



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 141

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1995

No. 204

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. GUTKNECHT].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
December 19, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable GIL GUTKNECHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of May 12, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes, and each Member, other than the majority or minority leader, limited to 5 minutes. But in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] for 5 minutes.

ELECTIONS IN HAITI

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, while we were at work here this past weekend trying to get out of the budget stalemate we are in, there were events going on in the world that are of very, very great importance to American interests.

In Russia, as you know, there are elections there. We are now sifting through and sorting out exactly what those elections meant.

Initially, though, not very much noticed at all, were other elections nearby in the small, tiny nation of Haiti,

just to our south, a friendly neighboring country. It is an election that Americans had a great stake in, primarily because we have invested on a per-capita basis probably more money in that election than any other in recent history. We have a huge American taxpayer dollar investment there in the growth of democracy, and I think it is very important that we have a full assessment of the way the moneys have been spent and how that tiny nation is doing on its path to democracy.

I think the important thing to say now is that the good news from Haiti is that there is no bad news; but the bad news is there is not much good news either.

Haiti did not have full, fair, free elections. But they did have a step in the right direction because they were able to carry out elections on a countrywide basis for a new President without any of the violence that we have seen in previous elections in that country.

The IRI [International Republic Institute] was there monitoring the progress of their elections, and they concluded in the conversations that I had in a telephone conversation with our on-the-ground team that what happened on Sunday in Haiti was important but it was not conclusive. So I think we are in a position now where we have got a pretty good assessment of the electoral process underway, the technical problems they had. What we do not have is a full assessment of what happened and where we are going now to justify the investment of taxpayer dollars and the American troops we have had there and what we should do next.

I think it is clear that we had low numbers in the Haitian election both in terms of candidates who are participating and in terms of voter turnout. The estimates in voter turnout are called light. The election was called lackluster, uninspiring. There are a lot of reasons for that.

It is true there are a lot of candidates who did not run, for a variety of reasons. Primarily the presidential campaign time was a very abbreviated time. It was about 4 weeks or so, and the campaign tactics themselves were nearly invisible. There was not a lot of campaigning, and there was not a lot of interest generated in the country as a result through the normal campaign tactics that you see for a presidential election.

The fact that much of the loyal opposition, including several of its major parties, boycotted the elections is not a good sign for democracy. People who feel compelled to go outside the system and will not participate inside the system and do not feel welcome or feel frustrated or feel it is so tilted they cannot have a fair chance clearly are making a statement when they say, "We are being forced outside the system."

It is also a fact that in Haiti, I think voter fatigue is a possibility. They have had a lot of elections, and I think that an awful lot of voters are saying the same things to reporters today they were saying to me after the parliamentary elections in June, and that is,

Why should we keep voting for this democracy thing? I still do not have a job. I am still hungry. My family is still hungry. I voted three times. Nothing is better. I am not sure democracy works. The only thing I know is Aristide is my hero.

And unfortunately, Aristide was not on the ballot because constitutionally he cannot succeed himself, and a lot of people probably stayed home because the person they wanted to vote for they could not vote for, so they registered their objection that way.

I think many others stayed home because the election was clearly, those who were organized were the one party that was ready for it and had all of the resources and the blessing apparently of the international parties, and they

□ 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.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H15089

just steamrolled it and apparently, when the election results come in, everybody believes widely there will be one very clear winner, not anybody really in second place. I do not know if that will be true. I think that is a feeling that probably kept people from voting.

In any event, when you have a countrywide presidential election that is supposed to be the most historic event in the peaceful turnover of democracy in the whole history of the country's 200 years and you only get somewhere between 20 and 30 percent turnout, clearly it is not working quite the way it should be.

Security was better. Law and order was better. Of course, it would be if you have Humvees with machine guns and soldiers mounted all over the place and running around from place to place insuring nothing gets out of hand. So we have somewhat of an artificial situation there about law and order.

Regrettably, as in every election, we had intimidations that kept candidates out. We had the media shut down through intimidations. We had allegations of misuse of dollars, all of those kinds of things. These things need a full accounting and full investigation.

Then the President needs to come to Congress and consult and tell Congress and the American people how we spent our money, what we have got for it, and where we are going next. I urge the President, Mr. Speaker, very much this time to consult with Congress before we get into the next chapter of what our relations are going to be with Haiti. I would hate to have to debate another invasion here, because we are seeing one more time a flood of refugees coming to the United States, and the administration's reaction is to send the military.

The economy does not work in Haiti. We know that. We need to have a full accounting. We need to know where we are going, and I urge the administration to check with the U.S. Congress. We are here to help.

NO BUDGET, NO PAY FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Federal Government was shut down by the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DOLE for the longest period of time in our Nation's history. It cost American taxpayers \$100 million a day for this political strategy, a manufactured crisis that sent 800,000 Federal employees home.

Most people thought that the Republicans had learned their lesson. America was not ready for that kind of political strategy. They found it childish and unnecessary, and yet here we are today in the midst of another Govern-

ment shutdown, inspired and orchestrated by the same Republican leaders. They just do not get it. They do not understand that sending home some 300,000 Federal employees a few days before Christmas is beyond heartless, it is stupid, crazy for us as a Nation to be incurring debts of \$80 million to \$100 million a day because of someone's pride.

The American people sent Democrats and Republicans to Washington to solve problems, not to create them, not to say to people who are going to Federal agencies today that their phone calls will be unanswered and no one will be at the door. What they want us to do is to sit down in a commonsense, bipartisan way, deal with our budgetary problems, to make sure we protect Medicare and Medicaid, to make sure that we do not end up obliterating college student loan programs, and to bring a balanced budget in a reasonable period of time.

It is time for some of the political hubris to be set aside.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I think the gentleman makes an excellent point. I mean, I think the American people know there are differences between us. We believe in saving the Medicare and Medicaid systems, with some moderate cuts. They believe in huge cuts and then tax cuts.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me just close by saying this: If it is a matter of principle to shut down the Government, as a matter of principle, the Speaker ought to give up his paycheck; no budget, no pay. If it applies to Federal employees, it ought to apply to the Speaker and every Member of Congress.

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SCHIFF] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I have a different view of why we have reached this impasse today. I acknowledge that in the past, during the discussions about reaching a balanced budget, that both sides bear some responsibility for putting some unnecessary obstacles in the way of reaching that goal. I think that the Republicans, at the very beginning, tried to put in unnecessary non-budget-related issues that have since been removed.

I think the President tried to avoid agreeing to a 7-year timeframe even though when he was campaigning for President of the United States 3 years ago, he said he would propose a balanced budget in 5 years.

But even though the past responsibility falls on both political parties, I believe the current impasse we are in today falls squarely on the Clinton ad-

ministration, and that is simply because the President of the United States is attempting to back out of the agreement he entered into less than a month ago with the Congress of the United States. We resolved the last partial Government shutdown by coming to an agreement. There were several major terms in that agreement, and one of those terms was that we would use common economic projections to put together a balanced budget.

I know this sounds very technical, but economic projections are the building blocks of any budget. They are the forecasts, in this case over 7 years, of how much Government revenue will be received, how much there will be an inflationary impact on Government programs and so forth.

The agreement by the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States was that we would use the figures of the Congressional Budget Office. Now, there was an additional provision, that the Congressional Budget Office was expected to consult with outside sources, which, to the best of my knowledge, they have done. But the bottom line, without any doubt, is that a budget would be put together using only the economic projections of the Congressional Budget Office. The President of the United States now is attempting to avoid living up to an agreement with the Congress of the United States, and the President has stated, first of all, that the Congress is demanding that the President put some cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and other programs up before negotiations can continue. This is not correct.

The Congress is saying the President should put forward a budget based upon CBO, Congressional Budget Office, projections, and that is all. Within those budget projections, the President is free, the administration is free, to put together any budget they want. They can have tax cuts or not have tax cuts. They can have tax increases if they want to propose it. They can have more funding for any program, less funding for any other program. So there is absolutely nothing in putting together a budget based upon the Congressional Budget Office economic projections of revenue, inflation and so forth, that dictates in advance what a budget has to look like.

I heard one of my Democratic colleagues this morning on television say, "Well, the agreement was we will use the Congressional Budget Office as a baseline, but then we could look at other figures." That is not correct. The agreement was that we would use the Congressional Budget Office figures.

Now, the point is, Mr. Speaker, that that is exactly what the Congress of the United States has done. The Congress of the United States passed a budget. I do not agree with all of its individual terms. But the Congress of the United States passed a budget and sent to the President a budget that was balanced in 7 years, which was part of our