necessary and hard.

I would point out to the gentleman, and we have a piece of evidence with us today, I would point out to the gentleman that change is hard in our society in the 1990's because some groups in our society do not like change. They do not want change. They will say anything to ensure change does not occur.

As the gentleman sees, I have brought the actual transcript with me of a little ad that is running around the country. The AFL-CIO, a big labor group, and I should make this point, not all elements of big labor but some big labor leaders and, of course, some big labor leaders love big government and, as a result, do not love this new majority nor this freshman class, but some members of big labor are running this ad.

I would like to direct a few questions to the gentleman from Arizona and my hallmate, the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], my very good friend and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], "Mr. Deregulation," my very, very good friend on our Subcommittee on Government Reform. What I would like to do, with the gentleman's indulgence, is take a look for

the next 10 or 15 minutes; let us take a look at the verbiage used by big labor to fight not an agenda for America's working families but to fight this new majority who have the real interest of America's working families at heart, the real people who work for a living, who sent every one of us here. Every one of this group was sent here by people who work and who resent these sort of commercials.

The gentleman from Arizona, the commercial begins, "On November 20, our Congressman," fill in the blank, "voted with NEWT GINGRICH and against working families." What vote? The balanced budget, the balanced budget for America's working families.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, how on Earth can that statement even be made? For why would a balanced budget work against America's families? Are we not putting money back in the pockets of working families by balancing the budget on a 30-year mortgage? Are we not realizing real cash that stays in the wallets and pockets of working families? By lowering interest rates with a balanced budget, are we not really helping to fulfill the American dream?

I am just curious that the gentleman from Maryland understands the rationale for this statement and if it is grounded within any type of intellectual fact.

Mr. EHRLICH. Of course not. If the gentleman will yield further, let us look at what follows the introduction. I know the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from California are chomping at the bit here, but it is essential that the American people understand big labor loves big government. They do not want a balanced budget. They do not want the agenda that every member of this freshman class ran on in support of the American family, in support of people who work for a living, who resent the increasing intrusion of big government into their lives every day.

Second line, "He voted to cut Medicare." Third line, "Education and college loans." Fourth line, my favorite, "Class warfare." Class warfare from big labor. "All to give huge tax breaks to big corporations," and our favorite, "the rich."

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MCINTOSH. I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate your diligence ferreting out the truth on these ads. It is about time we had a standard of truth in advertising that would apply to some of the claims that are made.

Is it not true, though, that the average worker will benefit from our balanced budget because of lower interest rates, where, if they have to borrow \$15,000 to buy a new car, they will be able to save \$900 over the loan? Now that is \$900 that is more of his take-home money that he can pay. And is it not true, in my district, for example,